

opinions. No matter how we like to flatter ourselves, Members of Congress are amateurs when it comes to understanding what works to reduce crime. The professionals are the people who work in prisons and the criminal justice system every day. Unfortunately, it is the amateurs who get to set policy, and, according to the professionals, we are doing a lousy job.

One year ago, I sponsored a survey of prison wardens asking for their views on our criminal justice and prison policies. Eight-five percent of the wardens said that most politicians are not offering effective solutions to crime. Instead of building more prisons and passing mandatory minimum sentencing laws, the wardens overwhelmingly favored providing vocational—92 percent—and literacy—93 percent—training to prisoners, and 89 percent support drug treatment programs in prisons. Congress has been quick to defund these programs, and pour scarce resources into prison construction, in the rush to be tough on crime.

The reality is that most prisoners will at some point be released, and our goal should be to ensure that those released from prison do not return to a criminal lifestyle. The Huron House in Michigan, a community-based alternative sentencing program which Mr. McCarthy refers to in his piece, costs less and is more effective at reducing recidivism than prisons.

In setting prison policies, we need to be more focused on what works. The best way to find out is to consult the professionals.

I ask that the full text of the op-ed be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

THE PROS KNOW WHY PRISONS FAIL

(By Coleman McCarthy)

PORT HURON, MICH.—Robert Diehl, who works with prisoners, believes it's time to get tough on crime. How? To begin with, not by longer sentences, not by building more prisons and not by agreeing with California Gov. Pete Wilson, who announced his presidential candidacy with the preachment that he'll "appoint judges who know that it's better to have thugs overcrowding our jails than overcrowding your neighborhood."

Diehl's philosophy of toughness involves the arduous and complex work of rescuing people with messed-up lives. He is the director of Huron House, a nonprofit, community-based alternative sentencing program for felony offenders. The three-story, 30-bed facility—located on a residential street in this small lakeshore community 60 miles north of Detroit—provides intensive 24-hour supervision and comprehensive services ranging from job training and job placement to mental health and drug counseling.

It isn't blind faith, much less addled thinking, that keeps Diehl going. In the 15 years he's been with Huron House, which opened in 1979, fewer than one in five men and women in the program has committed a new crime. The recidivism rate for the imprisoned is two out of three. It's \$50 a day to cage a person in a Michigan prison, as against \$35 a day to supervise a resident at Huron House.

In his office last week, Diehl, 53, described the futility of the current panic-button solutions to crime mouthed by one Pete Wilson or another: "Michigan has been trying to

build its way out of the crime problem for the past 12 years. We now have three times as many people in our prisons as 12 years ago. It doesn't work. There's been no reduction of crime, and there's no more perception of safety among our citizens. And prisoners' lives are not being changed for the better."

The public faces a choice: Does it want to follow the counsel of such corrections officials as Diehl or place its trust in politicians who advocate spending money on chain gangs, boot camps, three strikes, death rows, mandatory sentencing—and investing less or no money in inmate education or job programs.

The choice was rarely more stark than a few weeks ago, when two groups met—one in Cincinnati, the other in Washington—to offer prescriptions for fighting crime. One group was the professionals, the other amateurs.

The pros were people who run the nation's prisons and jails and who belong to the 20,000-member American Correctional Association (ACA). The amateurs were such members of the Senate as Texas Republican Kay Bailey Hutchison, testifying before a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on prison reform.

At the ACA conference in Cincinnati, those who toil behind the walls told of the frustration of doing politicians' dirty work and knowing all the time that longer sentences and meaner bastilles are counter-productive.

They listened to corrections officials who detailed the facts on how recidivism is reduced through community programs like Huron House and how the payoffs for public safety are in combinations of education, employment, drug treatment and punishment—not punishment alone.

Few people are wearier of quick-fix politicians than corrections professionals. Bobbie L. Huskey, the ACA president, states categorically that an "overwhelming consensus" exists among wardens that "incarceration, in and of itself, does little to reduce crime or have a positive impact on recidivism." Huskey cites a poll conducted by the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on the Constitution in which 85 percent of the wardens surveyed said that most politicians are not offering effective solutions to crime. Ninety-three percent favor literacy and other educational programs, 92 percent vocational training and 89 percent are for drug treatment.

While the professionals who know struggle on, the amateurs who don't keep popping off. At the Judiciary Committee hearings in late July, Sen. Hutchison accused federal courts of creating "comfort and convenience" for criminals in prisons. That was news to the wardens.

In addition to criminal recidivists, it appears that we now have politician recidivists: the Wilsons and Hutchisons who lapse, relapse and relapse again into deadend thinking. Maybe they need a brief stretch at Huron House. ●

LEGALIZED GAMBLING

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my Senate colleagues on the progress of important legislation moving through Congress that addresses the issue of legalized gambling in America.

Legalized gambling today is proliferating at breathtaking speed, touching the lives of millions of Americans. Communities across the country are considering casinos, riverboat gambling, pari-mutuel racing, off-track betting, and other forms of wagering.

Whereas only 2 States offered casino gambling in 1988, today 23 States have authorized casinos to operate. Overall, 48 States now permit some form of legalized gambling.

A steady stream of news accounts have chronicled the recent growth and expansion of gambling activities in America. Many of these stories describe the enormous profits generated almost overnight by gambling enterprises. Questions are being asked about decisions by State and local leaders to legalize gambling. People are concerned not only about the economic costs of these decisions, but of the human costs as well.

The Wall Street Journal, recently reported that some New Orleans public officials, retailers, and citizens are having second thoughts about the economic impacts of bringing riverboats, casinos, and video poker machines to Louisiana. The New York Times related the personal experiences of local residents in cities and towns across America who visit a casino instead of a restaurant or ballpark, who spend their grocery money on a nearby instant-play video lottery game, or who exhaust their personal or family savings at the casino tables.

In the face of this explosive growth, I joined Senator SIMON last April in support of legislation to establish a national commission to conduct an 18-month study on the effects of gambling. This measure, S. 704, would provide State and local governments with an objective, authoritative resource to use as a basis for making informed choices about gambling. S. 704 does not propose to further regulate gambling activities or to increase taxation of gambling revenues. The bill has been endorsed by the President and enjoys bipartisan support in the Senate with a total of 11 cosponsors, including Senators GORTON, KYL, LIEBERMAN, GRASSLEY, WARNER, FEINSTEIN, HATFIELD, KASSEBAUM, HATCH, and COATS.

The Governmental Affairs Committee on November 2 conducted a hearing on S. 704. Senator SIMON and I testified before the committee along with several other Members of Congress and outside experts concerned about this important issue. I am hopeful the committee will approve this important legislation before the conclusion of this session.

Companion legislation was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman WOLF of Virginia. The House Judiciary Committee held hearings on Representative WOLF's bill, H.R. 497, and approved the measure by voice vote on November 8. Prospects are good for passage by the full House during the 104th Congress.

The Washington Post, in a September 22, 1995, endorsement of the gambling study commission proposal, stated that,

Those pushing casinos into communities make large claims about their economic benefits, but the jobs and investment casinos create are rarely stacked up against the jobs

lost and the investment and spending forgone in other parts of a local economy. The commission's study could be of great use to communities pondering whether to wager their futures on roulette, slot machines and blackjack.

As evidence of the desirability for a comprehensive study of the gambling issue, I ask that the following Chicago Tribune article from November 29, 1995, be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 29, 1995]

RISKY BUSINESS: CAN GAMING WIN IN CITIES?—CHICAGO MAY GET TIP FROM NEW ORLEANS

(By Ken Armstrong)

The way casinos have flopped in New Orleans may drive other cities to flip in their views toward gambling, but Chicago still looks like a viable gambling market, according to financial analysts.

As the country's first major city to introduce large-scale gaming, New Orleans was to be a model demonstration of casinos creating tax dollars and jobs. What transpired instead were budget shortfalls, unrealized promises and the threat of municipal layoffs.

"I think there were many municipalities watching this project as an experiment in urban gaming," said Jason Ader, a gaming analyst with Bear Stearns & Co. in New York. "And the fact that it has effectively failed casts a dark cloud over other urban markets considering gaming as an economic engine."

Harrah's Jazz Co. shut its temporary casino in New Orleans last week and declared bankruptcy. Harrah's Jazz also suspended construction on its permanent casino, which was slated to open in New Orleans next summer.

No longer able to count on lease and tax payments from the casino, New Orleans faces a budget shortfall and has postponed the sale of \$15.8 million in general obligation bonds. Mayor Marc Morial said he may have to lay off as many as 1,000 city employees.

Gaming opponents have latched on to the debacle, using it to argue that other cities pursuing casinos would be wise to give up the chase.

Tom Grey, a Galena, Ill., minister spearheading the anti-gambling movement nationwide, said there's reason to believe that what happened in New Orleans would be replayed in Chicago, where Mayor Richard Daley has pushed hard for casinos.

But several financial analysts who specialize in gaming say it isn't necessarily so.

"Everybody in the industry knows Chicago and New York would be layoffs if they had casinos there," said Steve Schneider, an analyst with Stifel Nicolaus & Co. in St. Louis.

He estimated that casinos in Chicago could generate \$800 million to \$1 billion in gross profits without cutting heavily into the revenues of nearby riverboat casinos.

Daley spokesman Jim Williams said the mayor still views casinos as a good way to attract convention-goers and increase tax revenue for the city and state.

But he added: "The mayor has never seen gaming as a panacea. He's been steadfast in his belief that it should never be seen as a primary source of income."

What happened in New Orleans would more likely give pause to marginal markets for gaming such as Milwaukee or Cleveland, Schneider said. The poor performance of the New Orleans casinos also will make it more difficult for gaming companies to secure project financing for future developments, he said.

Brian Ford, director of gaming industry services at Ernst & Young in Philadelphia,

said New Orleans hardly proves that casinos can't flourish.

With video-poker machines in truckstops, casinos on riverboats and what would have been one of the world's largest land-based casinos, Louisiana tried to do too much with too small a population base, Ford said.

The shutdown of Harrah's Jazz was New Orleans' second losing hand.

Another project with two riverboat casinos—the \$223 million River City complex—closed in June after opening just nine weeks before. Analysts blamed its failure, like that of Harrah's temporary casino, largely on its location.

The riverboat complex was built in an industrial area where its neighbor is Glazer Steel & Aluminum—hardly a tourist draw. A thousand feet of head-high weeds, tractor trailers, piles of gravel and an abandoned Chevette with smashed-in windows separate the complex from the edge of the city's downtown area.

David Anders, a gaming analyst with Raymond James & Associates in St. Petersburg, Fla., said New Orleans shows that while state and municipal governments should rightfully profit from a casino, they shouldn't make the casino's financial burden so great it can't survive.

Harrah's Jazz paid \$125 million up front as a franchise fee for the state's only land-based casino and promised payments of at least \$100 million a year to the state, regardless of financial performance.

The company's principal partner is Memphis-based Harrah's Entertainment Inc., which grew from a bingo parlor in Reno during the Depression to an industry giant with casinos in all of the country's major gaming markets.

Ralph Berry, a Harrah's Entertainment spokesman, said Harrah's Jazz still wants to open the permanent casino and will try to renegotiate the casino agreement with the state, city and lenders. Critics have accused Harrah's Jazz of using the bankruptcy filing as leverage for more attractive terms. ●

NATIONAL VETERANS DAY AND ADDRESS BY ADM. LEIGHTON W. SMITH, JR.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Birmingham, AL has always conducted outstanding Veterans Day events. Each year, the ceremonies commence on the night of November 10, the day before Veterans Day, when a banquet is held to remember our veterans and to formally honor the National Veterans Award recipients.

This year, National Veterans Day in Birmingham sponsors, which include 16 of the national veterans organizations, decided to present the award to 5 World War II Congressional Medal of Honor winners. They were Adm. Eugene Fluckey of the U.S. Navy; Capt. Maurice Britt, U.S. Army; and PFC Jack Lucas, U.S. Marine Corps. There were two members honored from the Air Force, which during World War II was still the old Army Air Corps. They were Col. William T. Lawley and M.Sgt. Henry Eugene Erwin, both Alabama natives. There are a total of five surviving World War II veterans who served in the Army Air Corps and who are Congressional Medal of Honor winners, and we are proud that two of them hail from Alabama. Douglas Albert Monroe, signalman first class in

the U.S. Coast Guard was honored posthumously.

On Veterans Day itself, Birmingham hosts the World Peace Luncheon, which this year featured Adm. Leighton W. Smith, Jr., of the U.S. Navy as its distinguished guest speaker. Born in Mobile, Admiral Smith is the commander, U.S. Naval Forces in Europe and commander in chief, Allied Forces in Southern Europe. He was appointed to these posts in April 1994.

He was promoted to vice admiral in June 1991, and served for 2½ years as deputy chief of naval operations for plans, policy, and operations. He was a major contributor to Navy staff reorganization and the development of From the Sea, the Navy's strategy for the 21st century.

I ask that a copy of Admiral Leighton's outstanding address delivered at the World Peace Luncheon be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. LEIGHTON W. SMITH, USN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF ALLIED FORCES SOUTHERN EUROPE, COMMANDER IN CHIEF U.S. NAVAL FORCES EUROPE

Senator, Congressman, distinguished veterans, those of you who have worked so hard to put on this celebration, good morning.

No one knows better than I the value of and the sacrifices made by those we left behind.

I am distinctly honored to add my thoughts to those of the many distinguished speakers who have appeared here in previous years.

I doubt I can adequately express my gratitude for having been invited to join fellow Alabamians to pay tribute to our veterans—both those that have joined us here today and those who have gone before us.

It is absolutely right that we pause to reflect on what this day means—what it signifies—what it cost—and why, as Senator Heflin said last night, "The Strength of our Nation Must Never Be Allowed to Atrophy".

Few gathered here today can recall the first Armistice Day or the terribleness of the war it commemorated. Time has distanced us from the horror of that conflict.

It was the war to end all wars—but history reminds us that it really wasn't.

Other wars, conflicts and crises have followed, all evidencing the common denominators of destruction and death, but also individuals whose commitment, courage and personal sacrifices have continued to inspire us all.

Senator John Kerry, in speaking at the retirement of our Navy's Vietnam era swift boats, said:

"We were all bound together in the great and noble effort of giving ourselves to something bigger than each and every one of us individually, and doing so at risk of life and limb. Let no one ever doubt the quality and nobility of that commitment."

Those words could have been spoken about our veterans who served in the trenches of France, at Pearl Harbor and Bataan, at Midway, Normandy and Iwo Jima.

They would have been true at Inchon and the Frozen Chosin, in the jungles and skies of Vietnam, the deserts of Kuwait and Iraq and in other unnamed places where ordinary people do extraordinary things and in so doing, honor their country while preserving the ideals and values for which it stands.

Last year I attended commemorative ceremonies at Normandy.

As I sat waiting for the program to begin, I spotted an usher, a young soldier no more than 18 years old, my he looked so young.