

physical disabilities. As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Disability Policy, I have been fortunate to have witnessed that strength firsthand.

The last 20 years have brought many milestones for Americans with disabilities. We have learned the value of rehabilitation for the disabled, and we have seen the glory of a dream coming true with the help of a rehab professional and sheer determination. We have also watched as perceptions of people with disabilities have been shattered by the perseverance of those people with disabilities and rehabilitation professionals who never shied away from a challenge.

Mr. President, please join me in saluting the 49 million Americans with disabilities and the countless rehabilitation professionals who take the time and care to reach for these dreams and shatter the myths. National Rehabilitation Week continues to gain momentum. This year, more than 5,000 organizations are observing this event nationwide, including Health-South Hospitals in my home state of Tennessee. This is a week to applaud the accomplishments of people with disabilities and to recognize what still must be done.●

CRIME PREVENTION

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the growing problem of juvenile crime, and the failure of this Congress to adequately address it. As the former chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice, I am particularly alarmed by the growth of juvenile violence today, and the fact that we are doing little to slow this trend with investments in our young people.

At a time when crime is generally falling, a growing number of young people are becoming the perpetrators—and victims—of violence in America. Juvenile offenders are now responsible for 14 percent of all violent crime and 25 percent of all property crime. Criminologists report that 14 to 24-year-old-black males, who represent just 1 percent of the population, comprise 17 percent of all homicide victims and 30 percent of all offenders. Arguments that used to be solved with fists in a school yard are now being settled with Uzi's and Tech 9 semi-automatic weapons. Some schools are starting to resemble prisons, with metal detectors, armed guards, and bars on the windows.

This is not the healthy environment that will nurture a new generation. Instead, this is a recipe for disaster—a formula for creating an army of young criminals whose only future is to commit more heinous and vicious crimes with each passing year. And this army is likely to expand: there are now more pre-teenagers in America—39 million under 10 years old—than at any other time in the past generation.

There are many ways that society can combat this juvenile crime trend—and I support all of them. First, we can

get tough on the most violent juveniles—trying them as adults and locking them up—so that serious crimes receive serious punishment. Second, we can improve our ability to catch all juvenile offenders through more vigilant law enforcement. Accomplishing these goals requires more prisons and more police, and Congress is providing billions to build penitentiaries and fund 100,000 new police officers through the Crime Act of 1994.

However, a third part of the Crime Act calls for a different approach. Instead of spending all the money on prisons and police, Congress wanted some of it, about 20 percent, to be spent on preventing crime before it happens.

Now, crime prevention used to be a dirty phrase in Washington, something that so-called liberals touted and conservatives criticized as a strategy for coddling criminals. I hope we have moved past those simplistic arguments and are prepared to recognize the value of crime prevention programs. For years we have heard evidence about the value of investing some funds in crime prevention, and the fact that these programs measurably reduce crime. More recently, numerous studies have documented how small investments in a troubled young person's life will not only save that child from a life of crime and misery, but will also save society thousands of dollars in court costs and prison fees. Most important, these investments protect the lives of citizens and prevent tragic crimes before they occur.

There are literally hundreds of examples—I'll note only two here. A few years ago Fort Worth, TX, initiated a program called Code Blue. The program offered year round structured social, education and recreational activities for young people. Kids not only engaged in sports, but received homework assistance and help with college and GED preparation. Five community centers were established to help young people get on the right track and make a difference in the local neighborhoods.

According to the Fort Worth Police Department, crime dropped by 28 percent within a one mile radius of each center. Gang crimes declined by 30 percent city wide in the first 6 months of 1995. This was achieved at a cost of \$10 a year per student—that compares with the \$40,000 a year it costs to incarcerate a juvenile offender.

The results are the same across the country. A program called Children-At-Risk [CAR] coordinates social service agencies, police, and school officials to target intensive education, counseling, and family services at 11–13 year olds. A National Institute of Justice quasi-experimental study in five cities found that the CAR test group had almost half the number of contacts with police as the non-participant control group, and had less than half the number of contacts with the juvenile court as the control group.

We have seen these kinds of case studies proving the value of crime pre-

vention programs for years. But, Mr. President, we are now seeing comprehensive reports demonstrating the cost-effectiveness of crime prevention. Last month the Rand Corp. released a 2-year study comparing the value of investing in crime prevention versus tougher penalties and incarceration. It compared prevention programs such as graduation incentives, delinquent supervision, and parent training to a "three-strikes-and-you're-out" law. The study found that crime prevention was three times more cost-effective than increased punishment.

The study concluded that a State government could prevent between 157 and 258 crimes a year by investing \$1 million in crime prevention, compared with preventing 60 crimes by investing the same amount in incarceration.

Law enforcement officers—the troops on the front lines in this battle—are also calling on Congress to fund prevention programs. A recent Northeastern University survey of more than 500 police chiefs and sheriffs found that three-quarters of them believe the best way to reduce crime and violence is to increase investment in prevention programs. This is not surprising: it confirms what we found out last year when we polled Wisconsin police chiefs and sheriffs: almost 90 percent supported the Crime Act's prevention programs. These front line crime fighters know—better than anyone else—that crime prevention works.

Mr. President, let me be clear on this point. I am not advocating that we commit all our resources to crime prevention and no money to punishment and incarceration. Like the police chiefs and sheriffs, I support the Crime Act funding formula which allocates 80 percent for punishment, tougher penalties, and more police, as well as 20 percent for crime prevention.

Unfortunately, in the last 2 years since that legislation was passed, Congress has not lived up to its promise to adequately fund crime prevention programs and is actually moving toward eliminating the few programs that it has funded. Just this week, two bills were reported out of Committee which either defund or eliminate virtually all effective prevention programs. As a member of both relevant committees, I spoke out against these cuts in committee, and will work to reverse them on the Senate floor.

First, the Senate Appropriations Committee voted out the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations funding measure for 1997. Despite mounting evidence of the cost effectiveness of crime prevention, this bill fails to fund more than \$500 million in prevention programs authorized under the Crime Act. While I commend the drafters for appropriating \$20 million for Boys and Girls Clubs, this is a fraction of the prevention Congress authorized 2 years ago.

During the same week, the Senate Judiciary Committee passed the new 4-year authorization for the Juvenile

Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The legislation eliminates all crime prevention grants and uses that money for "research and evaluation." Mr. President, I am a strong advocate of research and evaluation, and have introduced a bill with Senator BILL COHEN of Maine that would require federally funded prevention programs to set aside money for rigorous, independent evaluation. But this proposed reauthorization funds research at the expense of all crime prevention programs. That is unacceptable.

Mr. President, at a time when juvenile crime is on the rise, when law enforcement officials are asking for more prevention funds, and when case studies and statistical evidence are proving that we can prevent crimes, protect citizens, and save money in the long run—how can this Congress cut funding for crime prevention and eliminate these programs?

When I walk the streets with police officers in Wisconsin and I tell them what Congress is considering, they are shocked. These people know what works and they want our help. We should not turn our backs on America's police officers and future generations, and resign ourselves to even more prisons and police. We have other alternatives that we should fund—cost effective measures which can prevent crime before it happens.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with my colleagues in a bipartisan fashion to correct the lack of juvenile crime prevention in the proposed versions of the Justice Department's funding bill and the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This is not a partisan issue—members from both parties recognize the common sense of spending at least a small portion of federal funds on prevention. As these bills come to the floor, I hope more colleagues see the tremendous progress we can make if we just move past the simplistic arguments and recognize the value of a small investment in crime prevention programs. •

SALUTE TO BRISTOL TREE CITY USA BOARD

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the Bristol TN, Tree City USA Board, which was founded 6 years ago to enhance the natural beauty of the Bristol area.

Under the leadership of Dr. Donald Ellis, the tree board has embarked on a massive reforestation project in their area. Since the effort began, Tennesseans have volunteered one by one to plant trees around Bristol with the goal of planting 1 million trees by the Tennessee bicentennial this year. Mr. President, I'm proud to say that these volunteers have not only reached their goal, but they will gather together on September 6 to plant tree number 1 million and one.

This is truly an example of the spirit that has made the Volunteer State

great for 200 years, and it's fitting that the 1 million and first tree will be planted this year by a volunteer.

In celebration of the bicentennial, my family and I also planted a tree—in Washington DC. Earlier this summer, Karyn, the boys and I planted a tulip poplar—the Tennessee State tree—on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol Building. This bicentennial tree will serve as the official Tennessee State tree on the Capitol grounds and as a testament to the contagious nature of beautification efforts like Tree City USA.

Mr. President, I commend Tree City USA for its dedication to the community of Bristol. Projects like Tree City USA not only benefit the people of Bristol, but all Americans. I would also like to commend the people of Bristol, TN and thank them for their efforts. Tree City USA could not reach its goal without the hard work of these community-minded citizens.

• Mr. KERREY. Mr. President I would like to express my appreciation to the managers of the FY1997 Agriculture Appropriations bill, the Senior Senator from Mississippi Mr. COCHRAN and the Senior Senator from Arkansas Mr. BUMPERS. Both Senators worked very hard to see that a well balanced bill came out of Conference. I would also like to note my appreciation that the conferees made a very wise decision to fully fund the Food Safety Inspection Service. Full funding for FSIS allows our food safety inspectors to do their job of protecting the nation's meat and poultry. I also rise to engage Mr. BUMPERS in a colloquy regarding the importance of food safety research done by the Agricultural Research Service. Understanding the enormous role that research plays in agriculture, I believe it is important to note that by increasing funding for food safety research the conferees laid the groundwork for a safe food supply well into the next century.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I also rise in support of the conferees decision to increase spending on food safety research through the Agricultural Research Service. This research is a very important part of the Federal Government's effort to protect the nation's food supply. The FY1997 Agriculture Appropriation's Conference Report sets spending for ARS Food Safety Research at \$5.5 million. By increasing funding for this research the Conferees took an important step toward ensuring that our food supply meets our highest expectations.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I appreciate Senator BUMPERS' support of this important issue. I would like to talk about several particular food safety research initiatives. I strongly support, along with the Conferees, three important components of pre-harvest and post-harvest food safety research proposed by the Agricultural Research Service. The Conferees made the right decision to fund research of methodologies for Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) validation,

host-pathogen relationships and rapid on-farm DNA-based diagnostic testing.

ARS should emphasize research on the genetic basis for host-pathogen relationships. Scientists already know that exposure, infection, and contamination of live animals by certain bacteria and parasites can result in pathogens in our meat-based foods. Further research in this area will enable scientists to develop methods to identify and select animals that are resistant to foodborne pathogens.

Along with studying the host-pathogen relationship, it is important that researchers develop rapid, specific, and sensitive DNA-based diagnostic tests that will allow identification of pathogens in live animals and their production environment. By developing technologies and techniques that make this identification possible, we will be able to prevent meat and poultry contamination problems in the early stages of production.

It is also very important that ARS develop on-line methodologies for HACCP validation. HACCP involves the systematic identification and prevention of safety hazards in food production processes. I applaud the administration's decision to implement this program and once again would like to emphasize the importance of the Conferee's decision to fully fund the Food Safety Inspection Service so that the benefits of HACCP can be recognized. Does the Senator agree that the three research areas I just described are important to the agricultural community and as a result deserve the funding we allocated to that purpose?

Mr. BUMPERS. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his question. I support the Conferees decision to fund research of host-pathogen relationships, rapid on-farm DNA-based diagnostic testing and improved methodologies for HACCP validation. These three areas have been targeted by the administration as priority research that should be carried out by the Agricultural Research Service, and I support that prioritization.

By supporting research to elucidate the relationship between livestock and pathogens, we will lay the foundation for breeding livestock that are resistant to foodborne pathogens and developing effective on-farm diagnostic tests. In this manner, scientists can improve our food production systems in the earliest stages before the meat ever reaches the processor. Furthermore, effective methodologies for HACCP validation will help federal food safety inspectors to ensure that our meat and poultry is not contaminated. The Conferees sent a strong message that they support food safety research at the Agricultural Research Service and I am pleased that the bill provides increased funding for this purpose.