

such report shall be submitted at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information, as such evaluating agency may require.

(b) REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall report annually to the Congress on the findings of the annual evaluation under section 11(a)(2) of each demonstration project under this title. Each such report shall contain a copy of—

(A) the annual evaluation under section 11(a)(2) of each demonstration project under this title; and

(B) each report received under subsection (a) for the applicable year.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit a final report to the Congress within 9 months after the conclusion of the demonstration projects under this title that summarizes the findings of the annual evaluations conducted pursuant to section 11(a)(2).

SEC. 13. REPEAL.

(a) AMENDMENT.—The Goals 2000: Educate America Act (20 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Education, in consultation with the appropriate committees of the Congress, shall prepare and submit to the Congress recommended legislation containing technical and conforming amendments to reflect the amendment made by subsection (a).

(2) SUBMISSION DATE.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall submit the recommended legislation referred to under paragraph (1).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 1995, at 9 a.m., in SR-332, to mark up the committee's budget reconciliation instructions.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DOLE. 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 27, 1995, to conduct a markup of S. 650, the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet during the Wednesday, September 27, 1995, session of the Senate for the purpose of conducting a hearing on S. 1239, the Air Traffic Management System Performance Improvement Act of 1995.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full Committee on Environment and Public Works be granted permission to conduct a nomination hearing to receive testimony from Kathleen A. McGinty to be a member of the Council on Environmental Quality, Wednesday, September 27, at 9:30 a.m., Hearing Room (SD-406).

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

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet for an executive session, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 27, 1995, at 9:30 a.m.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 27, 1995, at 2 p.m. to hold a hearing on intelligence matters.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PRISON, PROBATION ROLLS SOARING

• Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, as we move toward consideration of the Senate Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, which increases funding for State prison construction by \$250 million and allocates not one penny for crime prevention programs, it is important to take time to examine our current policies and consider our direction.

The Justice Department recently released a survey of our Nation's prisons, jails, parole, and probation services. According to the report, a record 5.1 million Americans—2.7 percent of all adults—were behind bars, on probation or on parole in 1994. Last year the Justice Department reported that we passed the mark of having 1 million people in prison. That puts the United States in the dubious position of having the second highest incarceration rate in the industrialized world. As our prison population has soared, our crime rate has been unaffected. Before we allocate scarce resources on more prisons, it makes sense to consider our alternatives and consult with experts.

Last December, I sponsored a survey of wardens and inmates in eight States in an effort to inform this debate. Rather than an all-or-nothing distribution of funds, when asked how they would spend an extra \$10 million to fight crime in their communities, wardens split the money evenly: 43 percent on prevention and 57 percent on punishment. Even the 1994 crime bill fell

far short of this equation, spending 75 percent of its funding on punishment and a mere 25 percent for prevention programs. This appropriations bill would further the imbalance by denying any funds for the crime bill's prevention programs.

Mr. President, I ask that a Chicago Sun-Times article on the Justice Department survey be included in the RECORD at this point.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Aug. 28, 1995]
PRISON, PROBATION ROLLS SOARING: TOTAL HITS 5.1 MILLION, 2.7 PERCENT OF ALL ADULTS
(By Alan C. Miller)

WASHINGTON.—A record 5.1 million Americans—2.7 percent of the nation's adult population—were behind bars, on probation or on parole last year, the Justice Department reported Sunday.

Since 1980, state and federal prison populations have increased by 213 percent, and probation rolls have jumped by 165 percent. The average annual rate of growth has been 7.6 percent; the figure for 1994 was 3.9 percent.

Nearly 3 million people were on probation as of last Dec. 31, a Bureau of Justice Statistics study found.

Half of those on probation were found guilty of committing a felony; one in seven had been convicted of driving under the influence of alcohol.

Another 690,000 people were on parole, or conditionally released under supervision, after serving a prison term. Parolees can be returned to prison for violating a set of rules or committing another offense. All but 5 percent had served time for felonies.

The Justice Department survey found that 82 percent of those on probation and parole had maintained regular contact with a supervising agency as required. Another 9 percent had failed to report or could not be located. The rest were not required to maintain regular contact.

Texas had the most people on probation and parole, 503,000—more than 3.8 percent of the state's adults. California followed with 370,000.

Illinois had about 103,000 people on probation and parole.

Twelve states and the federal probation system showed a decrease in the number of people on probation. The biggest decrease was in South Dakota, down 6.2 percent, followed by California, down 5.8 percent.

The figures show that a higher percentage of men and white people are on probation than are in the prison system. Women make up 21 percent of all probationers and only 6 percent of all prisoners. Blacks make up 32 percent of those on probation and 50 percent of the prison population.

Half of those in prison have committed a violent crime; 80 percent have previous convictions.

Prisons are running at 20 percent over capacity, and thus more than 4 percent of those sentenced to prison terms are being held in local jails despite considerable prison construction, forcing the early release of some inmates, said Lawrence A. Greenfeld, a deputy director of the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Criminal justice experts said the sharp increases reflect tougher sentencing on a range of crimes as well as a greater proportion of drug arrests involving longer prison terms.

At the same time, they said the consequent pressure to ease congestion in packed prisons and jails has led to expanded use of alternatives to incarceration or early release.

Alfred A. Blumstein, a criminologist at the Heinz School of Public Policy and Management at Carnegie Mellon University in Pittsburgh, Pa., said he believes the criminal justice system "may be overextending itself" and that increased emphasis on such programs as drug treatment and prevention may be more effective in the long run than meting out harsher sentences.

"Just by locking away more people, we do avert crimes, but at a cost," Blumstein said. "We have no good estimates of how much benefit we get for...the cost of \$25,000 per person per year in prison or jail."•

GREEN LIGHTS, MONTREAL PROTOCOL

• Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, the amendment I offered yesterday will restore the EPA Administrator's ability to fulfill our obligations under the Montreal Protocol. In addition, it will authorize the EPA Administrator to fund the successful Green programs, including the Green Lights Program and Energy Star Buildings Programs.

I need not go into detail on the importance of the Montreal Protocol. Last year, the Congress appropriated \$119 million for these important programs—\$101 million for the Green programs and roughly \$17 million for the Montreal Protocol multilateral fund. This amendment will allow the Administrator to spend up to \$100 million on these programs, a 13-percent cut from last years levels.

Negotiated and signed by President Reagan and expanded and implemented by President Bush, the Montreal Protocol is working to reduce the production and use of ozone-depleting substances. President Reagan believed it was vital that we fulfill our commitments under this important treaty. President Bush took a leadership position and urged the rest of the world to agree to a complete phase out of a number of ozone depleting substances. President Bush also concluded the negotiations, begun by President Reagan, to establish the multilateral fund.

Now, let me explain the fund, because this is what we are debating today. The multilateral fund was created in 1990 in order to assist developing countries in their efforts to phaseout ozone depleters. Since the development of the fund, 100 developing countries have ratified the protocol and agreed to the protocol's strict reduction requirements. They did this with the understanding that the fund would assist these developing countries in transferring the technology necessary to end this use of ozone-depleting substances. Most of this technology comes from the United States.

Failure to pay our share of the fund would force developing countries to end their protocol obligations. This would lead to increased use of ozone-depleting substances in developing countries and offset the tens of billions of dollars spent by the developed countries to phase them out.

Let me summarize.

No money to the fund.

Violation of our commitment to the treaty.

Greater use of CFC's by developing countries.

Faster depletion rates of the ozone.

More negative health effects, such as skin cancer and cataracts.

We must maintain our commitment to protect the ozone layer.

My colleagues may argue that funds for the Montreal protocol belong in the State Department budget, not the EPA budget. As a member of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, I am continuing to work to ensure that the protocol has adequately funded the State Department budget. However, I believe that funding for international programs is so limited, that offsetting the loss in this bill would be impossible.

Since 1991, almost one-third of the money for the fund has come from EPA. We made the decision, in 1990, to require EPA to assist the State Department. Let me read from section 617b of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, which many of us here today voted for. Quote:

The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall support global participation in the Montreal protocol by providing technical and financial assistance to developing countries.

And at that time we authorized \$30 million to be spent for the fund.

The phaseout of CFC's is not just an international political issue, it is a technical, industrial, and environmental issue, on which EPA is respected globally. Further, through its experience in the United States of ridding the country of ozone-depleting substances, EPA has a good understanding of the benefits of U.S. technologies, and has been able to promote those technologies in other countries.

This is no time to end this progress.

Let me spend a minute on the Green Lights Program. I remember President Bush searching for alternatives to the overregulation, command and control policies of the 1970's and 1980's. He longed to find a way to control pollution in a nonregulatory, free-market manner. His legacy to the environment is his success in developing just such a program.

The Green Lights Program, and Energy Star Programs, are a testament to the type of innovative programs we must implement if we wish to reduce the regulatory burden faced by industry today. The programs are voluntary, reduce energy use, decrease our dependence on foreign energy, save business money, and stimulate markets for clean, alternative energy technologies and services.

Green Lights is simple. EPA provides technical assistance to help a company survey its facilities and upgrade its lighting. That's it. Since its inception, Green Lights has saved companies hundreds of millions of dollars and dramatically reduced air pollution emissions. All this without one regulation.

This is the most successful public-private partnership running. Just ask

companies in my own State, such as IBM, our largest utility—Green Mountain Power, Jay Peak Ski area, and others.

Ask the Mobile Corp., who points out in this article in Time magazine that with the help of EPA Green Lights they have reduced their lighting energy costs by 49 percent.

Eliminating this program now would be unwise. This program reduces the need for regulation. Without Green Lights we might need more regulation to accomplish what is now being done with a voluntary partnership.

I believe one of the reasons this program is slated for elimination is that it is considered corporate welfare. Let me tell you why it is not.

EPA does not give any grants or financial assistance to Green Lights partners.

All funds are spent for information dissemination and communication.

The resulting investment by participants is more than 50 times the Federal investment.

Green Lights participants represent a wide range of entities, including 360 schools, 193 hospitals, numerous churches, local governments, small businesses, and nonprofit groups.

Overcoming market barriers is valuable to many, but beyond the reach of individual organizations. Many businesses cannot afford to keep on hand the technical expertise that EPA has assembled to help business succeed in reducing their energy costs in this manner.

Green Lights is a successful public-private partnership. It creates jobs and opportunities for sound energy use and savings, while at the same time preventing pollution. This is a model, non-regulatory program.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to seriously consider the consequences of ending these two vital programs. My amendment does not increase spending, nor does it cut from other areas of the bill. The amendment simply requests that the EPA Administrator be allowed to spend, within available funds, enough funds to keep these important programs up and running.●

TRIBUTE TO ABRAHAM SACKS

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great citizen of the State of Michigan, Abraham Sacks. On October 7, 1995, 50 years to the month when 1st Lt. Abraham Sacks returned to the United States from Europe, civilian Abraham "Abe" Sacks will receive his World War II medals. Fifty years—for some people that is a lifetime; in many families that is two generations. For Abe Sacks, it has not even been something to think about.

Abe served five years in the U.S. Army from 1941 until his discharge in January 1946. And since then, he has not had the time to think about the medals he never received. Abe and his wife Bea have been too busy living their lives. They settled into their new