

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

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.

Making matters worse is the U.S. arrogance when discussing problems of U.N. peacekeeping, especially regarding the U.N. troops in the former Yugoslavia, and the disavowal of Washington, particularly Congress, for America's part in the "failure" of the U.N. in the Balkans. The real facts regarding the limitations of U.N. peacekeeping in the post-Cold War period is a shameful record of "great power" mismanagement and unrealistic mandates. The vast majority of U.N. Troops in peacekeeping missions are from such member states as Fiji, Pakistan, Malaysia, Italy and Spain. The permanent members of the Security Council—the U.S., Britain, France, Russia and China—have extraordinary power and can stop the expansion or addition of U.N. missions simply by voting no. The fact that they hold such power is the primary reason that they are expected to pay more for these missions and to deploy larger troop contingents.

European concerns go well beyond the matter of America's \$1.5-billion U.N. debt. One thing that most bothers our allies is the cynical American tendency to take advantage of the organization when it serves our national interest—as it did with Haiti—or to use it as an excuse to hide behind when it doesn't—Bosnia, for example.

This is not a debate about the \$4.40 that each American owes the U.N. but about the kind of world we want in the 21st century. Will it be one with the U.S. as the haughty and lonely superpower or one with nations and peoples following America's moral leadership and working out differences through dialogue, cooperation and common will, something very similar to what the U.N. is all about?●

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIROYAL GOODRICH PLANT IN TUSCALOOSA, AL

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Manufacturing facility in Tuscaloosa, AL, which is celebrating its 50th year of successful production and community service. For half a century, the Uniroyal Goodrich plant has been an important part of Tuscaloosa's economic and social fabric as well as a source of great pride within the community.

For the last 50 years, the history of the Uniroyal Goodrich plant has reflected that of our Nation. In 1946, as our Nation was moving from wartime to a peacetime economy, BF Goodrich was leading the way, purchasing an unfinished tire plant from the Federal Government, and on October 23, 1946, rolling the first tire off the assembly line. Since then, a long series of ambitious modernizations and expansions have enabled the Tuscaloosa facility to keep pace with the constant business and technological innovations which have been the hallmark of American industry. Although Tuscaloosa's tire manufacturing plant began by producing belted bias tires in an 860,000-square-foot structure, today the facility is double its original size, 40 acres under one roof, and produces high performance radial tires 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

America's post-war success, like the success of the Tuscaloosa facility, has been a product of teamwork. In 1986, BF Goodrich joined forces with the Uniroyal Co. to produce high-quality tires. In 1990, the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Co. became part of Michelin North America. This new team promises to be a leader in American industry for many years to come.

The important role the Uniroyal Goodrich plant has played in the development of Tuscaloosa as a growing and prosperous community cannot be overstated. It is a rare Tuscaloosa family who does not have a father, son, brother, sister, or cousin who is a current or previous employee of the plant. The plant's first weekly payroll, back in 1946, was \$542.23 for 12 employees. This payroll has grown to over \$1.3 million for 2,000 hard-working local men and women. This income rolls over many times in the local economy, benefiting all of Tuscaloosa's businesses and individuals.

I am immensely grateful for, and proud of, the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Manufacturing plant and the men and women who work hard there every day. On behalf of all Tuscaloosans, I would therefore like to congratulate the Uniroyal Goodrich Tire Manufacturing plant for 50 years of outstanding production and community service. I wish them another 50 years of success and prosperity.●

IF WE WERE SERIOUS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, when Richard Darman served as The Office of Management and Budget Director, I sometimes disagreed with him; but I always had great respect for him.

He had an op-ed piece in The New York Times on September 1 that contains a great deal of common sense; and as we know, common sense is all too often the last thing that gets discussed during a political campaign.

He says correctly that we have to look at the entitlement picture. To pretend that we can balance the budget without looking at entitlements is living in a dream world, even if both political parties were not asking for tax cuts. The request for tax cuts simply compounds this problem.

Second, he suggests that we have to look at urban problems. If I can expand that to say we ought to be looking at the question of poverty, which is what he is really suggesting. That means looking at education and some other basics.

I have long favored having a WPA type of jobs program where we would pay people the minimum wage for 4-days a week. The fifth day they would have to be out trying to find a job in the private sector. When people cannot read and write, we would get them into a program. If their literacy and educational background was woefully inadequate, we would get them into a program to get their GED. If they have no marketable skill, we would get

them to a community college or technical school.

The reality is there is no way of achieving the kind of society we should have on the cheap, as Darman points out.

The third reality that he mentions in his article is that we are growing older and obviously that has a huge impact on the entitlement scene.

There is one other reality that he does not mention that ought to be put on the table and that is in terms of taxation. Contrary to the general myth, the percentage of our taxes that goes for government support is lower than any of the countries of western Europe or Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, if the Japanese industrial compact is considered. The lone exception to that is Turkey.

We ought to be looking at a value-added tax; we ought to be looking at a more realistic gasoline tax; we ought to be raising cigarette taxes, both for our economic health and our physical health.

In any event, the Darman discussion should move us a little more toward reality.

Mr. President, I ask that this article from The New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 1, 1996]

IF WE WERE SERIOUS

(By Richard Darman)

The prime-time convention shows have come to their balloon-drop endings. The mini-movies, zingers and dramatic speeches are over. What follows now, we are told, is the "serious campaign."

That is a notion which many would dismiss as oxymoronic. But it has the virtue of suggesting an interesting question: What important issues might the candidates address if the campaign actually were serious?

The question is not put to dismiss what has been presented so far. Bill Clinton and Bob Dole have both recognized that a governing majority requires far broader appeal than either party's traditional base provides. They have both broadened their reach.

Bob Dole has distanced himself from the dour anti-government focus of the House Republicans by selecting Jack Kemp—signaling an interest in growth, while underlining his commitment to equal opportunity, inclusiveness and tolerance. Bill Clinton has adopted a Reaganesque command of symbols and ceremony, declaring "hope is back." And he has again reversed himself on welfare and taxes, asserting "the era of big government is over."

How much of this is to be taken seriously, others may judge. Choices have been framed: whether to continue on the current path or pursue a bolder reach for growth; to rely on government or "trust the people"; to "bridge" forward or back to the future. The problem is that such formulations, though important, are abstract. As presented by the major candidates, they barely touch fundamental issues America must face.

One such issue, growing middle-class entitlements, was mentioned in a convention speech, but not by any of the candidates. Colin Powell warned of "condemning our children and grandchildren with a crushing burden of debt that will deny them the American Dream." He noted, "We all need to understand it is the entitlement state that