to us Vermonters. For there behind the microphone, or on camera, was Jack Barry—asking the questions to which we all wanted answers.

Jack Barry's style as a journalist and a professional broadcaster was one which we should all strive to live up to: He was polite and pesky, thoughtful and thorough. That's probably why he was loved and respected by so many people.

To the man with the silver voice and the silver hair, thank you. Thank you Jack Barry.

TOBACCO TAXES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last Friday's Wall Street Journal published the results of an April 1997 poll it conducted with NBC News. One of the questions in the survey deserves special attention.

The poll asked whether the American people support increasing the cigarette taxes by 43 cents a pack, and returning much of the revenues to the States to provide health care for the Nation's uninsured children. An overwhelming 72 percent of the respondents favored this proposal, which is contained in the legislation that Senator HATCH and I have introduced last month.

The detailed breakdown of the responses shows that the plan has broad support among people of all ages, incomes, ethnicities, educational backgrounds, party affiliations, and geographical regions. Support is at least 2 to 1 in all 36 groups, and it is 3 to 1 or even 4 to 1 in 17 of the groups. North, south, east, west—the American people support the Hatch-Kennedy bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the detailed breakdown of the Wall Street Journal-NBC poll be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALL STREET JOURNAL/NBC NEWS POLL, APRIL 26–28, 1997

Question: Two Senators, a Republican and a Democrat, have proposed increasing cigarette taxes by 43 cents a pack, and giving much of the money raised to help states provide health insurance for uninsured children. Based on this description, do you favor or oppose this plan?

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
All Adults	72	24	4
Men	67	30	3
Women	76	20	4
Northeast	73	20	7
Midwest	73	26	1
South	69	28	3
West	74	23	3
Whites	70	26	4
Blacks	80	16	4
18 to 34	73	25	2
Age 35 to 49	74	23	3
Age 50 to 64	66	30	4
Age 65 and Over	72	21	7
Under $20,000 Income	74	23	3
$20,000–$30,000	76	21	3
$30,000–$50,000	70	28	2
Over $50,000	70	26	4
Urban	76	21	3
Suburb/Towns	70	26	4
Rural	70	28	2
Registered Voters	73	23	4
Non-Registered Adults	65	32	3
Democrats	79	18	3
Republicans	67	29	4
Independents	69	27	4
Clinton Voters	80	17	3

[In percent]

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Dole Voters	64	31	5
Liberals	79	19	2
Moderates	79	19	2
Conservatives	64	31	5
Professionals/Managers	76	21	3
White Collar Workers	77	20	3
Blue Collar Workers	62	35	3
High School or Less	66	30	4
Some College	75	22	3
College Graduates	75	21	4

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Thursday, May 8, 1997, the Federal debt stood at $5,330,417,059,281.37. (Five trillion, three hundred thirty billion, four hundred seventeen million, fifty-nine thousand, two hundred eighty-one dollars and thirty-seven cents)

One year ago, May 8, 1996, the Federal debt stood at $5,094,597,000,000. (Five trillion, ninety-four billion, five hundred ninety-seven million)

Five years ago, May 8, 1992, the Federal debt stood at $3,881,282,000,000. (Three trillion, eight hundred eighty-one billion, two hundred eighty-two million)

Ten years ago, May 8, 1987, the Federal debt stood at $2,270,169,000,000. (Two trillion, two hundred seventy billion, one hundred sixty-nine million)

Twenty-five years ago, May 8, 1972, the Federal debt stood at $426,287,000,000 (Four hundred twenty-six billion, two hundred eighty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of nearly $5 trillion—$4,904,130,059,281.37 (Four trillion, nine hundred four billion, one hundred thirty million, fifty-nine thousand, two hundred eighty-one dollars and thirty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 20 minutes.

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

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

MOTHER'S DAY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this coming Sunday, May 11, is Mother's Day. It used to be that Members of the House and Senate would call attention to special days, days of special significance such as Mother's Day, Father's Day, Memorial Day, Columbus Day, Independence Day, and so on. I do not hear much of that being done anymore, but I like to stay with tradition. I believe that is the tried and true way. The Bible says, ''Remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set.''

Mother's Day came about through the efforts of a dedicated mother and daughter from Grafton, WV. Since 1914, the United States has set aside the second Sunday in May to honor mothers. Anna Maria Reeves Jarvis, a remarkable woman who championed the cause of sanitation and family health throughout her entire life and whose establishment of Mother's Day Work Clubs kept bound the fragile ties of families and communities throughout the Civil War, was a heroine to her daughter, Anna M. Jarvis. Due to Anna M. Jarvis' efforts, she also serves as the source of a beautiful sentiment for all of us today. In honoring her mother's hope that a post-Civil War ''Mothers' Friendship Day'' might someday become an annual event commemorating the service that mothers render to humanity in every field, Anna M. Jarvis has provided each of us with an opportunity to remember and to delight in the love and support which our own mothers have offered to us.

My own dear angel mother died when I was little less than a year old. She was a victim of the virulent Spanish influenza pandemic that swept the globe and swept the Nation in 1918, killing an estimated 20 million people around the world; 500,000 in this country alone. Her name was Ada Kirby Sale. In the one photograph which I have of her, gazing back at me is a blue-eyed, fair-complexioned, pretty young woman with a serious, yet sweet, expression on her face and a large bow of ribbon in her hair. How I wish that I had known her, even for one day! Even in her own distress, she thought of me, her youngest child, when she asked her sister-in-law and brother-in-law to raise me if she, my mother, did not recover from the flu. In those days they were stricken on one day and died the next. So, she asked my aunt and her husband to raise me if she, my mother, did not recover, while my father looked after my four older siblings. I had three brothers and one sister, and my father had 10 sisters and two brothers, so my father gave to various sisters my three brothers, and to Titus Dalton Byrd and my aunt, I was given. And my father kept my sister. I have always carried with me that remembrance of my mother's love for me, because she gave me two foster parents for the hard work of raising a child.

I, therefore, was reared by my Aunt Vlurma and her husband, Titus Dalton Byrd. My name was not Byrd at that time, my name was Sale. My ancestor came from England in the year 1657, and was an indentured worker 7 years to pay for the trip across the waters. He ended up down along the Rappahannock River, in Virginia. So I am his ninth generation descendant. His name was James Sale.

My foster mother and my natural mother were as different in appearance as two women can be. My aunt Vlurma was stocky, stockily built, olive-complexioned, and a laconic woman with dark-brown eyes. She was very religious. She did not make a big whoop-de-do about it. She was not of the religious right or the religious left. She just believed in the old-time religion.

She was religious, straightforward in her dealings with people, and a good shot with a pistol. She was very good to me, though she never displayed much affection. I have no recollection of ever receiving a kiss from her. But I have many recollections of hearing her prayers as they wafted through the stillness of the night from the other room. Many times I have seen her on her knees, praying. It used to be, when I would leave Raleigh County, West Virginia, to return to Washington on a Sunday afternoon, having been back in my congressional district, she would say, ''You be a good boy, Robert. I always pray for you.''

So, she was a major influence in my life, and I thank her to this day for accepting responsibility for me out of affection and kinship with my mother, and for instilling in me strong values—strong values, a sense of duty, a sturdy work ethic, and an unshakable—unshakable faith in the Creator.

How proud man, vain man has become. How arrogant, who has the audacity to say there is no God! I read, just a few days ago, about a poll that was taken among scientists—of all people, who should believe and who should realize that there is a Creator. And I noted that only 40 percent of those scientists, according to the poll, believed in a Creator. That was amazing. It was the same percentage as resulted from a similar poll among scientists in 1916. I took the occasion a few days ago to read from Darwin's ''Origin of Species,'' and to read where Darwin made reference to a Creator, made reference to God; and Darwin asked the question: Is it possible that the Creator may be so superior in intellect to the intellect of man as the human eye is superior to the man-made camera? Here was a scientist who did not deny the existence of a Creator.

I ask doctors—when I go to the office of a physician, I say, ''Doctor, do you believe that there is a Creator?'' And I have yet to come across a doctor who has not answered without hesitation, ''I do. I believe in a Creator.'' I had one doctor less than a week ago talk with me in his office. I asked him the same question. And I sat, open-mouthed and open-eyed, listening to him talk about the audacity of men who would say there is no God.

Raising a child is hard work. Even though the endeavor is leavened with joy, lightened with laugher, and sweetened with children's kisses, raising a child is a demanding job. Every mother who takes on the challenge and raises a responsible, caring individual, merits applause from all of us.

Emerson said, ''Men are what their mothers made them.'' The mother figure is certainly the strongest influence over the character and development of a child in its early years. Motherhood is the most important of life's assignments. There is none other that will equal that. And the responsibility of motherhood is a particularly challenging endeavor, especially in today's world, where parenting responsibilities often have to be juggled with work responsibilities and housekeeping chores.

I often stop to marvel at the many young mothers who work in my own office and in the various Senate offices and throughout the Government and the Nation. Poised, cool, and professional at work, one might never suspect that, after work, they must still dash to the day-care center, race home, feed husbands and children, spend quality time with the family, buy groceries, do the laundry, clean the house, and be back at the office the next morning to begin the cycle all over again. So, I take my hat off to all working mothers as we honor mothers this weekend. They maintain a heroic pace and the Nation owes them a debt that can never be paid.

But, I also salute those women in our society who stick to the more traditional role of keeper of the home and the hearth, for theirs is a difficult job as well, and it is a job for which they receive no pay and little recognition in exchange for their priceless contribution to society.

Anne Morrow Lindbergh said: ''By and large, mothers and housewives are the only workers who do not have regular time off. They are the great vacationless class.''

Sometimes it seems to me that the traditional stay-at-home mom is not as much appreciated today. I have always believed that a great deal of credit should go to those women who make the decision to work in the home. Theirs is the oldest profession in the history of the world: The home maker, the housewife. Managing a home and raising children are serious responsibilities, which, if well carried out, can make a significant contribution to the stability and well-being of our own country.

I recall the story of a great painter, a great artist, Benjamin West, who went to his mother and showed her the little drawings of birds that he had made with pencil and crayon on pieces of paper. And then she took him and sat him gently on her knee and kissed him on the cheek and said, ''You will grow up to be a great painter.'' And Benjamin West attributed his greatness in that art as having originated with a mother's kiss.

My own treasured wife, Erma, with whom I have been blessed to share the past 60 years—as of 2 weeks and 6 days from today—has devoted her life to caring for me and our household, our children and our grandchildren. With her capable hand in charge on the home front, I have had the luxury to devote myself to the duties of the Senate, free from any domestic worries. And it's a great luxury. I could not have put in the countless hours required by my office without her extreme patience and forbearance, understanding and good humor and support. Erma is the epitome of traditional family values, and my pride in the accomplishments of my daughters and their children is a clear reflection of the values and lessons that they learned from their mother and grandmother.

While I was out campaigning in the early years, while I was out knocking on doors, driving over the hills and up the hollows and down the creeks campaigning, she was at home, my wife, with those two young daughters. It is one of the great sacrifices that I have made in public life, one that I can never retrieve—the time that I would like to have spent but didn't spend with my two daughters. But she, my wife, was there, at home and at the hearth with them.

Family values and family structure have traditionally served as the strong backbone of the Nation, and we ought to stop and think about that, not just on Mother's Day, but every day. This strong backbone of our Nation has suffered from osteoporosis in recent years, but it is currently enjoying a resurgence of strength and appreciation because of a collective realization that most of society's ills are not a result of the success or failure of any Government program, but rather have their roots, as well as their solutions, in the most basic building blocks of our culture, like the quality of the home and the cohesion of the family.

Society is a collection of individuals, each of which is shaped, first and foremost, in large part, by his or her own mother. The values that we all cherish, and on which society depends—like caring for others, respect for the law, tolerance, comity, perseverance, loyalty, dedication, patriotism, faith in God—are learned earliest and best from the examples set by our mothers. The woman who raised me didn't hold any doctorates, master's degree, baccalaureate degrees. I don't know that she ever went to school a day in her life, but she taught me how to live. And with that kind of teaching, one may stray from time to time throughout the years of one's life, but they will always come back—they will always come back.

When I think of her, and I can say much about the man who was her husband, also—I will save that for another day—when I think of her stalwart faith in a supreme, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent God, I think of something that made this a great country, and the same thing made the ancient Romans a great people. Theirs were pagan gods, but they believed in their gods. They venerated their ancestors. They honored their parents. The Bible says, ''Honor thy father and thy mother.'' When I think of the woman who took me to raise—I never knew any other mother—I think of one who was as unshakable in her faith as are the mountains of West Virginia, and she ingrained that faith in me.

Churches and schools are important places of learning, but it is the constant encouragement and attitude of our mothers that instill in children the proper respect for church and school in

the first place. We learn to pray at our mother's knee, and to read while sitting on her lap.

In my view, we desperately need a serious bolstering of our national regard for the position of the family in our national life. One day we ought to take the people who do the TV programming that spews filth and violence and sex into the homes of America and shake them with legislation—and the day will come, I believe—that will teach those people that if they will not clean up their act, somebody else will do it for them.

We need more Anna Maria Reeves Jarvises and more daughters like Anna M. Jarvis, who could so effectively mobilize a nation in honor of her own heroic mother and all mothers, and we should honor the role of mothers, not only this weekend, but every day.

So this weekend, especially, let us recognize the role of motherhood, with all of the sentimentality and sweet remembrance that a day set aside for honoring unselfish love should invoke. Let us also realize that proper mothering is a tough job, with the future of our Nation riding, to a great extent, on the success of that endeavor, and let that realization guide us as we contemplate policies for an ailing society sorely in need of a strong dose of moral direction and support.

ROCK ME TO SLEEP

Backward, turn backward, O time, in your flight,
Make me a child again just for tonight!
Mother, come back from the echoless shore,
Take me again to your heart as of yore;
Kiss from my forehead the furrows of care,
Smooth the few silver threads out of my hair;
Over my slumbers your loving watch keep;—
Rock me to sleep, Mother—rock me to sleep!

Over my heart, in the days that are flown,
No love like mother-love ever has shone;
No other worship abides and endures—
Faithful, unselfish, and patient like yours:
None like a mother can charm away pain
From the sick soul and the world-weary brain.
Slumber's soft calms o'er my heavy lids creep;—
Rock me to sleep, Mother—rock me to sleep!

Tired of the hollow, the base, the untrue,
Mother, O Mother, my heart calls for you!
Many a summer the grass has grown green,
Blossomed and faded, our faces between:
Yet, with strong yearning and passionate pain,
Long I tonight for your presence again.
Come from the silence so long and so deep;—
Rock me to sleep, Mother—rock me to sleep!

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DEWINE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, it is always a real treat to be on the Senate floor when my friend and colleague and neighbor from West Virginia speaks. That was a very moving and eloquent statement about Mother's Day, but, of course, also about his own natural mother and also about the mother who raised him.

FAMILY FRIENDLY WORKPLACE ACT

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, we have been this morning, now this afternoon, talking about the issue of the Family Friendly Workplace Act. I would like to spend just a few more minutes talking about this issue.

We are proud, once again, to bring before the Senate this piece of legislation that we believe will help bring the American workplace into the 21st century. The Family Friendly Workplace Act will make our Nation's working environments more flexible, more productive and more hospitable to the changing needs of the American family.

Last week, in my opening comments about this bill, I described what we discovered in the hearings, and I use the term ''discover'' rather loosely because, really, I think we all knew what we saw in those hearings, what we heard in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee. The testimony was very clear that the American workplace today is a dramatically different place than it was when the underlying bill was enacted 60 years ago.

The facts are that the stereotypical roles of management and labor and of male and female workers really no longer apply. The testimony in front of our committee was that individual workers are too often faced with a brutal squeeze today, a squeeze between their duties at work, their obligations, and what they want to do with their families. This worker squeeze is so great that I believe it calls for immediate action. And this bill is that action.

The static and outdated Fair Labor Standards Act that was enacted over 60 years ago must be modified, must be changed. It must be changed to allow American workers today the flexibility that they demand, the flexibility that they want.

The facts are fairly clear. When the underlying legislation, the underlying bill was enacted in 1938, less than 16 percent of married women worked outside the home. Today, more than 60 percent of married women work outside the home. And 75 percent of mothers with school-aged children today work outside the home. And according to a survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, the top concern—top concern—of working women is flexible scheduling in the workplace, flexible scheduling which will allow them to balance their responsibilities at work with the needs of their children and the needs of their families.

The chart that is behind me depicts the pattern of change the American workplace has undergone over the last 25 years. ''The Changing Labor Force Trends of Families, 1940–1995.''

Look at the complete contrast between the family structure today and the family structure as it existed in 1940—1940—only 2 years after the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In 1940, Mr. President, 67 percent of all families had a working husband and a wife who stayed at home, what we considered in those days, the typical family. At the same time, only 9 percent of families had two working spouses. And in 1940 only 5 percent of the families were actually headed by women.

Clearly, this is no longer the case.

By 1995, only 17 percent of families had a working husband and a wife who stayed at home. And 43 percent of American families had two working spouses. And 12 percent were actually families headed by women.

Society, Mr. President, has changed. But the workplace, at least the laws governing the workplace, has not kept pace. I believe that Americans are crying out for relief. They are demanding of this Congress that we change the law, that we change the law to reflect the way people really live today.

Take for example, the Morris family. Clayton Morris—father, husband—is a public employee. As a public employee he has the option of choosing compensatory time over traditional monetary overtime pay. He gets a choice which way he wants it. He is free to spend important extra time with his 2½-year-old son Domenic, while his wife Ann, a sales assistant for a Cleveland area business form company, cannot. She is prohibited by law from having that option.

This is what Ann has said:

> He [referring to her husband Clayton] has the ability if he works overtime to store [up] those hours . . . [he] can use the stored comp time to be at home where he is needed. [However, when] I need to be able to leave work, I end up having to take sick time or vacation time to do that. [That's what I have to do.] It would be really nice if I had a flexible schedule [also].

Mr. President, seemingly countless studies and surveys have pointed out time and time again that Americans overwhelmingly need, desire, want, and support a more flexible workplace schedule and the changes the Family Friendly Workplace Act would bring about.

Let me take the opportunity now to highlight what this bill will do, S. 4, and explain briefly the different provisions of the bill.

The first option of the bill we refer to as comptime. This allows workers to voluntarily—voluntarily—choose to take their overtime pay as time off instead of taking their overtime pay in money. They get the time off as opposed to taking the money. But it is the worker's choice.

Under this bill, compensation in the form of compensatory time off is paid out at the same rate as an employee's normal rate of overtime pay. That is, one-half hour of compensatory time off for every hour of overtime worked.

Mr. President, under this option employers and employees must agree to provide and receive, respectively, compensatory time in lieu of monetary overtime pay. It is an agreement, a voluntary agreement entered into by both