

(A) FAILURE TO SATISFACTORILY COMPLETE TEST.—Participants who fail to complete satisfactorily the basic competency test required in paragraph (1) shall be furnished counseling and instruction. Those participants who lack a marketable skill must attend a technical school or community college to acquire such a skill.

(B) LIMITED ENGLISH.—Participants with limited English speaking ability may be furnished such instruction as the governmental or nonprofit entity conducting the project deems appropriate.

(e) COMPLETION OF PROJECTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A governmental or nonprofit entity conducting a project or projects under this title shall complete such project or projects within the 2-year period beginning on a date determined appropriate by such entity, the State agency administering the project, and the Secretary.

(2) MODIFICATION.—The period referred to in paragraph (1) may be modified in the discretion of the Secretary upon application by the State in which a project is being conducted.

SEC. 109. EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.

(a) BY THE STATE.—Each State conducting a community works progress program or programs under this title shall conduct ongoing evaluations of the effectiveness of such program (including the effectiveness of such program in meeting the goals and objectives described in the application approved by the Secretary) and, for each year in which such program is conducted, shall submit an annual report to the Secretary concerning the results of such evaluations at such time, and in such manner, as the Secretary shall require. The report shall incorporate information from annual reports submitted to the State by governmental and nonprofit entities conducting projects under the program. The report shall include an analysis of the effect of such projects on the economic condition of the area, including their effect on welfare dependency, the local crime rate, general business activity (including business revenues and tax receipts), and business and community leaders' evaluation of the projects' success. Up to 2 percent of the amount granted to a State may be used to conduct the evaluations required under this subsection.

(b) BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress concerning the effectiveness of the community works progress programs conducted under this title. Such report shall analyze the reports received by the Secretary under subsection (a).

SEC. 110. EVALUATION.

Not later than October 1, 2000, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of community works progress programs in reducing welfare dependency, crime, and teenage pregnancy in the geographic areas in which such programs are conducted.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 13, 1995, to conduct a hearing on the status and effectiveness of the sanctions on Iran.

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

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, September 13, 1995, beginning at 9 a.m., in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building on the nomination of Paul M. Homan to be special trustee for the Office of Special Trustee for American Indians in the Department of the Interior.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 13, 1995, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on "Ninth Circuit Split."

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 13, 1995, at 10 a.m. to hold an open hearing on Intelligence matters.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Immigration Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 13, 1995, at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing on "Legal Immigration Reform."

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

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

TIME TO FACE THE TRUTH ON PRISONS

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, the recent news that we now have over a million people in our State and Federal prisons, and over half a million in our local and county jails, is unprecedented in this country and perhaps unprecedented in any country.

We have to be looking for other answers than more and more prisons. And there are much better answers, both from the viewpoint of the dollar and from the viewpoint of humanity.

States are compounding the problem with passage of various legislation, such as "three strikes and you are out" in California.

A Chicago Tribune editorial commented recently on the State picture in Illinois. What it is really commenting on is about an attitude that exists, not only in Illinois, but in the Nation.

And what the editorial says makes a good deal of sense.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 28, 1995]

TIME TO FACE THE TRUTH ON PRISONS

Now that Gov. Jim Edgar has signed the state's new truth-in-sentencing legislation, someone is going to have to figure out how to make it work before there is a disaster in the prison system. The governor is willing, but the responsibility belongs squarely with the General Assembly that created this time bomb.

When the legislature passed the law, it is a pity that it wasn't accompanied by truth-in-legislation legislation to give the public an honest portrayal of the costs. Instead, it pandered to the popular appeal of getting tougher on serious crime without regard to the consequences and without providing the resources to handle the added burden on the prisons.

Among other things, the law requires that convicted murderers must serve their entire sentences and those convicted of other serious crimes—attempted murder, rape, kidnapping, armed robbery—must serve at least 85 percent. That certainly resonates strongly with a public continually outraged by stories of violent offenders who serve half their time and commit other heinous acts when released. And certainly prison space and stern punishment ought to be reserved primarily for the worst offenders.

Truth in sentencing, however, focuses on getting felons into prison and keeping them there longer; it ignores the impact and fosters a myth that there will be no effect on the general prison population.

There will be a dramatic effect. According to the state Department of Corrections, it will add the equivalent of some 3,800 inmates at a cost of \$320 million over the next 10 years—an impact that will escalate in succeeding years. And these will be the hardest cases, stuffed into a prison system that already is seriously overcrowded and may be out of space next year.

Anticipating this, Edgar proposed adding some 4,800 cells to the system, but the legislature—primarily because of Democratic opposition—cynically rebuffed his request for bonding authority. In short, the legislature was eager to flood the prisons with new inmates but not to pay the bill.

Now Edgar is proposing a different strategy: contracting with private firms to build a new prison and two work camps and add cells to eight existing prisons. The state would lease the facilities and run them.

There is merit to the idea in that it could get the job done, and the governor deserves credit for trying. But the answer is not some gambit to bypass the legislature; it is for the legislature to face its obligation.

First it must concede what it is not telling the public; that for every prisoner pushed into the system, someone must be pushed out the other end—perhaps sooner than the public will tolerate. Or the overcrowding will get worse, raising the risk of inmate violence and riots, and ultimately inviting federal court intervention to force Illinois to clean up its act.

If more prison space is the solution, the General Assembly must provide the money. If not, it must expand the concept of innovative alternative sentencing for non-violent offenders and revisit the state criminal code—reducing the penalties for lesser offenses and giving judges more discretion.

Truth in sentencing is an easy answer to serious concerns. There is no easy way out of the problems that it will create, and it's time to stop the pretense. •

THE AMERICAN PROMISE

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, as has been said many times before, ours is

the only nation founded on an idea—the idea of democracy. No idea is more American. Yet the idea of democracy is neither simply defined, nor easily described. American democracy expresses itself in endless variations.

I rise today, Mr. President, to remind my colleagues of the grassroots democracy, taking place every day in communities across the United States, which is literally vital to the life of the Nation, yet too often ignored in the chambers of this Capitol. With that in mind, I recommend to you "The American Promise," an important new PBS television series celebrating community-based democracy. "The American Promise," a 3-hour program, makes its national broadcast premiere on October 1, 2 and 3.

Here in Washington, we conduct democracy's most visible work. It is the democracy studied in political science classrooms and reported by our newspapers, magazines, and television programs.

We arrive here after elections, propose and study legislation, and then vote on competing proposals. It is a fact that each stage of the process has winners and losers. By necessity, we live and work in a world of partisanship and competition. Before any proposal becomes the law of the land, it must be debated, tested and its consequences thoroughly understood by the people and by us, the people's representatives.

Not surprisingly, this world in which we are immersed leaves many citizens frustrated and cynical. Too often, this version of democracy seems to be nothing but a political contest. Who is up? Who is down? How do yesterday's events affect the power to get things done tomorrow? Our standing is judged by an extraordinarily sensitive barometer, instantaneously reflecting each small political success and failure.

Our work here in Washington is but one form of American democracy—we would be seriously mistaken to think otherwise. We must never lose sight of the fact that American democracy is larger and more diverse than the business conducted here in this Capitol. In community after community across America, in ways great and small, citizens decide every day to become part of the democratic process—they decide what they want. They join an organization; build a better mousetrap; question why flawed practices can't be changed; engage in respectful civil debate, and shoulder the responsibility to make hard decisions.

When this happens, there are no losers. American democracy comes to life and everybody in the community wins.

So strong is my belief in the importance of grassroots democracy that I can say it literally shaped my political career.

When I was appointed to the position of national administrator of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration in 1974, my goal was simple: to encourage the maximum number of

people across America to become involved in the programs they—not government—desired to honor their local communities and our great Nation. We wanted our Nation's 200th birthday to be celebrated in a simple, historic way, with maximum participation on the "Village Greens" of every crossroad, town, and city in America. I will never forget the wonderful breadth of experience I had over the next two years, working with citizens, local groups, service clubs, organizations, City Councilmen, Mayors, and Governors. America's birthday was celebrated America's way, from every vantage point across the country.

There is no better antidote to doubts about our Nation's future than grassroots democracy.

Happily, "The American Promise" reminds us all of the community-based democracy found beyond this Capitol. In so doing, it restores our faith in the idea of democracy, the idea of America, and the wonderful, limitless potential for our Nation's future.

In some fifty different story segments from every region of the United States, lessons are offered on the skills and values needed to bring democracy to life. They illustrate core American values—freedom, responsibility, opportunity, participation, and deliberation. Special historical reenactments are included, the first set in 1769, in the streets of Colonial Williamsburg. We watch as a young Thomas Jefferson, along with Patrick Henry, Colonel George Washington, Peyton Randolph, George Mason, Richard Henry Lee, and others take the first steps toward freedom. In the House of Burgesses, in a local tavern, on the streets, the group draws up Virginia's plans to boycott English goods. We hear Washington's words: "How far their attention to our rights and privileges is to be awakened or alarmed by starving their trade and manufacturers remains to be tried." Viewers will see our Founding Fathers starting a rebellion that will gather strength for 7 more years before it takes the form of the Declaration of Independence.

That is a sobering thought: our freedoms were not won by crazy revolutionaries on a field of battle, but rather through years of meetings, of talk, of debate and compromise. It is a true reminder of the communal instincts that helped form our great Nation.

The October premiere of "The American Promise" will be just the beginning of the program's contributions. It will then be put to use in high school and junior high school classrooms throughout the country, as an instructional tool on civics and community-based democracy.

The National Council on the Social Studies has endorsed the program. Farmers Insurance Group, the program's corporate sponsor, has pledged to make the video, teaching guides, and classroom materials available to all interested schools and teachers at no cost.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues and viewers across America to watch this important and instructional program. And I extend my commendation and appreciation to the Farmers Insurance Group, and its Chairman, Leo E. Denlea, Jr., for bringing this fine programming to us.

"The American Promise" reminds us of all that is good and right in America—and what we have to do to make good on America's bright future.●

BLACK STUDENTS LIVE DOWN TO EXPECTATIONS

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, there is continued discussion, and will be until November 1996 at least, on the whole subject of affirmative action.

My strong belief is that affirmative action has been a good thing but, like any good thing, can be abused occasionally. Religion can be abused. Education can be abused. But that does not make religion and education a bad thing.

While we were in recess, the New York Times published an op-ed piece by Claude M. Steele, a professor of psychology at Stanford University and president-elect of the Western Psychological Association.

It gives a solid analysis of affirmative action at the collegiate level.

It is important enough to call to the attention of my colleagues, who may not have seen it, and to others who may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The material follows:

[New York Times; Thursday, Aug. 31, 1995]

BLACK STUDENTS LIVE DOWN TO EXPECTATIONS

(By Claude M. Steele)

STANFORD, CA.—The debate over affirmative action on college campuses has become dangerously distanced from facts. The issue has taken on such an ideological fervor that votes, Presidential and otherwise, are hanging in the balance. In the fray, the image of African-American college students has taken a beating.

Opponents of affirmative action claim that it pushes African-American students into schools where they can't compete and where, with the stigma they bear as "special admits," they get lower grades and drop out more than other students.

It is true that these students have their troubles, suffering a college dropout rate hovering near 70 percent (against 40 percent for other students), with lower grades to match. Given such statistics, even supporters of affirmative action have faltered, too unsure themselves about the students' abilities to rise quickly or publicly to their defense.

In fact, most black college students are in school on the same terms as anyone else, not as a result of any racial preference. Still, as their fate goes, so goes our faith in affirmative action and in the ability of public policy to address racial and social problems. So a few facts and some new evidence can help in addressing some central questions.

Do the academic troubles of black students stem from their being underprepared for the competition?

This is a common complaint that has turned into conventional wisdom. But in fact