

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