reform without talking about creating jobs for people of limited skills is public relations and nothing more.

Such a WPA program should tie in with the education recommendation of Mort Zuckerman. People who come into the program should be screened, and if they can't read and write, we should get them into the program. We have 23 million Americans who cannot fill out an employment form and who cannot read the newspaper. That is a huge drag on our productive capacity.

Those who come into the WPA type of program who have a remarkable skill should be given an opportunity to enhance that skill, whether through an apprentice program or a technical school or community college.

Mort Zuckerman ends his column by saying ''but it is hope that will sustain and enrich us.'' He is correct.

The great division in our society is not between black and white or Hispanic and Anglo or many of the other divisions that people talk about. It is between those who have hope and those who have given up. We need programs that give people the spark of hope.

We have shown very little creativity in dealing with the problems of poverty in our Nation. We have been pandering to those who make the big campaign contributions and who are politically articulate.

It is about time we pay attention to those who make no campaign contributions and who are getting more and more disillusioned with our Government.

The editorial follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 26, 1996]

CRUMBS FOR THE MAJORITY

(By Mortimer B. Zuckerman)

The stock market is up over a trillion dollars in the past 14 months. The United States is five years into an economic recovery. But the opinion polls reveal the public to be in a foul mood and pessimistic about the future. What is going on?

The cake has gotten bigger, but it is not being shared equitably. The technological and educated aristocracy, and the owners of financial assets, are sharing the cream with a highly skilled and well-educated minority, a little more than a third of the work force, who have full-time, full-benefits jobs. But there are only crumbs for the majority of the population who lack a college education or specialized skills. Incomes have been falling or stagnating as this group has remained mired for more than 20 years in what has been called ''the silent depression.'' As social analyst Daniel Yankelovich points out, we are in the midst of the erosion of one of the greatest achievements of the post-World War II era, in which not only people with a college degree could make a good living but also people without one. This gave us a middle class and a prosperous country with a sense of fairness and hope.

That optimism and faith in America have been eroded. Too many Americans cannot afford health insurance; too many can barely save; too many cannot afford to send their children to college; and as 1995's Christmas sales indicate, too many cannot afford gift buying. Both spouses have to work, and the one-earner, middle-class family is becoming extinct. Parents are now spending about 40 percent less time with their children than they did 30 years ago. To support the children who need ever more costly education for ever longer periods of time, parents have to be willing to make larger and larger sacrifices. What's more, too many men are bailing out of these obligations.

This erosion of family life has led to a widespread sense of moral confusion and a breakdown in the shared norms that hold our society together. No value has suffered more than individual responsibility. A nation whose creed is individualism courts disaster if it then proceeds to weaken the moral responsibility of the individual by a philosophy of entitlement. The social conservatism that has re-emerged in response has found its political expression in a bipartisan readiness to cut social services and other programs, which is understandable. Americans ask, If we are spending so much, why aren't we seeing better results? Many Americans see themselves as subsidizing well-organized special-interest groups that are excessively influential in shaping the decisions of our rulers once they are in office.

The voters are rebelling not just against big government—everyone's villain these days—but against bad government. The government has proved inadequate in grappling with the problems of corporate downsizing and declining incomes that now affect tens of millions of workers. We have civil servants who are not civil, public schools that do not teach the public, a criminal justice system that neither reduces crime nor produces justice and economic insecurity even in a rapidly growing economy.

Merely cutting this and that is hardly a sufficient response. There are areas where only government can lead. Higher education and continual learning are a place to start. Higher education is an investment in the greatest strength a country has, its people. We need a modern version of the GI Bill, which provided mass higher education for more than 20 million veterans and dependents. Any student able to meet minimum standards upon graduation from high school should qualify for a scholarship for higher education for the information age, providing family income does not exceed a maximum amount of, say, $125,000. This would be a constructive way to shrink the gap between the haves and the have-nots—much better than doing it only by taxation.

Such a program would cost billions of dollars. But government must find a way to reorder its priorities, to shift money from less valuable programs. Without positive policies to arrest our national decay, the deep anxiety that now seizes much of our society may well turn to fear, or even panic. It is fear that has provided the political basis for the success of Pat Buchanan. But it is hope that will sustain and enrich us.●

INCREASING THE FEDERAL DEBT LIMIT

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I wanted to express my concern over the increase in the public debt limit which occurred under a unanimous-consent agreement on the Thursday before the Easter recess. Having earlier expressed in a letter to the Republican leadership my intention to oppose an increase in the debt limit if it was not directly connected to a balanced budget. I believe this unanimous-consent agreement hangs over this Congress like a black cloud, marking a dark day for the American taxpayers.

The Congress had done the hard work of putting together a balanced budget that would have put this Nation on the glidepath to eliminating the deficit. Furthermore, it represented our best hope for tackling our $5 trillion debt.

Yet the President carelessly vetoed the bill and its key reforms which would have restored solvency to our Medicare System and ended welfare as we know it. All the while, he has sat at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, clamoring for more spending.

Mr. President, I believe yesterday's vote was a white flag of surrender, and a retreat on our pledge to protect the American taxpayers. Nothing in this bill ensures any progress will be made with this Administration in attempting to reach a balanced budget agreement.

Instead, we promised this President we would increase the credit limit on the Nation's charge card by $600 billion—an amount the Congressional Budget Office estimates will be exceeded by next summer. And what did the taxpayers receive in return? The promise of bigger government, a bigger debt, and more of the status quo.

I will acknowledge that the bill did contain two riders which I have supported. The Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act is similar to a measure I had supported earlier this month. And as a cosponsor of the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act, I had advocated passage of this bill earlier this year. But I do not believe seniors or small business should be held hostage to an increase in the debt limit. Unfortunately, they were used to mask the fact that yesterday's vote dragged us deeper into financial chaos.

While the Federal Government's impending financial crisis may have been averted by this debt limit increase, the President must understand that our action does not absolve him of his responsibility in derailing the first real balanced budget produced by a Congress in over 25 years. Given that track record, we cannot allow another increase to occur without the enactment of a balanced budget plan. The Nation's credit card is ready to snap under the heavy load we have already heaped upon it—the American taxpayers are no longer willing to shoulder that burden.●

CANADA, BACKED BY MEXICO, PROTESTS TO UNITED STATES ON CUBA SANCTIONS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I cast 1 of the 22 votes against the Cuban sanction bill that passed the Senate and has been signed by the President.

I read the story in the New York Times, by Richard Stevenson, titled ''Canada, Backed by Mexico Protests to United States on Cuba Sanctions,'' which I ask to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD after my remarks.

Canada is right, Mexico is right, and the Senate, House, and the President are wrong on this one.

We are capitulating to emotion, and we will have done not one thing to discourage Castro.

Our policy to remove Castro has failed for decades, in fact it has had the opposite affect. We simply are compounding the problem.

We are like an accident victim who has suffered a gash, and we think we can stop the bleeding by cutting ourselves some more.

The column follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 1996]

CANADA, BACKED BY MEXICO, PROTESTS TO UNITED STATES ON CUBA SANCTIONS

(By Richard W. Stevenson)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—In a sign of the growing tensions between the United States and its trading partners over stepped-up American sanctions against Cuba, Canada said today that it had lodged a trade protest with the Clinton Administration, and Mexico immediately asked to join Canadian-American discussions on the issue.

Responding to a new American law that seeks to tighten the economic vise on Cuba by putting pressure on other countries not to do business with Fidel Castro's Government, Canada said it asked for consultations with the United States under the terms of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Canada has extensive trade with Cuba, and has vigorously protested what it sees as unfair efforts by the United States to penalize Canadian companies and business executives who operate there.

Canadian officials said the law, sponsored by Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina and Representative Dan Burton of Indiana, both Republicans, and signed on Tuesday by President Clinton, could violate the free trade agreement in several ways.

In Ottawa, Canada's Trade Minister, Arthur Eggleton, said his government would ''seek clarification of U.S. intentions'' in introducing the bill.

''Canada finds objectionable the Helms-Burton bill, which could interfere with companies engaged in legitimate business and which attempts to extend U.S. law to other jurisdictions,'' Mr. Eggleton said.

Mexican officials, expressing similar misgivings, said they supported the Canadian action, and wanted to take part in the consultations to get a clearer idea how the United States would carry out the legislation's most contentious measures.

A request for consultations is the first step in resolving trade disputes under Nafta, and could lead to a formal ruling on whether the American legislation violates the pact.

The legislation was passed by Congress and signed by President Clinton after the drowning of two small civilian aircraft by Cuban fighters last month. Among other things, it allows American citizens to sue foreigners and foreign companies that ''act to manage, lease, possess, use or hold an interest in'' property confiscated by the Cuban Government from people who are now American citizens.

It also permits the United States to bar entry to foreign corporate officers and controlling shareholders who take part in using such property and foreign executives whose companies do business in Cuba.

The United States Trade Representative, Mickey Kantor, said the American position ''is entirely consistent'' with both the rules of Nafta and the world trade talks.

In an interview, Mr. Kantor said that under the trade agreement the United States reserved the right to protect its security interests and to bar from entry people who have committed crimes of moral turpitude under United States laws.

''The combination of those two, or either standing alone depending on the situation, would support our position,'' Mr. Kantor said.

Federico Salas, the minister for political affairs at the Mexican Embassy in Washington, said ''The Canadians have taken the initiative and we have requested to participate in these consultations.'' The European Union said last week that the law would ''represent the extraterritorial application of U.S. jurisdiction and would restrict E.U. trade in goods and services with Cuba.''

Russia also objected to provisions in the law linking American foreign aid to Russia to Moscow's cutting its military and economic ties to Mr. Castro.●

INTERNATIONAL BRIBERY

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, export promotion is a critical component of both domestic economic growth in this country and of our foreign policy. One of the barriers to more trade for U.S. companies has been a virtual subsidy by the governments of many of our trade competitors for offering bribes to win foreign contracts. Of course, U.S. business is prohibited from engaging in bribery by the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. While there have been calls to repeal the FCPA, for almost 2 years, I have been working to promote universal acceptance of the principles of the FCPA. I introduced legislation and a sense of the Senate resolution last year to move forward in that direction. A version of the proposals were included in the Senate State authorization bill, but not included in the conference agreement.

For a problem that no one seems to want to talk about publicly, there has been some important movement to help eradicate this practice in Europe. Two years ago the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development a group of 26 major industrialized countries, passed a resolution to ''deter, prevent, and combat bribery.'' Now it has expanded on that by recommending that members terminate the tax-deductibility of bribes, such as allowed in Germany and elsewhere.

This is a significant step toward leveling the playing field for U.S. exports. It is also important that major newspapers, such as the New York Times and the Washington Post, have carried opinion pieces in the past couple of days on this issue. I ask that the articles be printed in the RECORD and commend them to my colleagues for their review. Bribery and corruption are serious impediments to our exports, and promote bad business practice. We should be supportive of efforts, such as the recent initiatives by the OECD to help protect American business.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 16, 1996]

AN END TO CORRUPTION

(By Robert S. Leiken)

If a German bribes a German, he gets thrown in jail; if he bribes a foreign official he gets a tax deduction. Only American businessmen can be prosecuted at home for bribing foreigners.

But the day when U.S. business was a solitary straight arrow seems to be ending. This is not because the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) has become a dead letter. IBM-Argentina, now under federal investigation, can testify to that. What may be opening a new chapter in commercial diplomacy is a revolution in public opinion, the repudiation of bribery and kickbacks by societies that once tolerated them.

Last week the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the league of wealthy industrial nations, recommended that is members stop allowing tax write-offs for bribes. Sources close to those protracted negotiations said that the public reaction to recent bribery scandals helped overcome resistance to the measure led by France, Germany and Japan.

The end of the Cold War, the spread of democracy, the rise of civil societies have sparked disclosure of corruption East and West. This is the case not only in the former Soviet bloc but also among Western allies where military regimes or ruling-party dominance has given way to competitive politics.

An intriguing community of interests is forming between U.S. corporations and democracy. For the solution to translational bribery lies not in a futile attempt to repeal the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act but in universalizing it and supporting reforms in emerging countries.

Corruption is being challenged by opposition parties, and unmuzzled press, religious groups and other nongovernment organizations, as well as prosecutors, magistrates and other civil servants. Anti-corruption movements have emerged in countries as diverse as Argentina, Cambodia, Italy, Hungary, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, El Salvador, South Korea, Switzerland, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, New Zealand and Zimbabwe. Citizens who have silently endured corruption for generations now take to the streets to protest corrupt practices, to elect anticorruption candidates and to impeach corrupt presidents, vice presidents, premiers, cabinet ministers and party leaders.

Many countries have appointed national commissions to recommend reforms and have established government agencies to prosecute abuses. Small countries are beginning to make known their anticorruption sentiments. Recently, for example, Malaysia and Singapore each declared several foreign firms caught bribing officials ineligible for bidding on future contracts.

The stakes are enormous for U.S. companies and workers. As emerging nations drop trade barriers and privatize state monopolies, more than $200 billion of export and investment contracts will be open to international bidding. Our trade rivals understand that these contracts will determine who builds tomorrow's economies. The U.S. Department of Commerce has calculated that from April 1994 to May 1995 nearly 100 foreign contracts worth $45 billion were lost to foreign competitors through graft. The most egregious bribers, according to U.S. government and business officials, include companies from Japan, France, Germany, Spain, Britain, Taiwan and South Korea.

These bribes cost Americans jobs, and since less competitive firms must bribe to win contracts, they cost emerging countries efficiency—which is what they need most. Studies show corrupt procurement practices deter foreign investment while as much as doubling the price that emerging countries pay for goods and services.

As globalization offers corporations more options, corruption has come to be a factor in choosing where to invest. Meanwhile, emerging nations wishing to shed bad reputations have begun to court firms with ''squeaky clean'' images. In some emerging markets, U.S. firms now advertise their liability to the FCPA as surety of their integrity. Several governments have engaged the ''credibility services'' of reputable Western