the SLORC. We shall, therefore, support any of your measures to effect this.

Sincerely yours,

(Signature)

SPICE SIN HWIN
Representative, DRSO (East Coast).

(From the Desk of Betty Williams)

Senator MITCH MCCONNELL,
Russel Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Dear Senator McConnell: I wish to take this opportunity to offer my support to the initiative you are preparing to undertake on behalf of my sister, Suu Kyi and the people of Burma. It has been brought to my attention that you intend to introduce legislation on July 11, 1995 which will ban all U.S. foreign investment in Burma.

On June 26, 1995, while commemorating the 55th Anniversary of the United Nations, Bishop Diamond Tutu, Lech Walesa, Oscar Arias Sanchez and myself presented a letter to the United Nations which included the signatures of seven other Laureates asking for the introduction of such legislation. "She has endured six long years of solitary detention without trial at the hands of the military regime. There is no other act of her release. We absolutely oppose political oppression, as well as criminal detention," Bishop Tutu, in a statement to a forum at the UN headquarters, added that the insecurity called for sanctions to be imposed on Burma.

This legislative initiative is long overdue and will play a critical role in bringing about a transfer of power to the democratically elected 1990 representatives, allowing them to take their rightful (and legitimate) seats in parliament. I offer congratulations for implementing this endeavor and hope that your colleagues in the Senate will join you in this worthy effort which I hope will lead to a political dialogue and settlement of the Burmese conflict and the release of Suu in Burma.

Most sincerely,

BETTY WILLIAMS,
Nobel Laureate 1975.

UNITED FRONT FOR DEMOCRACY & HUMAN RIGHTS IN BURMA,

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Senator: The United Front for Democracy and Human Rights in Burma and its affiliated organizations, in the United States, Canada, Europe and Asia want to heartily commend you for the hearing on the Trade and Investment Sanctions bill held on July 24, 1995.

On behalf of these organizations, I was present at the hearing and wish to express my views regarding the various statements made there. While we thank Assistant Secretary Winston Lord and Assistant Secretary Gelbard for the perspectives they gave on the counterterrorism laws and your sanction bill, our organizations disagree with their approach. We heartily endorse the views expressed in the opening statement made by you and the statements made by Khin Chinar and the representatives of Human Rights Watch and the AFL-CIO as well as the statement submitted by Prime Minister Dr. Selim Win of the NCUU.

Our organizations, after very careful consideration of the present situation and after hearing the various views at the hearing as well as those of individuals and organizations closely observing the developments in Burma, feel very strongly that the only language the SLORC, one of the most repressive and repressive regimes in the world, would understand is the comprehensive trade and sanctions legislation against Burma that you propose to introduce. We also believe that this is the right time for the introduction of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi herself has acknowledged publicly as quoted by you. "We are nowhere near democracy, I have been released, that is all. The situation has not changed in any other way." Most prudent Burmese observers including Ambassador Lord are of the opinion that the reason for Suu Kyi’s release was not out of good intention or desire to change to democracy and national reconciliation in Burma, but due to international pressure including your proposed bill as well as the forthcoming ASEAN meeting in Brunei...

Enclosed herewith also is the statement made by the United Front on the release of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi.

Yours sincerely,

U BA THAW,
Chairman.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. BRYAN).

S. 903. A bill to prohibit the applicability of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993, or any amendment made by such act, to an individual who is incarcerated in a Federal, State, or local correctional, detention, or penal facility, and for other purposes. To the Senate of the United States:


Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk in behalf of Senators REID and BRYAN.

Mr. President, the bill that I just introduced is a prison reform bill that is designed to close a gaping hole in the current law that allows prison inmates to file frivolous lawsuits at will.

This legislation is necessary, and it is overdue. It addresses and remedies a specific ailment plaguing an otherwise solid piece of legislation that passed this body in the last Congress, I am referring to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. More specifically, I am referring to the application of this law as it relates to prison inmates.

When the Senate passed RFRA, it sought to provide the legal protections to prisoners exercising religious freedom that the Constitution requires, and it did so by requiring that any amendment to the law be narrowly tailored. And when RFRA was signed into law by President Clinton, a provision was included that stated that the amendment did not apply to prison inmates. The concern I have with this provision is that it did not reflect the letter or the spirit of RFRA.

As the saying goes, Mr. President, you reap what you sow. And because the sponsors of this legislation sought to extend this coverage to prison inmates, our courts are now being flooded with the late lawsuits alleging discrimination under this act. And the lawsuits are filed often for the most spurious of reasons. I said then, and I say now, that prison inmates with that utter frivolity, all those rights and privileges would be a recipe for disaster, and I was right. (Mr. CRAFAR assumed the chair.)

Mr. REID. Mr. President, word of these new legal rights has spread like wildfire. They are in Idaho. We have a letter that we will talk about from one of the taxpayers’ attorneys general of Idaho.

These taxpayer-supported lawsuits are spreading like wildfire. The research for these filings is being conducted in taxpayer-supported law libraries. The research for these filings is being conducted in taxpayer-supported law libraries.

I do not know where to start talking specifically. I only brought over a few of the lawsuits.

In this hand I have the some of the Nevada lawsuits; only some of them. Because you see prison litigation in Nevada takes up 40 percent of the courts time. Out of the litigation in our Federal courts in Nevada are a result of prisoner lawsuits. I am that this is all you have. Have we become so concerned with prisoner rights that we have forgotten the rights of society members. These people are in jail because they have been convicted of felonies. They are not there anyone, we talk about and should I talk specific. I do not know where to start talking specifically. I only brought over a few of the lawsuits.

In the State of Connecticut they have allowed Catholics and Protestants to have religious services, and Moslems. We have an inmate there who was not satisfied with that. What this inmate wanted is a certain very refined, defined sect of the Moslem religion because he refuses to go to a service for all Moslems. He wants his own. We have one who changes his name. This man is in Florida. He keeps changing his name, and he sees the prison because they do not give him their mail in his right name.

We have, out of Florida, another case. There, an inmate alleges his rights were denied when he was not allowed to see Moslem visitors at a time that he wanted them. Not when everybody else visits those that are confined. He wanted a time convenient to him. So he filed a lawsuit.
One wanted to perform the rite of washing—a religious ceremony.

Another inmate filed a lawsuit because he has alleged that the inmate bakers are unskilled and are forced to perform the haircuts under too much pressure from the clock. This is a lawsuit filed by a man who was trapped in a man’s body, and thus strip searches by male prison officials are not allowed by his religion.

We have another case out of Nebraska. This man has filed a lawsuit because he is a member of the Assaizu religion, which is an Islamic word, which is a term for an ancient religion of the Teutonic people of northern Europe. And the prison authorities had a little trouble finding the paraphernalia this gentleman wanted.

We have another case out of Nebraska, where an inmate there thinks he is a man trapped in a man’s body, and thus strip searches by male prison officials are not allowed by his religion.

Again, Mr. President, I kind of wish I was making this up. I mean, you can imagine these are real lawsuits that our Attorneys General and others are defending on a daily basis, dealing with tremendous amounts of time when they should be involved in other important matters.

We have cases after cases of this nonsense. I said it would happen and I intend to continue to fight to end this problem.

I am going to push this, Mr. President. We can wait for hearings in the Judiciary Committee. We can do all kinds of things. But before this year is out, I am going to be offering the amendment to a piece of legislation moving through here. We cannot allow this kind of stuff to go on.

We have a letter here—I said on the floor, this is going to happen—from the Attorney General of the United States saying, no, it will not.

Like an alcoholic locked inside a liquor store, these inmates cannot get enough.

The consequences of these new prisoner rights are many, and an overburdened judiciary is forced to allocate its scarce resources to considering and processing these frivolous lawsuits. Our Nation’s attorneys general are being forced to defend inmate lawsuits rather than prosecute criminals. And as usual, who is picking up the tab? The taxpayers are paying for the lobbies that are better than I had when I practiced law. Why not? They get anything they want. All they have to do is ask for it.

The American taxpayer, to the delight of these inmates, is left holding the tab on all of these legal expenses. And the time and cost is only going to continue to escalate unless we exempt inmates from the coverage of RFRA.

At some point we are going to have to answer the question of whether crimes are being left unprosecuted because the States’ defense of prisoner lawsuits is their first thing to do. I repeat, have we become more concerned about the rights of the criminals than we have the rights of society? I asked the attorney general of Nevada, Frankie Sue Del Papa, to keep me apprised of these RFRA-related lawsuits they are defending. That was quite a task. Just to send me copies of the garbage that is being filed has taken a significant amount of time of her staff.

I have told you about some of the cases around the country. Those in Nevada are different. They are just as ridiculous. A lawsuit filed because religious rights have been denied—because they were not able to check to see if there was pig fat, hog fat in the Legionnaires’ Club. They wanted scientific tests run on this to find out if there were pork products in the toothpaste.

They wanted meat inspections to find out if the meat was properly cared for before it was given to the prisoners. This, of course, on a religious basis. They defecated a necklace that was bulky and too large. I thought it could cause problems to the rest of the prison populace. Not according to this man’s religion. According to his diet, the jewelry would become defiled if another person touched it.

We have another man who is suing a prison chaplain for refusing to conduct a marriage ceremony between him and his male friend because they belong to Universal Life Church, and this church allows people of the same sex to marry. They cannot get insane; they cannot get jewelry for their religious ceremonies; they cannot get the right type of altar; they cannot get the right type of nutritious vegetarian diet.

Skinheads are suing for the right to receive, because of their religion, hateful, bigoted, anti-Semitic, racist literature from all over the country.

I have a letter from the deputy attorney general from the State of Idaho. She says, besides the cases enclosed—paraphrasing—even though we do not have a lot of cases, the flood is beginning. I emphasize “you.” Because I know the Department of Corrections has every reason to believe it is only a matter of time.

This woman goes on in her letter to explain the trouble they have gone to in Idaho. They have sweat lobbies in their prisons, trying to make the Indian religions happy. They have problems with the Anyan Nation, motorcycle gangs, trying to comply with their wishes of what they need in prison. I do not understand why we have to bend over backward to protect the rights of people who are locked up in prison.

Remember, 1 percent of the criminals commit over 75 percent of the violent crime in this country. So our job is to get rid of the 1 percent. But what are we doing? We are trying to determine if the right pork products are in toothpaste. I believe that these criminals who are convicted felons have forfeited all of their rights by committing these acts against society. Rather than providing them taxpayer-funded law libraries, and better gyms, which most people in America do not have the opportunity to see, let alone join, and they file these lawsuits creating more work, rather than spending the money on defending these frivolous lawsuits, I would prefer hiring more personnel so they could watch them in chains.

I think with some of what we have gone back and looking at chain gangs and having these people do work instead of spending more time prosecuting criminals, not defending frivolous lawsuits brought by them. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1099

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That:

SECTION 1. APPLICATION TO INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS. The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 2000bb et seq.) is amended by:
(1) by moving section 5 to the end of the Act, and
(2) by redesignating section 5 as section 8.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION TO INCARCERATED INDIVIDUALS. "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be continued to affect, interpret, or to any way address that portion of the First Amendment regarding laws prohibiting the free exercise of religion."