

Government regulation has become the norm. However, we have developed not one, but two regulatory regimes. The first is public regulation for which we developed all manner of disclosure, discovery, and due process. This regime is under constant scrutiny. Thus, the 104th Congress enacted the Congressional Review Act which establishes a sweeping procedure whereby Congress, with Presidential approval, can nullify regulations.

There is, however, a second regulatory regime concealed within a vast bureaucratic complex. There is some Congressional oversight: some Presidential control. Do not overestimate either. Not that the public is excluded altogether, save as bureaucracies or bureaucrats think it to their advantage to make some things public. As, for example, it being budget time, we find on the front pages the report that:

"The Central Intelligence Agency has severed its ties to about 100 foreign agents because they committed murder, torture and other crimes. . . ."

This is surely a welcome development. Although it could be asked why in the first instance public monies were disbursed to murderers, torturers and sundry criminals.

This second regime is in need of radical change. We have sensed this for some time. But I now submit that change will only come if we recognize it as a bureaucratic regime with recognizable and predictable patterns of self-perpetuation which will never respond to mere episodic indignation.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may need to the sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

VOLUNTEER PROTECTION ACT OF 1997—MOTION TO PROCEED

The Senate continued with the consideration of the motion to proceed.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I thank you for this opportunity to spend a few more minutes helping those watching understand exactly what significant opportunities we are talking about with the Family Friendly Workplace Act. It is our effort to try to give to people who are on hourly working arrangements the ability to develop flexible working schedules—to do it in the same way as has been possible for Federal workers so situated for the last—well, during the 1970's, 1980's and into this decade of the 1990's.

The attempt to offer the ability to work flexible schedules is a result of people feeling the stress of the job that tugs them away from their families. In order to understand the true nature of workers' stress and the benefit they would gain from flexible work schedules, I would like to read some letters that have been sent to our office. Here is a letter that says:

DEAR SENATOR ASHCROFT. I'm a 29-year-old working mother. I have a 2-year-old daughter and am pregnant and due in November. I recently heard about your Family Friendly Workplace Act. Under current law where I work does not allow me to have a flexible work schedule. They are not allowed by the

law to let us work less than 40 hours one week and then more than 40 hours the next. In my current condition, I need to be able to take off for doctors' appointments. Due to the fact that I have a complication in my pregnancy, I have more appointments than average. If I was able to take off more one week and work more the next, it would be very helpful to me and other mothers in Missouri.

That is perfectly stated. Here is another letter:

My 2-year-old daughter is healthy but there are some days she needs extra attention and some days that she is sick. Some days she is just 2.

Meaning the terrible 2's, I suppose.

If I was able to take time I need for some mornings and to make it up at lunch or the next week, it would make my life much easier.

Here is another letter:

It's been a struggle for me to be able to arrange for doctor appointments, be home when my child is ill and my three children are always sick at different times. Or when my babysitter has been unable to take my children because of illness. Not all of us have spouses or family members who can fill in for us or when we need to be there for our children. My husband works out of town on many occasions and is unable always to be around when needed.

Working parents are not asking for special favors, just a way to be able to meet the demands of both our jobs and families. The Family Friendly Workplace Act would help solve the problem of inflexibility in the workplace. Being able to arrange biweekly work schedules would be very helpful in meeting the needs of our families. I would be able to take the time off for doctors' appointments or to leave a couple hours early one day if the babysitter calls to tell me my child has a fever. Being able to make that time up the next week would certainly take off a lot of the pressure and the stress of taking these last few hours of leave time or potentially being on leave without pay.

Here is an individual working because they need the money. When a little crisis arises, because flextime is not available, they have to leave the office without pay. She goes on to say:

The option of taking compensatory time in lieu of monetary compensation would also be very valuable to working parents who just need the time off.

Here is another.

Presently I enjoy flexible schedules. The extra day off [I have] during the week allows me to spend one-on-one quality time with my 5-year old daughter. She will start kindergarten this fall, which makes these girls-only days especially meaningful for both of us. Additionally, I can schedule many doctors' appointments as well as other appointments for me and my children on this day off. This allows me to save my accrued sick or vacation leave for a time when I really need the sick leave or can take a well planned family vacation.

As a supervisor, I currently have the flexibility in my schedule from week to week. However, my staff are not given the same opportunity, although many of them would be able to utilize and benefit from it.

Kind of interesting to me. Here is the supervisor that has the flex capacity, says that the staff ought to have the same thing. This is really the crux of what we are talking about in this bill.

My staff are not given this same opportunity although many of them would be able to utilize and benefit from it.

She says:

I am reluctant to exercise this advantage, however, of mine because it seems unfair to me that I have something that my employees do not. I understand that this bill would require that this opportunity be afforded to all employees, not just those in management or supervisory positions.

Here is another letter from a constituent:

Time with my children is very important and, unfortunately, working outside the home is important, too. My children will only be young once, and missing parts of their development is a very important part that I can never replace. I would like to better balance my family life and my work life. And I think the Family Friendly Workplace Act is an excellent opportunity for working parents.

Here is a letter from a schoolteacher:

I ask that you support the bill as I think it would be a great benefit to all citizens in this country. As an educator, I feel that this would allow parents time to be in school with their children. Time and time again, parents relate to me that they cannot come to school for conferences or other meetings because they have to work. This bill would allow some flexibility in the workplace.

Another letter. I think this letter is very interesting. This writer used to be a Federal employee and is now working in the private sector. The individual writes:

I have worked in the Federal Government with a flexible schedule based on 80 hours and enjoyed it."

That means you work an average of 80 hours over 2 weeks.

Now that I have left the Federal work force, I have questioned why this same opportunity is not available to me in the private sector. As an American, this disappoints me greatly. The Government does not have enough confidence in me to allow me to make a decision to not take overtime pay if I exceed 40 hours a week. By pretending to protect me, they have hurt me. My company cannot pay me overtime, so I cannot take time off next week. I would like to see the same benefits that Federal workers have, be offered to the private sector.

Another example is the vacation time, the writer goes on to say:

What I receive in industry isn't near that what the Federal Government provides. Three-day weekends were great while they lasted—even 4-day weekends allowed the family to get away for a short trip, which is about all we can ever afford anyhow, and I still have discretionary time for kids, doctor visits, and other needs.

Here is a letter from a schoolteacher:

As an elementary teacher I feel parents need to have time off to help in their child's classroom and attend conferences. The children have the real benefit of this bill, if it passes, because they will know that their parents really do care about them and their progress in school.

We will have an opportunity to debate and discuss this matter fully. I thank the majority leader, TRENT LOTT, for allowing us to have this time this afternoon to bring this bill forward. It is pretty clear that the supplemental appropriations will take precedence over this bill when we reconvene next week and that budget matters will have priority and be the subject of our

deliberations. But, because this measure was the next measure to come up after those come before us, the majority leader let us have a start on this important issue this afternoon.

I look forward to the time when these other measures—which are very important and require our attention—will have been settled and we can get back to this all-important issue of allowing workers to have the flexibility to spend time with their families. It is as important as ever to allow workers in the private sector who are paid hourly wages to have the same benefits that Federal Government workers have had since 1978.

So I thank the majority leader for giving us the opportunity to begin this bill now. It will be necessary for us to bring the bill down so we can proceed to other matters. I close by thanking my good friends who have helped in this measure. Perhaps the most responsible for the significant progress we have made is Senator DEWINE of Ohio, in whose subcommittee this bill was heard and whose leadership has resulted in it being one of the first pieces of major legislation brought to the floor during this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Missouri for the excellent statement and explanation about his bill and also congratulate him for bringing this bill to the floor. As he stated, we knew as we began the debate today that we would only just get started and that, because of concerns about the budget and other scheduling matters on the floor, we would have to ask to have this bill pulled down temporarily. We will be back on this bill. It is a very important bill to American workers. It is a question of fairness. It is a question of equity. It is a question of really trying to bring our laws up to date to reflect the reality of how people live their lives today, the reality of the American workplace.

It is a bill about eliminating discrimination. The current law, frankly, as we talked about it, does in fact discriminate against hourly workers who are in the private sector who do not have the benefit of working for the Federal Government.

So, at this point I do ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the motion is withdrawn.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE

Financial Disclosure Reports required by the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended and Senate rule 34 must be filed no later than close of business on Thursday, May 15, 1997. The reports must be filed with the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510. The Public Records Office will be open from 8 a.m. until 6 p.m. to accept these filings, and will provide written receipts for Senators' reports. Staff members may obtain written receipts upon request. Any written request for an extension should be directed to the Select Committee on Ethics, 220 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510.

All Senators' reports will be made available simultaneously on Friday, June 13. Any questions regarding the availability of reports should be directed to the Public Records Office. Questions regarding interpretation of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 should be directed to the Select Committee on Ethics.

THE CULTURAL DECLINE IN AMERICA

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I would like to make a few remarks in morning business. Today, as most people recognize, is a national day for prayer. We have also been talking about a very important thing regarding families and a bill that has been put forward to try to help families be able to do their job better.

What I would like to speak about a little bit today is building off of that statement and also off the National Day of Prayer to talk about, overall, the culture of America and what has happened to our Nation, what has happened in our culture. I think it probably would come as no surprise, unfortunately, to most people that our culture is in difficulty and has been having a great deal of problems lately.

I have been looking at and studying this issue for some period of time. Plus, as I travel across my State, as I travel across Kansas, I hear more and more people mentioning how much difficulty they think the culture is in, how much they feel like they are fighting culture just to raise their kids and raise their families. I would like to take the Senate's time for just a few minutes to describe where we are today in this culture. Why do we need things like flexibility for families to be able to be families again? Why do we need to do those things?

Let us look at some of these charts. I apologize ahead of time for how discouraging they are, because they are. As you look at these things—look at this. This is child abuse and neglect reports in America. We are talking, in 1976, about 500,000 of them, which was a lot at that point in time. But consider where we are today: 3 million in 1995 reported, of child abuse and neglect cases reported on an annual basis, 3

million. That is a high percentage of our children being recorded in this. This is a terrible situation and, unfortunately, an indictment of the culture.

Let us look at out-of-wedlock births. This is something that has received a lot of attention overall in our society. Consider where we were in 1960—about 5 percent. And you can go back earlier in time and it stays at about this 3 to 5 percent level. Consider where we are today—30 percent. About one in every three children born in America today is born to a single mom. That is a tough situation. In our inner cities—in the District of Columbia we have here, that figure gets up to nearly 60 to 70 percent.

My wife and I have three children. It is tough enough for two of us to raise them, let alone without flexible time to be able to get off from work, and let alone without being born into a situation where you start out with one parent just at the very outset.

The next chart, violent crimes taking place in our society. Unfortunately, I think everybody knows the situation here, but look at the staggering numbers—staggering numbers. In 1960, we are talking about violent crime offenses—rape per 100,000, we had about between 100 to 200 per 100,000 citizens in the country in 1960. Look at where we are today. We are up at nearly 800 per 100,000 people. Look at that period of time, 1960 to 1993, 33 years, and we go up nearly sevenfold in violent crimes, sevenfold.

My own staff here in Washington, DC, and I have only been here now 4 months, three of them have been burglarized, my own staff here in Washington, DC. This is across the country what is taking place. This is just a horrendous number, if you look at that.

Take a look at this. This one is sad, about the hopelessness of some of our kids in this society. Just think about the concept even of a teenager, somebody who is just looking at getting into life and into what should be the flowering, the spring of his or her life, committing suicide; having, actually, the mental thought that I should end this life. To me that is just—it is almost unthinkable, anyway; abhorrent. What has happened in our culture? These are again per 100,000. We used to have about 3 in 1960. We are up to nearly 12; quadrupled in a 35-year time period, of teens being hopeless. How much more do they reflect the rest of teenagers who have thought about this and decide, well, I am not willing to quite take that step? It has quadrupled in 35 years, in the state of our society.

What about marriages ending in divorce? Do not hear me to say I am perfect or my family is perfect. We have had divorces in our family, too, just like every family in America. But look at the numbers, because they are staggering; they really are. In 1920, about 10 or 11 percent of marriages ended in divorce. Where are we today? Nearly 50 percent; nearly 50 percent. And it affects all families everywhere. It affects my family, too. Look at that.