twice the rate for the general population over 18. And 38 percent of prisoners without high school degrees were unemployed just prior to being incarcerated, compared to 25 percent for those with high school diplomas.

In prison, only about one-third of inmates receive vocational training or work experience designed to improve their ability to obtain legitimate employment once released. And very few former incarcerated individuals receive job counseling and placement services after their release.

Because of the low pay, lack of benefits, and lack of advancement potential of many formal work activities, informal and illegal activities may be tempting. Especially considering that an estimated 70 percent of State prison inmates have a history of regular drug use, and very few receive formal treatment in prison.

Most communities where prisoners go upon release already struggle with high poverty, unemployment, fragile families, and a dearth of jobs. In Illinois, for example, 54 percent of those released from prison return to just seven communities around Chicago. These communities are among the poorest in Chicago and are ill prepared for the additional burden of reintegrating young men with criminal records, spotty employment histories, low skills and education.

Former prisoners also face employer resistance to hiring people with criminal backgrounds. One study found that applicants with criminal records experienced a 50 percent reduction in job offers for entry level jobs, compared to those without records. This was compounded by racial bias as black former inmates experienced at 64 percent reduction in offers.

Other barriers include one documented by a recent study in Illinois in which only 22 percent percent of the prisoners had a photo identification card at the time of release. And most prisoners have financial and other obligations, including child support and the conditions of their release, that require immediate attention.

Notwithstanding the barriers to successful reentry, however, faith based and community based organizations have been achieving positive results with the released prisoner population for years. The Second Chance Act celebrates the potential of nonprofit community organizations working with State and local authorities and corrections departments to promote responsible parenting and sustainable employment, and to reduce recidivism.

This bill will make funding available to the Attorney General to support and evaluate the efforts of innovative communities and local service providers. Grants can be used to expand access to transitional jobs programs and to transitional and permanent housing, to support health services, to support the children of incarcerated parents and the maintenance of healthy parent-child relationships, to address literacy and educational needs, and to ensure that appropriate job training, placement, and retention services are available.

Priority under the Second Chance Act will be given to projects that serve geographic areas with large ex-prisoner populations, to projects that include partnerships with nonprofit organizations, and to projects that provide consultations between victims and ex-prisoners. Priority will also be given to projects that consider appropriate reforms of sanctions for technical post-release violations, and to projects that establish pre-release procedures to connect participants to the State and Federal benefits and referrals to social and health services for which they are eligible.

And by maintaining a strict focus on measurable results and data collection, the Second Chance Act will help us learn what works and what does not work.

Too many people are caught up in the criminal justice system. Especially within the African American community where 32 percent of black males will enter State or Federal prison sometime during their lifetime. Communities are protected and strengthened when people who break the law are punished appropriately. But communities—all communities, including yours and mine are weakened if we neglect the challenges of rehabilitation and reentry.

To improve the integration of former prisoners and to reduce recidivism is in all of our best interests. A well-designed reentry system can enhance public safety, reduce recidivism, reduce costs, and help prisoners achieve long-term integration. Former prisoners who are engaged in lawful work after they have returned to the community are less likely to commit new crimes and are more likely to be involved in their children's lives.

The Second Chance Act is an important effort to strengthen America's communities. The bill is supported by a wide range of organizations, and I urge my colleagues to join us in passing this important legislation.

## LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On August 08, 2005, in New York, NY, an unidentified gay man was beaten by two men in what police are calling a hate crime. The man was walking with a companion when two others approached screaming anti-gay slurs before attacking the victim; the attacker hit the victim repeatedly. Following the attack, the victim was taken to a near by Manhattan Hospital for head injuries.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

## CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT COMPLIANCE

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, pursuant to section 313(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, on November 3, 2005, I submitted for the RECORD a list of material in S. 1932 considered to be extraneous under subsections (b)(1)(A), (b)(1)(B), and (b)(1)(E) of section 313. The last page of the list that was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 3, 2005, was inadvertantly dropped. Today I resubmit the complete list and asked that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXTRANEOUS PROVISIONS—SENATE BILL

[Prepared by Senate Budget Committee Majority Staff]

| SENATE | |
|---|---|
| Provision | Violation/Comments |
| TITLE I—AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION AND FORESTRY | |
| N/A | N/A |
| TITLE II—BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS | |
| Sec. 2014(b)(3)(F) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Report to Congress. |
| Sec. 2018(a) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Studies of potential changes to the federal deposit insurance system—just a study. |
| Sec. 2018(b) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Studies of potential changes to the federal deposit insurance system—just a study. |
| Sec. 2025 | 313(b)(1)(A)—Authorization of Appropriations—no money involved. |
| TITLE III—COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION | |
| 3005(c)(2) | 313(b)(1)(E)—low-power TV and translator outlays occur after 2010, increasing the deficit. |
| 3005(c)(3) | 313(b)(1)(E)—interoperability grant outlays occur after 2010, increasing the deficit. |
| 3005(c)(4) | 313(b)(1)(E)—E911 outlays occur after 2010, increasing the deficit. |
| 3005(c)(5) | 313(b)(1)(E)—coastal assistance outlays occur after 2010, increasing the deficit. |
| 3005(d) | 313(b)(1)(A)—transferring offsetting receipts that federal government has already received does not produce a change in outlays. |
| 3005(f) | 313(b)(1)(A)—does not produce a change in outlays as additional receipts could not be spent and would be deposited in Treasury anyway. |
| TITLE IV—ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES | |
| N/A | N/A |
| TITLE V—ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS | |
| N/A | N/A |
| TITLE VI—FINANCE | |
| 6012(a)(5)(F) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Requirements on insurance sellers produce no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6012(b)(4) | 313(b)(1)(A)—State reporting requirement produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6012(c) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Annual report to Congress produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6022 | 313(b)(1)(A)—CBO score of zero. |
| 6026(a) Sec. 1937(a). | 313(b)(1)(A)—Medicaid CFO produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6026(a) Sec. 1937(b). | 313(b)(1)(A)—Oversight Board produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6026(a) Sec. 1937(e). | 313(b)(1)(A)—Annual report produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6036(e) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Reports produce no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6043(c)(2) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Budget neutrality language produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6103(c) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Study and Report by HHS Inspector General produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6103(d) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Rehabilitation Advisory Council produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6110(a) 1860E–1(e). | 313(b)(1)(A)—Arrangement with an Entity to Provide Advice and Recommendations produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6110(b)(3)(E) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Report produces no change in outlays or revenues. |
| 6110(c)(1)(C) | 313(b)(1)(A)—Sense of the Senate produces no change in outlays or revenues. |