

would have the ability to be with their kids on occasions when current guidelines prohibit. In my case, my job as a security guard occasionally calls for overtime. Under this legislation, I would be allowed the choice to receive pay or to be more involved in coaching, attending school events and other general activities my kids are involved with.

Our government serves people in many ways, but there is no better way to serve than building strong families, which the Family Friendly Workplace Act obviously seeks to accomplish.

There is a security guard that I think feels capable of making judgments about whether or not he wants to be paid for all of his overtime, or whether he would like to be able to opt to have some time off. I am just delighted that there are moms and dads in America that would like to be more involved in coaching, attending school events, and other general activities with kids. Yet, our Government is keeping that from happening.

Here is a letter from a 29-year-old working mother:

I am a 29 year old working mother. I have a two-year-old daughter and am pregnant and due. . . .

I recently heard about your Family Friendly Workplace Act. Under the current law, the law firm in which I am employed does not allow me to have a flexible work schedule.

No wonder it doesn't; the law doesn't allow it.

In my current condition, I need to be able to take off for doctor 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 time in one week and work more the next, it would be very helpful to me and other mothers. . . .

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

Those of us who are parents are familiar with kids that are "just two."

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

Well, these letters are just a few. As we debate these issues during this session and over the next few days or as we approach voting on this particular measure, I would just say that it is fundamentally important for us to recognize the need to provide America's working families with the same kind of advantage, with flexible time, which American families that work for Government have. If it's good enough for Government workers, it is good enough for private workers. If Government workers are smart enough to know when they want comptime as compared to pay and are able to figure that out and when they would like to be able to rearrange their schedules to be involved with their children, I firmly believe that private workers have the same kind of intelligence and capacity. I think it is incumbent upon those of us in Government to make sure that we begin to legislate policy which is consistent with the principles of America and the principle of strong families, which is one we ought to be careful to understand and reinforce.

So I think we are going to have a great opportunity in this session. I expect that it will be a great opportunity as we legislate in this particular matter. We are going to have the opportunity to provide flextime and comptime to America's private-sector hourly workers. It is a privilege that is understood by the salaried workers in the private sector, understood by both the hourly and salaried workers in Government. Flextime is understood by people in the Federal Government system. Comptime is understood by, and enjoyed by, people in government systems everywhere, State, local and Federal.

We have delayed this benefit package for too many days. I say "we," and I have done that to label the U.S. Senate. But the delay has come from the other side of the aisle. No amendments were offered when we brought this up before, but no vote was allowed. It's time that we have serious amendments, serious negotiations, and that we seriously embark upon providing the people of this country with this opportunity to serve their families.

Today's speeches about how we need to debate openly and bring amendments on a family-friendly agenda could not be more on point. So let's have the debate, let's have the family-friendly agenda, let's have those amendments as it relates to the opportunity for hourly workers in the private sector to be able to spend time with their families as a result of voluntary agreements with their employers, to have flexible working arrangements and compensatory time arrangements similar to those of salaried workers and similar to those of Government workers.

We are going to debate and act on flextime and comptime this year. I look forward to the debate very much. I am grateful for the opportunity to submit this amendment in this respect.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES— H.R. 2472

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of February 12, 1998, the Chair appoints the following conferees to H.R. 2472.

The Chair appointed Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. AKAKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a

period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, March 20, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,538,571,184,190.64 (Five trillion, five hundred thirty-eight billion, five hundred seventy-one million, one hundred eighty-four thousand, one hundred ninety dollars and sixty-four cents).

One year ago, March 20, 1997, the federal debt stood at \$5,369,250,000,000 (Five trillion, three hundred sixty-nine billion, two hundred fifty million).

Twenty-five years ago, March 20, 1973, the federal debt stood at \$456,695,000,000 (Four hundred fifty-six billion, six hundred ninety-five million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion—\$5,081,876,184,190.64 (Five trillion, eighty-one billion, eight hundred seventy-six million, one hundred eighty-four thousand, one hundred ninety dollars and sixty-four cents) during the past 25 years.

MUHAMMAD ALI—ATHLETE OF THE CENTURY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am delighted that my dear friend Muhammad Ali has been named by Gentlemen's Quarterly as Athlete of the Century.

We have had many noteworthy athletes in this century—the century that has brought us modern sport. Excellence has been personified by such sports heroes as Lou Gehrig, Babe Didrickson Zaharias, Bobby Orr, Walter Payton, and Michael Jordan. But, to my mind, though this company is clearly outstanding, GQ made the obvious choice.

Muhammad Ali's road to sports immortality began on January 17, 1942, in Louisville, Kentucky. Introduced to boxing at the age of 12, Ali won National AAU and Golden Gloves titles. He brought home the Olympic gold medal from Rome in 1960.

After turning professional, he stunned the sports world by defeating the also great boxer Sonny Liston in 1964. His victories over such accomplished opponents as Liston, Floyd Patterson, Ernie Terrell, Joe Frazier, George Foreman, and Ken Norton make him, in my mind, the greatest boxer of all time.

But Ali's greatness goes beyond his physical strength and athleticism. In 1964, he converted to the religion of Islam, adopting a set of beliefs for which he would sacrifice a great deal. In 1967, at the height of his career, he was convicted of draft evasion and stripped of his heavyweight title. For a period of three years, Ali was shunned by the boxing world and vilified by many who had previously hailed him.

The conviction was eventually overturned by the United States Supreme

Court, and Ali turned to the ring in 1970 and took on Joe Frazier in the "Fight of the Century." This bout, between the only two undefeated fighters, resulted in Ali's ascension as the undisputed heavyweight champion of the world. Ali brought speed and grace to the world of boxing, demonstrating how to "flit like a butterfly and sting like a bee."

Ali held this title until 1978 when he lost a hard fought bout to Leon Spinks in 15 rounds on points. But, just seven months later, he dethroned Spinks and recaptured the title for an unprecedented third time.

I have come to admire Ali, however, not just for his unparalleled skill in the boxing ring, but also for his faith and his humanity.

Ali has traveled the world on humanitarian missions. And he has given most unselfishly, particularly to young people. During his recent visit to Utah he was never without a gaggle of kids surrounding him. Even though the effects of Parkinson's disease have made speech difficult, he really does not need to talk to communicate. He exudes kindness and friendship.

I am honored to count Ali and his wonderful wife Lonnie among my friends. I commend the writers and editors at GQ for selecting Ali for this very significant distinction. No one deserves it more. He's the greatest.

SUCCESS OF IMMIGRANT CHILDREN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, according to a recent study by sociologists at Michigan State University, and Princeton University, one of the great contributions of immigrants to America, in addition to their own skills and hard work, is the values they instill in their children—respect for hard work, doing well in school, succeeding against the odds, loving their families and their cultures, and an abiding belief that the United States is the best country in the world.

Contrary to many of the myths about immigrants, this study concludes that the vast majority of immigrant children learn English. Nine out of 10 speak their native languages at home, but 88 percent preferred English by the time they completed high school.

This study is also significant because it does not gloss over the challenges that many immigrant families face along the way. The study reminds us that immigrant children struggle against discrimination and anti-immigrant attitudes and policies. The study found that as a result of attacks on immigrants in public policy in recent years, children of immigrants were less likely to regard themselves as "Americans" and more likely to regard themselves as members of their ethnic groups. This kind of polarization could have profound consequences for our society in the future, and we need to be vigilant against it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a March 21 article in the New York Times on this study may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 21, 1998]

BEST STUDENTS ARE IMMIGRANTS' CHILDREN, STUDY SAYS

(By Celia W. Dugger)

A multiyear survey that is the largest ever of the children of immigrants—who now account for almost one in five American children—found that they overwhelmingly prefer English to their parents' native tongues and have higher grades and steeply lower school dropout rates than other American children.

While a majority of those surveyed, who were predominantly Hispanic, Asian and black children, said they had personally experienced discrimination, an even larger majority of them said they still believed that the United States is the best country in the world to live in. The youths were adolescent.

The lead researchers on the study describe these findings as reassuring indications that the children of immigrants are unlikely to form a new multiethnic underclass, as some experts fear, cut off from the mainstream by academic failure and an inability to speak English.

But the researchers also say it is still an open question how well these young people will do in college and the job market, a caution shared by other experts.

The researchers said that the survey brought into sharp relief the extraordinary diversity of the children of immigrants, not only by national origin, but by social class. It reaches from the young of Chinese and Indian couples from highly educated, upper-middle-class backgrounds to Mexicans and Dominicans from the humblest origins.

"What can certainly be predicted now is that the destinies of these youth will diverge," said Professor Ruben Rumbaut, a sociologist at Michigan State University. "Some will go up and some will go down."

The survey, which shows that the children of immigrants outperform their American peers and that those from more advantaged backgrounds do better than poorer children, will inevitably become fodder for the larger debate about the United States' immigration policy.

Supporters of the current high levels of immigration will cite the achievements of these young people, while critics may find reinforcement for their view that national policy should be tilted to favor more highly skilled and educated immigrants.

The research team, led by Rumbaut and Professor Alejandro Portes, a sociologist at Princeton University, first interviewed 5,200 youngsters in Southern California and South Florida in 1992 when the youths were in the eighth or ninth grades, and then tracked down 82 percent of them for a second interview in 1995 and 1996 when most of them were high school seniors.

This fall, another team of sociologists will begin a large-scale survey of the grown children of immigrants in New York City and its suburbs, focusing on adults 18 to 32 years old, rather than adolescents.

The number of children who are either immigrants or the American-born offspring of immigrants grew to 13.7 million last year, from 8 million in 1990, making them the fastest-growing segment of the U.S. population under the age of 18, according to a new analysis of census data by Rumbaut.

The \$1 million survey of the children of immigrants was financed by the Russell Sage, Andrew W. Mellon, Spencer and National Science Foundations. The researchers provided their findings to The New York Times.

Among the most striking findings of the bicoastal survey of children from San Diego

and Dade and Broward counties in South Florida have to do with the contentious issue of language. While nine out of 10 of the youths surveyed spoke a language other than English at home, almost exactly the same proportion, 88 percent, preferred English by the end of high school.

Rumbaut wrote, "The findings suggest that the linguistic outcomes for the third generation—the grandchildren of the current wave of immigrants—will be no different than what has been the age-old pattern in American history: The grandchildren may learn a few foreign words and phrases as a quaint vestige of their ancestry, but they will most likely grow up speaking English only."

And the professor also pointed to the ascendancy of English as evidence of the irrelevance of a California ballot initiative that could end bilingual education, which has been depicted as an impediment to the acquisition of English. "English is triumphing with breathtaking rapidity," he said.

The study presents a generally upbeat portrayal of the children of immigrants as ambitious, hopeful and resilient in the face of discrimination.

In San Diego, the children of immigrants had better grades than their American peers in every grade. The gap narrowed over time, largely because the poorly performing children of immigrants were more likely to stay in school than their peers who were not the children of immigrants, the researchers say. In South Florida, the school districts were unable to provide the researchers with grade-point averages for the district as a whole.

But when the researchers analyzed how the children of immigrants were faring by national origin, they found that levels of scholastic success diverged sharply. Generally, the children whose immigrant parents had better educations and jobs and who came from stable, two-parent families were predictably more successful, with a few startling exceptions.

The children of Chinese, Indian, Japanese and Korean parents had the highest grade-point averages, A's and B's. English-speaking West Indians had lower grades, C's and C-pluses. Latin American and Haitian youths performed most poorly, with averages that were slightly higher or lower than a C.

But a few groups defied what would have been expected based on their socioeconomic status. The children of Southeast Asian refugees, who came from the most impoverished backgrounds and whose parents were among the least educated, were also among the least likely to drop out of school and had above-average grades. They did it by studying for longer hours and watching less television than many of the other children of immigrants, the study found.

And the children of Cuban immigrants, who were from average to above-average socioeconomic backgrounds, had the highest dropout rates and among the lowest grades (an average of C or C-plus), the survey reported. The Cuban children, who belonged to the dominant group in metropolitan Miami faced less discrimination than any other group in the survey, the researchers said.

The children of Cubans did worse academically than the children of Mexicans, who are one of the poorest and by far the largest immigrant group in the United States.

The findings about Cubans were among the survey's most startling to Rumbaut and Portes and their colleague, Lisandro Perez, director of the Cuban Research Center at Florida International University, who are all Cuban immigrants themselves.

Portes had earlier hypothesized that Cuban youths would use their economically powerful ethnic enclave as a springboard to higher education and the middle class, much as

Eastern European Jews did in an earlier wave of immigration.

"As it turns out, the enclave may not be a springboard," Perez said, "but a cushy net that means you don't have to depend exclusively on education for a job. It may be that Cubans are right, and will do better going to work at an uncle's factory in Hialeah. We're not certain how it will translate economically."

The survey also found some intriguing changes in the way the children of immigrants identified themselves, possibly reflecting their altered relationship to the rest of American society or perhaps just adolescent rebelliousness.

When the youths were first interviewed, more than half labeled themselves as hyphenated Americans or as plain Americans. That sounded like old-fashioned assimilation and it might have been expected that, three years later, even more of the youths would have chosen an American identity.

But the results of the second interview, conducted in the months after California's passage of Proposition 187, the initiative that called for restricting social and educational benefits to illegal immigrants, turned those expectations on their head.

Only a third of the youths in Southern California picked an American identity the second time around, while almost half identified themselves by their national identity, especially youths of Mexican and Filipino descent, who belong to the two largest immigrant groups in the United States.

The researchers interpreted the change as part of a backlash among these youth against what they perceived as immigrant bashing that surfaced in the campaign for Proposition 187.

In South Florida the pattern was different, but equally striking. The proportion identifying themselves by some kind of American label dropped to about a third, while those who chose ethnic identities such as Hispanic or black doubled to 38 percent, mainly among Latin Americans and Jamaicans.

The more militant, nationalistic identities assumed by Mexicans and Filipinos in California, and the minority-groups identities chosen in Florida, reflected the youths' rising awareness "of the ethnic and racial categories in which they were persistently classified by mainstream society," Rumbaut wrote.

In one of the more troubling findings of the study, the young people who identified themselves by ethnic identities like Chicano or Latino in junior high had lower grades and somewhat higher dropout rates than the other children studied. This finding lends support to analysts who have suggested that children of immigrants who come to identify with American minorities may take on "oppositional" identities and see doing well in school as "acting white."

REPORT CONCERNING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO ANGOLA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 114

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby report to the Congress on the developments since my last report of September 24, 1997, concerning the national emergency with respect to

Angola that was declared in Executive Order 12865 of September 26, 1993. This report is submitted pursuant to section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

On September 26, 1993, I declared a national emergency with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola ("UNITA"), invoking the authority, *inter alia*, of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) and the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c). Consistent with United Nations Security Council Resolution ("UNSCR") 864, dated September 15, 1993, the order prohibited the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related material of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to the territory of Angola other than through designated points of entry. The order also prohibited such sale or supply to UNITA. United States persons are prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies, or from attempted violations, or from evasion or avoidance or transactions that have the purpose of evasion or avoidance, of the stated prohibitions. The order authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the order.

1. On December 10, 1993, the Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) issued the UNITA (Angola) Sanctions Regulations (the "Regulations") (58 *Fed. Reg.* 64904) to implement the imposition of sanctions against UNITA. The Regulations prohibit the sale or supply by United States persons or from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of arms and related material of all types, including weapons and ammunition, military vehicles, equipment and spare parts, and petroleum and petroleum products to UNITA or to the territory of Angola other than through designated points. United States persons are also prohibited from activities that promote or are calculated to promote such sales or supplies to UNITA or Angola, or from any transaction by any United States persons that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in the Executive order. Also prohibited are transactions by United States persons, or involving the use of U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, relating to transportation to Angola or UNITA of goods the exportation of which is prohibited.

The Government of Angola has designated the following points of entry as

points in Angola to which the articles otherwise prohibited by the Regulations may be shipped: *Airports:* Luanda and Katumbela, Benguela Province; *Ports:* Luanda and Lobito, Benguela Province; and Namibe, Namibe Province; and *Entry Points:* Malongo, Cabinda Province. Although no specific license is required by the Department of the Treasury for shipments to these designated points of entry (unless the item is destined for UNITA), any such exports remain subject to the licensing requirements of the Departments of State and/or Commerce.

2. On August 28, 1997, the United Nations Security Council adopted UNSCR 1127, expressing its grave concern at the serious difficulties in the peace process, demanding that the Government of Angola and in particular UNITA comply fully and completely with those obligations, and imposing additional sanctions against UNITA. Subsequently, the Security Council adopted UNSCR 1130 postponing the effective date of measures specified by UNSCR 1127 until 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, October 30, 1997, at which time they went into effect.

On December 12, 1997, I issued Executive Order 13069 to implement in the United States the provisions of UNSCRs 1127 and 1130 (62 *Fed. Reg.* 65989, December 16, 1997). Executive Order 13069 prohibits (a) the sale, supply, or making available in any form, by United States persons or from the United States or using U.S.-registered vessels or aircraft, of any aircraft or aircraft components, regardless of origin; (i) to UNITA; (ii) to the territory of Angola other than through a specified point of entry; (b) the insurance, engineering, or servicing by United States persons or from the United States of any aircraft owned or controlled by UNITA; (c) the granting of permission to any aircraft to take off from, land in, or overfly the United States if the aircraft, as part of the same flight or as a continuation of that flight, is destined to land in or has taken off from a place in the territory of Angola other than a specified point of entry; (d) the provision or making available by United States persons or from the United States of engineering and maintenance servicing, the certification of airworthiness, the payment of new claims against existing insurance contracts, or the provision, renewal, or making available of direct insurance with respect to (i) any aircraft registered in Angola other than those specified by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, and other appropriate agencies; (ii) any aircraft that entered the territory of Angola other than through a specified point of entry; (e) any transaction by any United States person or within the United States that evades or avoids, or has the purpose of evading or avoiding, or attempts to violate, any of the prohibitions set forth in this order. Specific licenses may be issued on a case-by-case basis