

pay at 350 of the country's largest firms. The median CEO salary and bonus in 1997 was \$1.6 million, or \$770 an hour. The CEO takes less than 2 days to earn what a minimum wage worker earns in a full year.

The same groups that complain about an increase in the minimum wage are the ones that have made dramatic increases in the payment of their officials, Mr. President. On the one hand, they say, "We can't afford to pay a 50 cent or \$1 increase in the minimum wage"; yet, they are able to afford millions more in salaries and stock options to their executives.

Over 170 groups have joined the Campaign for a Fair Minimum Wage. They include religious groups, such as the American Friends Service Committee, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the United Methodist Board of Church and Society, the United States Catholic Conference—and dozens more.

Women's organizations are also represented: the American Association of University Women, the National Committee on Pay Equity, the National Partnership for Women & Families, the National Women's Political Caucus, the Older Women's League, and many others.

Civil rights groups also support the Campaign. These groups and others understand that the minimum wage is a civil rights issue—a partial list includes the American-Arab Anti-discrimination Committee, the Asian American Legal Defense Fund, the NAACP, the National Council of La Raza, the Rainbow Coalition, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and many more.

Trade unions have joined the Campaign, too. Virtually every union member earns more than the minimum wage, thanks to union representation at the bargaining table. But that hasn't stopped the AFL-CIO, AFSCME, the Communications Workers, the Steel Workers, the Service Employees and other unions from strongly supporting this increase. They believe that every working American deserves a decent wage, and they are working hard to achieve that result.

Mr. President, we will continue to consider the issues that have been raised in past debates on the minimum wage. We are eager to debate these issues on the floor of the U.S. Senate and give the membership an opportunity to vote on this issue.

As I have mentioned, and will continue to say time in and time out, this is an issue of fundamental fairness and decency. It is a real reflection of the kind of values which this institution has.

This is a women's issue because the majority of minimum wage workers are women. It is a children's issue because many of those women have children.

It basically is a fairness issue. And we are very hopeful that we will have the opportunity to debate this and have a decision on this issue in the U.S. Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

ORDER FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 6 p.m. there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

CONSUMER BANKRUPTCY REFORM ACT OF 1998

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

THE MINIMUM WAGE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me, first of all, say that as we go into this debate—and I am pleased to be joined with Senator KENNEDY; I have spoken about the importance of raising the minimum wage—I look forward to having the opportunity to debate this with colleagues.

I guess I have reached the conclusion—I think this is sort of the common ground with the Chair—that the best single thing we can do in the Congress, in the House and the Senate, is to do everything we can to enable parents to do the best by their kids, or a single parent to do her or his best by children. I really do believe that this means many different kinds of things. But one of them certainly is to try to make sure that people have a living wage. I think it is terribly important.

I think it is a value question. I look forward to the debate. I will be out on the floor with my colleague, Senator KENNEDY, and others as well.

CRISIS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I want to talk for a moment, or for a little while here, about what is happening in the Midwest. I had thought that perhaps this afternoon I would have an opportunity as a Senator from Minnesota to join my colleagues from other Midwestern States with an amendment that would speak to the crisis in agriculture. That didn't happen this afternoon.

For those who are watching this debate, now that there is an attempt to work out an agreement on this bankruptcy bill with a potential cloture vote tomorrow, it doesn't look like we will be able to introduce this amendment, at least today. But I do want to just say to colleagues—I know that a number of us will be on the floor tomorrow—that my top priority as a Senator from Minnesota is to bring to the floor of the Senate, with other colleagues, an amendment that would really make a difference in the lives of family farmers in my State.

Mr. President, we have an economic convulsion in agriculture. There is tre-

mendous economic pain in our rural communities.

Many farmers and their families are just leaving their farms now. They are doing it quietly. It is not so much like the mid-1980s where you really saw a lot of farm rallies and marches and whatnot. That may happen. That may not happen. I don't know.

I know that when I go to farm gatherings—whether it be in Fulda, MN, or in Granite Falls, MN, or Crookston, MN, it is quite unbelievable with the number of people that come.

The fact of the matter is that with farmers now receiving somewhere like \$1.42 for a bushel of corn, there is just simply no way—or \$2.15 for a bushel of wheat—they can't cash-flow.

My friend, the Presiding Officer, is from the State of Indiana. And he knows something about this issue.

You can be the best manager in the world. You can't make it. If you are not a huge conglomerate, then you have more of a family farm operation, which really ranges in terms of numbers of acres of land. But the important part of it is that it is entrepreneurship. The people that work the land live there. These are the people that are in the most trouble.

For those of us who are from the Midwest—in a way, I approach this debate with a sense of history, because I think in many ways this is sort of one of the last regions of the country where you have a family farm structure in agriculture.

Mr. President, what I want to say to colleagues, understanding full well that we will not be able to do this on the bankruptcy bill, though I must say to my colleague from Iowa, a very good friend, that there is unfortunately a very direct correlation between what is happening, as he well knows, to family farms in our State and bankruptcy.

If we can't do this amendment that will speak to the farm crisis on the bankruptcy bill, then the very next vehicle that comes to the floor—the very next bill—we absolutely have to have an amendment out here.

We may have some different views about what needs to happen. But I will tell you that the amendment that I see which must be brought to the floor first and foremost is we are going to have to remove the caps on the market assistance loans. We can do other things as well and allow a 6-month loan extension. Corn right now is capped at \$1.89 a bushel. This would get it up to \$2.00, \$2.20, \$2.25. Wheat is capped at \$2.58. This would get it up to \$3.20. This would be the single most important thing we can do, along with providing indemnity payments that we have all been talking about.

We passed this before we went on recess. It is going to have to be more by way of financial assistance, given what is happening to a lot of farmers in the South as well, because of weather conditions. And in our State, in northwest

Minnesota, it is also scab disease. But we have to do those two things.

Mr. President, I want to say to colleagues that I don't feel like time is neutral. In many ways, I feel like as a Senator from Minnesota that I am confronted with the urgency of now. I am trying to say to myself, "You are here as a Senator. What is the best thing you can do?"

We have a bankruptcy bill. We can't put this amendment on the bankruptcy bill. But the next bill that comes to the floor next week, or the end of this week, we are going to be out here with an amendment that speaks directly to this farm crisis. We have to. It would be like not being a Senator from your State not to do this. I think every Senator on this floor, Democrat and Republican, understands this. I hope that we will have this amendment in the Chamber no later than the beginning of next week, if not tomorrow, although I am not quite sure how we are going to proceed on this bankruptcy bill. And if not that, there will come a point in time where probably the best thing I can do, if we are completely shut out—and I hope this won't happen—will be to come to the floor and filibuster, just basically stop everything.

I don't think that will happen, but there is no way, there is no possible way, that I can go back home to the State of Minnesota and look in the eyes of a lot of people I really love and believe in without having made an all-out fight. We have only, what, 3 weeks left.

So my appeal to colleagues is, look, it is getting hard to find the time to do some of what we think are our priorities. I wanted to see us out on the floor with this amendment today. That is not going to be possible as we try to work out something on the bankruptcy bill.

It is a bitter irony for me to see "bankruptcy bill." My gosh, that is what is happening in my State. That is what is happening all across greater Minnesota right now. People cannot make it. We cannot do the amendment on the bankruptcy bill. But whatever the next bill is, I guess at the beginning of next week we will have this amendment out here. I know how strongly Senator DASCHLE from South Dakota feels about this. This is his State, agriculture. There are other Senators from the Midwest who believe just as strongly, Democrats and Republicans.

But I just want to say to Minnesota and to my colleagues, there is no way in the world that I can see us adjourning without taking action. There is just no way. It would be just impossible to go back into greater Minnesota to meet with people in communities and say, "Well, we had too busy a schedule. It was too difficult to find a 'vehicle'." No one knows what you are talking about—vehicles. I said it 5 minutes ago: "We are looking for a vehicle." No one knows what that means. But just to try to say to people in Min-

nesota, "We only had a few weeks, and there was too busy a schedule; there were many important appropriation bills that we had to pass; there was no way to find the time," people would say, "Aren't we a priority?" They would say, "Paul, aren't we a priority?—\$1.40 for a bushel of corn, \$2.50, \$2.60 for a bushel of wheat. What about us? What about our children? What about our families? What about our communities?"

So, again, move the caps on the market assisted loans and allow a 6-month extension. You have to get the price up. It is price, price, price. There is no substitute for getting the price up. If we can debate this, I don't even want to have an acrimonious debate. Those who thought that the Freedom to Farm—which I always called the "Freedom to Fail"—bill was an important piece of legislation, call it a modification, just a modification. We still have a loan rate. We just cap it at a very low level. Call it part of what we do by way of disaster relief, by way of emergency assistance, because this is an emergency. This is a disaster. The record low prices are a disaster. It is an emergency because people are not going to be able to continue to stay on their farms.

What people are asking for in Minnesota, in my State, is not anything more than a fair shake. They are just saying give us an opportunity to have a decent price in the marketplace.

Let me tell you, the grain companies will do just fine, but these family farmers will not. This "Freedom to Fail" bill has been a disaster in and of itself. We have to at least come back and have some kind of modification, some kind of safety net, some kind of way that farmers can get a better price. We also have to make sure that we get these indemnity payments out to people. People need the cash assistance so they can keep going.

Mr. President, those are the two major provisions. There will be other provisions as well in an amendment we will bring to the floor, but I cannot see any way to postpone action on an agriculture farm crisis relief amendment any longer.

We have been talking about this. Everybody is trying to figure out what are going to be the electoral connections, how is this going to fit into the elections, and so on and so forth. I will tell you, I think those of us from these States don't feel that way; we have to get something done. I do not think any proposal is credible unless you can get the price up. It all starts with getting the price up for family farmers.

There is a whole lot going on in Washington right now, I guess. None of it should make anybody here, regardless of party, all that happy or all that pleased. But I can say without any exaggeration whatsoever, believe it or not, that in Fulda, MN, or Granite Falls, MN, or Crookston, MN, or in all sorts of communities in Minnesota where a lot of wonderful people who

work so hard live, for them the focus is on being able to stay on their farm.

The focus is whether or not the Senate and the House of Representatives are going to respond to their pain, whether or not we are going to provide them with some relief, whether or not we are going to do anything about this crisis. It cannot be done in Indiana or Minnesota at the State level. You cannot affect price at the State level. You could put together at the State level some different credit relief packages and all the rest, but you cannot affect the price. You have to remove the cap on the loan rate. You have to get the price up. You have to give these people a chance to get a decent price in the marketplace. You have to do that. First and foremost, you have to do that. We cannot wait any longer.

So I don't know whether my words tonight are so much sort of talking about substantively what any number of us are going to bring out as an amendment—there are a lot of my colleagues in the Midwest I know who are going to be out here with this amendment led by Senator DASCHLE—or whether what I am trying to say is, look, I don't want to have people angry at me next week or the week afterwards, but I tell you, if we don't get an opportunity to put this amendment on a piece of legislation, then I am just going to come out here and talk for hours and hours and hours. I will just start talking about families, and I will start translating this into terms. I have done it before on the floor of the Senate.

There is no issue I feel more strongly about. I don't really care how much is swirling around Washington, DC, and all the other stuff that people are going to be talking about, all of which I know has to be discussed and talked about, I guess, up to a point, although I think it ought to be proved. I think ultimately we are all going to have to make some decision about this, so we ought to wait and see what the facts are.

But I tell you, right now, for me, this is the issue. This is the issue for a lot of people all across Minnesota. And I am not just saying it to give a speech. It is just true. They do not have any future for themselves and their families unless we take some action. We are going to have to do that. I feel stymied that we cannot do it on the bankruptcy bill. It seems that there is a very logical connection to record low farm prices and bankruptcy. But if not this bill, if not tonight, if not Friday, then next week we will bring this amendment to the floor and we will have a debate and we are going to pass a farm crisis relief amendment. And then we are going to get it through the House. And the House and the Senate are going to agree, and there is going to be credible, substantive farm crisis relief legislation that will make a difference.

If we keep getting shut out and there is just no way to do it by way of bills, then I am just going to come out and filibuster.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for morning business.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, we have reached the time set aside for morning business. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak as in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business. The Senator has that right. Without objection, the Senator will be recognized to speak as in morning business for 20 minutes.

THE CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, at present, it is our expectation tomorrow morning to be voting on cloture on a motion to proceed forward on S. 1645, the Child Custody Protection Act. It is my hope that tomorrow we will find 60 votes so we might proceed to debate that issue. The fact is, we have not had an opportunity here on the floor to have much debate about this motion to proceed, or about the issue itself, so I would like to take the time today to begin to acquaint our colleagues with this very vital piece of legislation.

Mr. President, the Child Custody Protection Act would protect State laws requiring parental involvement in a minor's important decision whether or not to undergo an abortion.

If the minor's home State has a parental involvement law this legislation would make it a Federal offense to transport that minor across State lines to obtain an abortion, unless the parents have been involved as that law requires, or the requirement has been waived by a court.

By protecting existing State laws this legislation would help protect parents' rights and the health and well-being of teen-age girls facing unexpected pregnancy.

I know, Mr. President, that the abortion issue has been strongly debated in this Chamber and, indeed, throughout our country. But I believe we all should be able to agree on the need for this legislation. Whatever one's position on the underlying issue of abortion, the protection of parental rights, of valid

State laws, and of our daughters' health and emotional well-being demand that we prevent non-parents and non-guardians from circumventing State parental involvement laws.

The rationale behind this legislation is simple, Mr. President: States that choose to institute parental involvement requirements deserve to have those requirements respected.

Mr. President, 85 percent of Americans surveyed in a 1996 Gallup poll favored requiring minors to get parental consent for an abortion. Americans quite reasonably believe that no teen should be left to face an unexpected pregnancy alone. As the Supreme Court noted in *H.L. versus Matheson*, "the medical, emotional, and psychological consequences of an abortion are serious and can be lasting; this is particularly so when the patient is immature."

I believe the American people share this realization, and also realize that parents are almost always the ones most willing and able to provide their daughters with the guidance and support they need in making the life-changing decision whether or not to undergo an abortion.

Thus it is not surprising that more than 20 States have instituted parental involvement requirements.

These laws are on the books. They have been held constitutional, and they have the support of a strong majority of the American people.

Unfortunately, parental involvement laws are being circumvented and undermined by non-parents and non-guardians taking pregnant, minor teens across State lines for secret abortions.

This is a significant problem. The abortion rights Center for Reproductive Law & Policy reports that thousands of pregnant girls are taken across State lines by adults to obtain secret abortions.

Indeed, a veritable interstate abortion industry seems to have grown up.

Abortion clinics in States without parental involvement laws are advertising in States that do have these requirements. The advertisements inform anyone who cares to know that the clinics will perform abortions on minors without parental notification or consent.

Many people are attracted by these advertisements, and the results can be tragic.

During the hearing on this bill, the Judiciary Committee heard from Joyce Farley. Mrs. Farley told us how her 12-year-old daughter was given alcohol, raped, then taken across the State lines, by the rapist's mother, for a secret abortion. Understandably, Mrs. Farley was of the view that the abortion was undertaken to destroy evidence of her daughter's rape by a 17-year-old neighbor, who committed the act.

Mrs. Farley's daughter was understandably frightened and embarrassed. She did not immediately tell her mother of either her rape or her pregnancy.

Her rapist's mother took advantage of this situation. Without telling Mrs. Farley, she drove the girl from her home in Pennsylvania, which has a parental notification law, to New York, which does not. She took the girl to an abortion clinic, lied on the forms, claiming to be the girl's mother, and waited while the girl underwent an abortion. The rapist's mother then dropped Mrs. Farley's daughter off 30 miles from her home.

This poor girl was bleeding and in pain. When she got home, Mrs. Farley asked her what was wrong and eventually was told about the abortion. She then called the New York abortion clinic and was told that the pain and bleeding were normal—to be expected. She was told to increase her daughter's medication.

Luckily for her daughter, Mrs. Farley is a nurse, so she knew that this advice was dangerously wrong. As it turned out, the abortion was incomplete and this young girl, now just 13, had to undergo another procedure to complete the abortion.

Mrs. Farley was understandably very upset at what had happened to her daughter. She also was upset at what had, and what had not, been done about it.

The man who had gotten her daughter pregnant eventually pleaded guilty to statutory rape. But the rapist's mother, who claimed she was just "helping out" by taking a by-then-13-year-old rape victim across State lines for a secret abortion, may receive no punishment at all.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court has just accepted for review her challenge of Pennsylvania's prosecution of her under State law. She charges that Pennsylvania exceeded its constitutional authority. Moreover, courts, legislators and prosecutors face great difficulty in situations like this because it is unclear which State's laws should apply.

The actions of the rapist's mother were arguably legal in New York, even though Pennsylvania has made them illegal within that State. It is this classic conflict of laws problem that the Child Custody Protection Act would address.

Mr. President, Mrs. Farley deserves better protection than she currently receives. Her daughter certainly deserves better protection, and parents and teens all across America deserve better protection against this kind of interference in the most important and most private decisions people can make.

Any parent with minor daughters—and I have two of my own—should be concerned about what happened to Mrs. Farley, and especially what happened to her daughter.

State parental notification and consent laws exist to protect girls from predators. They also exist to protect families.

Today, any child is at significantly increased risk of drug abuse, crime,