

(c) PAYMENT IN FULL SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.—Payment under this section, when accepted by an individual described in subsection (a), shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of, or on behalf of, the individual against the United States that arose out of the termination of the White House Travel Office employment of that individual on May 19, 1993.

SEC. 529. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of the President to request from the Federal Bureau of Investigation any official background investigation report on any individual, except when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) such individual has given his or her express written consent for such request not more than 6 months prior to the date of such request and during the same presidential administration; or

(2) such request is required due to extraordinary circumstances involving national security.

SEC. 528. (a) REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN ATTORNEY FEES AND COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay from amounts appropriated in title I of this Act under the heading, "Departmental Offices, Salaries and Expenses", up to \$499,999 to reimburse former employees of the White House Travel Office whose employment in that Office was terminated on May 19, 1993, for any attorney fees and costs they incurred with respect to that termination.

NOTICE OF HEARING

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Special Committee on Aging will hold a hearing on Thursday, September 19, 1996, at 9:30 a.m., in room 562 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. The hearing will discuss Social Security reform.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be granted permission to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 11, 1996, for purposes of conducting a full committee business meeting which is scheduled to begin at 9:30 a.m. The purpose of this meeting is to consider pending calendar business.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 11, 1996, at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing on "Mergers and Competition in the Telecommunications Industry."

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be author-

ized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 11, 1996, at 9 a.m. to hold a closed business meeting.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on International Operations of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 11, at 2 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure be granted permission to conduct a hearing Wednesday, September 11, at 9:30 a.m., Hearing Room (SD-406) on the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act and the role of Federal, State, and local governments in surface transportation.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REGARDING PUERTO RICO ECONOMIC INCENTIVES

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I have said in the past, and continue to believe, that the action taken by Congress in eliminating section 936 without a permanent replacement program that provides a major stimulus to economic development in Puerto Rico and the creation of well-paying and stable jobs was unfortunate.

We have the seeds of a replacement program in new Internal Revenue Code section 30A that provides a targeted wage credit to companies currently doing business in Puerto Rico based upon the compensation paid to their qualified employees. Although this is certainly movement in the right direction, it does not allow new business starts, and the credit will sunset in 10 years. As such, it does not provide the permanency that is needed to maintain the economic development of Puerto Rico, and will adversely impact States like New York.

Corporations headquartered in New York State that have invested in Puerto Rico employ over 39,000 persons in New York. Moreover, Puerto Rican subsidiaries of mainland companies purchase approximately \$195 million per year worth of supplies and services from New York. Consequently, when the wage credit sunsets in 2006 and corporations are drawn to other regions where there are tax incentives, New York State will lose not only jobs, but a significant amount of income from goods and services.

Mr. President, Congress needs to work with the elected representatives of Puerto Rico to expand section 30A

into a dynamic and effective job creation incentive that helps to bring new and high-paying jobs to Puerto Rico. By doing so, we will raise Puerto Rico's economic standards and provide efficient Federal incentives to accomplish those goals. I firmly believe that Congress, working with Governor Rossello and other elected leaders from Puerto Rico, can successfully fashion a program that achieves economic progress for Puerto Rico and efficiency in Federal expenditures. •

SHOULD WE TROT OUT THE NEW DEAL AGAIN?

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, one of the ablest aldermen in the city of Chicago, Burton F. Natarus, recently had a commentary in the Chicago Tribune in which he calls for a public works program along the lines of the WPA. It makes eminent good sense.

We can learn from history, but we're apparently unwilling to do it.

The welfare bill that passed is going to cause huge problems in our society if we don't come up with something better and do it quickly.

A WPA type of welfare reform would cost a little more initially, but saves huge amounts of money in the long run and be of great assistance to impoverished areas, whether rural or urban.

Right now we are trying to have welfare reform but do it without creating jobs for the unskilled and without having day care for their children.

Anything labeled "welfare reform" that doesn't provide the jobs and doesn't provide day care is not really welfare reform.

Mr. President, I ask that Alderman Natarus' article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 22, 1996]

SHOULD WE TROT OUT THE NEW DEAL AGAIN?

(By Burton F. Natarus)

On July 24, the Senate approved a comprehensive welfare bill, the most sweeping change since the creation of the New Deal 60 years ago. Federal guarantees of cash assistance for the nation's poorest children have evaporated and states will be given new powers to run welfare on their own. The measure also imposes a five-year lifetime limit on cash assistance payments to any family and requires the head of every family on welfare to work within two years or lose benefits.

While we laud the new thrust toward the self-sufficiency of our population, and the end of the obsolete aspects of the 60-year-old welfare system, we have serious concerns about jobs. Where are they to come from? Where is the new workforce to go? To Bainbridge Island, Wash., to work for Microsoft? To the high-tech Naperville corridor for that chemical engineering position? The welfare reform bill, which President Clinton is expected to sign, presumes there will be jobs available for the workforce. These jobs may or may not exist and we have to face the brutal fact that generations of welfare families have no saleable working skills. Recall the controversial "workfare" Comprehensive Employment and Training Act program from the Nixon administration in the flush, moneyed '70s, when Congress tried to create jobs accompanied by teaching and skills

training. Limited in scope and a short-term solution to unemployment, it finally ended with the Reagan era and here we are 10 years later with no significant federal jobs program as we throw the poor out on their own.

With the CETA program, the private sector created low-level and semi-skilled jobs, which concentrated in the food service, truck driving and clerical fields. There were considerable financial incentives for the private sector to participate in CETA. These incentives do not exist today and the private sector may not be willing nor is it able to create entry-level jobs in sufficient numbers.

In 1929, the Depression commenced its sad and ugly course and by 1933 12 million able-bodied Americans were out of work. No work. No money. The country was, however, fortunate enough to have Franklin Roosevelt as its 32nd president. We know of his long roster of massive relief measures and social programs to cope with the Depression and a country in crisis: farm relief, unemployment insurance, Social Security, fair bankruptcy and foreclosure procedures and numerous federal jobs measures. At the 1932 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Roosevelt declared, "I pledge myself to a new deal. . . . This is more than a political campaign; it is a call to arms."

What we need is a "new" New Deal and a call to arms. Let us recall some of those job-creating public works bills of the Roosevelt administration.

In March 1933, his recovery plan included the Civilian Conservation Corps, which gave 250,000 young men meals, housing, wages and the necessities of life for their work in the national forests and other government properties.

There was the Works Progress Administration and in the words of Sen. Paul Simon (D-Ill.) 10 years ago, it was "refreshingly sensible." The WPA put 8.5 million people to work building bridges, airports, highways and developing programs to foster cultural awareness. The Federal Art Project's works are still seen today in murals at such places as Lane Tech and the Lakeview Post Office. Hundreds of thousands of Chicagoans worked for the WPA during these years, including thousands of laborers, artists and writers who worked for \$95 a month. In Illinois, from 1935-38, these new hires built 28 million square feet of sidewalks, 1,895 rural bridges, 300,000 public artworks. A recent New York Times Magazine article entitled, "When Work Disappears" recounts the staggering national accomplishments of the administration, from playgrounds, athletic fields, viaducts and culverts, to LaGuardia Airport and FDR Drive. This week it has been nationally reported that the cities with the most decrepit crumbling and unsafe bridges in the country are New York and Washington, D.C. In Chicago, we could also use the help of our citizens in repairing old infrastructure.

The Public Works Administration created jobs and stimulated business between 1933 and 1939. The federal government spent \$6 billion on construction of the Washington, D.C. Mall, Hoover Dam, the Lincoln Tunnel and Ft. Knox. This bureau also created jobs geared toward the preservation of public works.

The creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority put the government in the electric power business, selling electricity in competition with private firms, and giving the government ownership of hydroelectric plants in large rivers. Under the program, Norris Dam was built on the Tennessee River and the Bonneville and Grand Coulee on the Columbia River. These dams employed hundreds of thousands of people who ended up not only supporting themselves and their families but constructing enduring legacies for the country. How many flood plains could use dams right here in Illinois?

World War II eventually solved the unemployment problem but you can imagine how bereft the country would have been for those 10 years without the PWA, the WPA, the CCC and the TVA. One powerful reason why it makes good economic sense to place people on the federal payroll is that the jobs are taxable and the tax monies revert to the federal government as wages are disbursed. Programs such as the WPA pay for themselves in the long run, which is so much more financially efficient than a dole or handout.

Furthermore, when the federal worker leaves his public sector job he will be ready, or at least more ready, for private sector employment, having received on-the-job training in a specific field. Incidentally, the jobs would not be ad aeternum nor for the lifetime of an individual. They would be for a finite period after which time others would be hired and given a chance to learn replicable skills. By creating these government jobs an economic rippling effect inevitably occurs in which private industry is stimulated.

A federal public jobs program would not carry the stigma of welfare so public jobs must be made available for those who will no longer be on the dole. We owe our citizens this much. This is indeed a call to arms and in this matter we have no choice.

The WPA was the most beneficial project in the history of the United States. Bringing it back is long overdue. . . . There are plenty of projects now without having to make work. Everything is deteriorating—bridges, buildings, roads, schools, everything. •

TRIBUTE TO OATS

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Older Adults Transportation Service, Inc. [OATS]. It is a great pleasure to recognize OATS for its 25 years of loyal service to residents in the State of Missouri.

OATS was founded in November 1971, as the Cooperative Transportation Service, to provide reliable transportation to seniors, people with disabilities and rural residents of Missouri in order to increase their mobility to live independently in their own communities. Since then, the not-for-profit corporation has grown from 3 buses serving 8 mid-Missouri counties, into a fleet of over 300 vehicles serving 87 out of Missouri's 113 counties. Today, over 1,000 volunteers and 342 drivers and staff dedicate their time and energy to increasing mobility and extending a lifeline for those with special transportation needs.

As OATS celebrates its 25th anniversary on September 25, 1996, it is an honor to congratulate its members on their long lasting commitment to Missourians. I wish OATS the best of luck in all its future endeavors and continued success in its service to others. •

WHY DO WE KEEP STIFFING THE UNITED NATIONS?

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the Los Angeles Times recently carried an op-ed piece by James P. Muldoon, Jr., and Rafael Moreno under the title, "Why Do We Keep Stiffing the U.N.?"

My colleagues know of my unhappiness with our failure to pay the debt we owe.

Our provincialism is astounding. The article refers to our debt as being \$1.5 billion. That may be a slight exaggeration, but it is at least \$1.2 billion and probably somewhat higher than that.

What is also of interest is their paragraph on relative cost paid by different countries. They write:

It's difficult for Europeans to accept that the U.N. is a budget-buster for the U.S. The costs to Americans for the U.N. in general and U.N. peacekeeping in particular are significantly lower than they are for Europeans. The U.S. costs for the 1996 U.N. regular budget come to only \$1.24 per American, while the people of San Marino owe \$4.75 each. Luxembourg \$2.06 each and for the Swedes \$1.57 each. The U.S. per capita cost for 16 U.N. peacekeeping operations in 1994 was less than \$4.

I ask my colleagues to read what Mr. Muldoon and Mr. Moreno have to say.

I ask that the op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD.

The op-ed piece follows:

WHY DO WE KEEP STIFFING THE U.N.?

(By James P. Muldoon Jr. and Rafael Moreno)

Italian President Oscar Scalfaro, in an address to the U.N. General Assembly earlier this year, diplomatically yet firmly took the United States to task about its mountain of debt to the United Nations. Sadly, Scalfaro's message is hardly new. Over the past few months, nearly all our European partners have expressed similar discontent with U.S. leadership at the U.N.

This week the Council on Foreign Relations issued a report by a bipartisan group of U.S. foreign-policy experts, who warn that Washington's hostility to the U.N. is damaging both the world organization and America's national interests. The report says that politicians have misrepresented U.N. activities in such trouble spots as Somalia and Bosnia in order to cover up their own policy failures.

America's U.N. debt now tops \$1.5 billion. French President Jacques Chirac chided members of Congress, in a joint session, saying their shortsightedness was weakening America's position of global leadership. Behind the scenes, similar messages of concern are being registered across Europe. America's allies are confounded by the intense anti-U.N. rhetoric that has emerged during the U.N.'s 50th anniversary year, intensifying as the presidential election nears.

Since the end of the Cold War, the major powers have recognized that the U.S. could not (and would not) be the world's policeman. For that reason, many countries, including the U.S. attempted to make the U.N.'s "collective security" machinery function in response to a range of conflicts over the past five years that were not imagined by the drafters of the U.N. Charter. Yet when the peacekeeping missions in Somalia, the former Yugoslavia and Haiti lost their way, the "great powers" who approved and mandated these missions conveniently shifted most of the blame onto the secretary-general and the U.N. secretariat, distancing themselves from their decisions and mandates in the Security Council. When the bills came due, the greatest power—the United States—said it was unable to pay.

It's difficult for Europeans to accept that the U.N. is a budget-buster for the U.S. The costs to Americans for the U.N. in general and U.N. peacekeeping in particular are significantly lower than they are for Europeans. The U.S. costs for the 1996 U.N. regular budget come to only \$1.24 per American, while the people of San Marino owe \$4.75