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(E) has as its sole purpose the acquisition and operation of an integrated communications satellite system and other telecommunications facilities dedicated to instructional, educational, and training programming.

(2) INTERIM ACQUISITION OF TRANSponder CAPACITY.—As an interim measure to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may acquire unused transponder capacity owned or leased by a department or agency of the Federal Government or unused satellite transponder capacity owned or leased by a non-Federal broadcast organization for reuse by schools, colleges, community colleges, universities, secondary schools, colleges, and community colleges, universities, State agencies, libraries, and other nonprofit organizations.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year to carry out this section.

(g) LIQUIDATION OR ASSIGNMENT.—(1) IN GENERAL.—In order for a lender to receive a loan guarantee under this section the lender shall agree to assign to the United States, upon payment of interest and principal, the communications satellite system or communications satellite system services that such lender possesses upon payment by the Secretary of Commerce of the proceeds of such loan guarantee.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As an interim measure to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may acquire unused transponder capacity owned or leased by a department or agency of the Federal Government or unused satellite transponder capacity owned or leased by a non-Federal broadcast organization for reuse by schools, colleges, community colleges, universities, State agencies, libraries, and other nonprofit organizations.

(b) INELIGIBLE LOANS.—The Secretary of Commerce may guarantee a loan under this section only to a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) that shall determine the technical and training needs of the school, college, community college, university, State agency, library, or other nonprofit organization for which the loan is to be made and training programming.

(c) LIQUIDATION OR ASSIGNMENT.—In order for a lender to receive a loan guarantee under this section the lender shall agree to assign to the United States, upon payment of principal, the communications satellite system or communications satellite system services that such lender possesses upon payment by the Secretary of Commerce of the proceeds of such loan guarantee.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As an interim measure to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may acquire unused transponder capacity owned or leased by a department or agency of the Federal Government or unused satellite transponder capacity owned or leased by a non-Federal broadcast organization for reuse by schools, colleges, community colleges, universities, State agencies, libraries, and other nonprofit organizations.

(b) INELIGIBLE LOANS.—The Secretary of Commerce may guarantee a loan under this section only to a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) that shall determine the technical and training needs of the school, college, community college, university, State agency, library, or other nonprofit organization for which the loan is to be made and training programming.

(c) LIQUIDATION OR ASSIGNMENT.—In order for a lender to receive a loan guarantee under this section the lender shall agree to assign to the United States, upon payment of principal, the communications satellite system or communications satellite system services that such lender possesses upon payment by the Secretary of Commerce of the proceeds of such loan guarantee.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As an interim measure to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may acquire unused transponder capacity owned or leased by a department or agency of the Federal Government or unused satellite transponder capacity owned or leased by a non-Federal broadcast organization for reuse by schools, colleges, community colleges, universities, State agencies, libraries, and other nonprofit organizations.

(b) INELIGIBLE LOANS.—The Secretary of Commerce may guarantee a loan under this section only to a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) that shall determine the technical and training needs of the school, college, community college, university, State agency, library, or other nonprofit organization for which the loan is to be made and training programming.

(c) LIQUIDATION OR ASSIGNMENT.—In order for a lender to receive a loan guarantee under this section the lender shall agree to assign to the United States, upon payment of principal, the communications satellite system or communications satellite system services that such lender possesses upon payment by the Secretary of Commerce of the proceeds of such loan guarantee.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As an interim measure to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may acquire unused transponder capacity owned or leased by a department or agency of the Federal Government or unused satellite transponder capacity owned or leased by a non-Federal broadcast organization for reuse by schools, colleges, community colleges, universities, State agencies, libraries, and other nonprofit organizations.

(b) INELIGIBLE LOANS.—The Secretary of Commerce may guarantee a loan under this section only to a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) that shall determine the technical and training needs of the school, college, community college, university, State agency, library, or other nonprofit organization for which the loan is to be made and training programming.

(c) LIQUIDATION OR ASSIGNMENT.—In order for a lender to receive a loan guarantee under this section the lender shall agree to assign to the United States, upon payment of principal, the communications satellite system or communications satellite system services that such lender possesses upon payment by the Secretary of Commerce of the proceeds of such loan guarantee.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As an interim measure to meet the requirements of paragraph (1), a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) may acquire unused transponder capacity owned or leased by a department or agency of the Federal Government or unused satellite transponder capacity owned or leased by a non-Federal broadcast organization for reuse by schools, colleges, community colleges, universities, State agencies, libraries, and other nonprofit organizations.

(b) INELIGIBLE LOANS.—The Secretary of Commerce may guarantee a loan under this section only to a corporation that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) that shall determine the technical and training needs of the school, college, community college, university, State agency, library, or other nonprofit organization for which the loan is to be made and training programming.

(c) LIQUIDATION OR ASSIGNMENT.—In order for a lender to receive a loan guarantee under this section the lender shall agree to assign to the United States, upon payment of principal, the communications satellite system or communications satellite system services that such lender possesses upon payment by the Secretary of Commerce of the proceeds of such loan guarantee.
eventually—they will be less inclined to file a lawsuit in the first place.

JUDICIAL SCREENING

Another provision of the Prison Litigation Reform Act would require judicial screening before docketing, of any civil complaint filed by a prisoner seeking relief from the Government. This provision would allow a Federal judge to immediately dismiss a complaint if either of two conditions is met: First, the complaint does not state a claim upon which relief may be granted, or second, the defendant is immune from suit.

OTHER REFORMS

The Prison Litigation Reform Act would also allow Federal courts to revoke any good-time credits accumulated by a prisoner who files a frivolous suit. It requires State prisoners to exhaust all administrative remedies before filing a lawsuit in Federal court. And it provides a defense for prisoners from suing the Government for mental or emotional injury, absent a prior showing of physical injury.

If enacted, all of these provisions would help keep the frivolity out of frivolous litigation.

STOP TURNING OUT PRISONERS

The second major section of the Prison Litigation Reform Act establishes some tough new guidelines for Federal courts when evaluating legal challenges to prison conditions. These guidelines will work to restrain liberal Federal judges who see violations on constitutional rights in every prisoner complaint and who have used these complaints to micromanage State and local prison systems.

Perhaps the most pernicious form of judicial micromanagement is the so-called prisoner release order. In 1993, for example, the State of Florida put 20,000 prisoners on early release because of a prison cap order issued by a Federal judge who thought the Florida prison system was overcrowded and thereby inflicted cruel and unusual punishment on the State’s prisoners.

And then, there’s the case of Philadelphia, where a court-ordered prison cap has put thousands of violent criminals back on the city’s streets, often with disastrous consequences. As Pro. John Dilulio has pointed out: “Federal Judges Norms. Shapiro has allowed handily decriminalized property and drug crimes in the City of Brotherly Love * * * Judge Shapiro has done what the city’s organized crime bosses never could; namely, turn the town into a major drug smuggling port.”

By establishing tough new conditions that a Federal court must meet before issuing a prison cap order, this bill will help slam-shut the revolving prison door.

CONCLUSION

Finally, Mr. President, I want to express my special thanks to Arizona Attorney General Grant Woods and to the National Association of Attorneys General. Their input over these past several months has been invaluable as we have attempted to draft a better, more effective piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, as well as a letter from the National Association of Attorneys General and a section-by-section summary, be reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1279

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996." 

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATE REMEDIES FOR PRISON CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3626 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

§ 3626. Appropriate remedies with respect to prison conditions.

(A) REQUIREMENTS FOR RELIEF.—

(i) Relief in any civil action with respect to prison conditions shall be granted only if the relief sought to be remedied through the prisoner release order should be entered.

(ii) the defendant has had a reasonable amount of time to comply with the previous court orders.

(B) In any civil action with respect to prison conditions, the court shall grant preliminary injunctive relief to correct the violation of a federal right, and the least intrusive means necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right. The court shall have the right to intervene in any proceeding relating to such relief.

(C) A party seeking a prisoner release order in Federal court shall file with any request for such relief, a request for a three-judge court and materials sufficient to demonstrate that the requirements of subparagraph (A) have been met.

(D) If the requirements under subparagraph (A) are met, the court shall grant preliminary injunctive relief to correct the violation of the Federal right.

(E) If the court grants the prisoner release order under paragraph (2), to the extent that modification or termination would otherwise be legally permissible.
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(c) SETTLEMENTS.—

(1) CONSENT DEGREES.—In any civil action with respect to prison conditions, the court shall grant one or more consent degrees unless it complies with the limitations on relief set forth in subsection (a).

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1997b) is amended—

(1) by striking "he" each place it appears and inserting "the Attorney General"; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

The Attorney General shall personally sign any certification made pursuant to this section.

(c) INTERVENTION IN ACTIONS.—Section 5 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 1997c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "he" each place it appears and inserting "the Attorney General";

(2) by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

The Attorney General shall personally sign any certification made pursuant to this section.

Sec. 7. SUITS BY PRISONERS. —

(a) APPLICABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES.—No action shall be brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), or any other law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility until such administrative remedies as are available are exhausted.

(b) FAILURE OF STATE TO ADOPT OR ADHERE TO ADMINISTRATIVE GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE.—The failure of a State to adopt or adhere to an administrative grievance procedure shall not constitute the basis for an action under section 3 or 5 of this Act.

(c) DISMISSAL.—(1) The court shall on its own motion or on the motion of a party dismiss any action brought with respect to prison conditions under section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), or any other law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility if the action fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted or is frivolous or malicious.

(2) In the event that a claim is, on its face, frivolous or malicious, the court may dismiss the underlying claim without first requiring the exhaustion of administrative remedies.

(d) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—(1) In any action brought by a prisoner who is confined to any jail, prison, or other correctional facility, in which attorney's fees are authorized under section 2 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1988), such fees shall not be awarded, except to the extent that—

(A) the fee was directly and reasonably incurred in procurement of the plaintiff's rights protected by a statute pursuant to which a fee may be awarded under section 2 of the Revised Statutes; and

(B) the amount of the fee is proportionately related to the court ordered relief for the violation.

In addition to a monetary judgment, a Court may order such other relief as is appropriate to provide full relief to the complainant.

EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.
n an hourly rate greater than the hourly rate established under section 3006A of title 18, United States Code, for payment of court-appointed counsel.

"(4) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit a prisoner from entering into an agreement to pay an attorney's fee in an amount greater than the amount authorized under this subsection, if the fee is paid by the individual rather than by the defendant pursuant to section 2 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (6 U.S.C. 186).

"(e) LIMITATION ON RECOVERY.—No Federal civil action may be brought by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility, pretrial detention facility, or other institutional facility, for mental or emotional injury suffered while in custody without a prior showing of physical injury.

"(7) HEARING LOCATION.—To the extent practicable, in any action brought with respect to prison conditions in Federal court pursuant to section 1979 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (42 U.S.C. 1983), or any other law, by a prisoner confined in any jail, prison, or other correctional facility, pretrial detention facility, or other institutional facility, for mental or emotional injury suffered while in custody without a prior showing of physical injury, the magistrate judge of the district court of the district in which the prisoner is confined shall conduct a hearing on the complaint.

"(8) DETERMINATION.—If the court determines, on the basis of the evidence produced at the hearing, that any part of the complaint is frivolous, the court shall dismiss the complaint, or any portion of the complaint, if the complaint—

"(A) requires the payment of costs by persons representing the prisoner to be incurred before the prisoner brings a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under this section if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, brought an action or appeal in state or Federal court that was dismissed on the ground that it was frivolous, malicious, or failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious bodily harm.

"(B) DETERMINATION.—Section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(c) In no event shall the costs ordered exceed the amount of the costs ordered by the court.

"(d) COMPLAINT.—Section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item "prisoner" means any person incarcerated or detained in any facility who is accused of, convicted of, sentenced for, or adjudicated delinquent for, violations of criminal law or the terms and conditions of parole, probation, pretrial release, or diversionary program.

"SEC. 4. JUDICIAL SCREENING.—

"(a) In general.—Chapter 123 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1915 the following new item:

"(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 123 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1915 the following new item:

"(c) EARNED RELEASE CREDIT OR GOOD TIME CREDIT LOCALIZATION.—

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 123 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item following new subsection (a) of section 3624(b) of title 18, United States Code, the following:

"(A) "In any civil action brought by an adult convicted of a crime and confined in a Federal correctional facility, the court may order the revocation of such earned good time credit under section 3624(b) of title 18,
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Section 4: Proceedings In Forma Pauperis: This section reforms the filing of suits in forma pauperis by prisoners.

- Requires an inmate seeking to file in forma pauperis to submit to the court a certified copy of the inmate's prison trust fund account statement.

- Requires prisoners seeking to file in forma pauperis to pay, in installments, the full amount of the filing fee, unless the prisoner has absolutely no assets.

For provided appointed counsel for indigent in forma pauperis litigants, and requires the court to dismiss a suit filed in forma pauperis if the allegation of poverty is untrue, or if the suit is frivolous or malicious.

Section 5: Judicial Screening:

- Requires judicial pre-screening of prisoner suits against government entities or employees.

- Requires the dismissal to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or which seek monetary damages from an immune defendant.

Section 6: Federal Tort Claims:

- Limits prisoner suits against the federal government for mental or emotional injury under the Federal Tort Claims Act to instances where the plaintiff shows physical injury as well.

Section 7: Earned Release Credit or Good Time Credit Revocation:

- Repeals provisions governing the award of “good time” credit in the federal prison system.

- Permits a federal court to order the revocation of a federal prisoner’s good time credit as a sanction for the filing of malicious or harassing claims, or for the knowing presentation of false evidence to the court.

Section 8: Attorney Fees:

- Provides that future awards of good time credit will not vest prior to the prisoner’s actual release date. Returns to the standard that applied prior to the enactment of the Sentence Reform Act of 1986.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF ATTORNEYS GENERAL,


Hon. Bob Dole,

Senate Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: We write on behalf of the Inmate Litigation Task Force of the National Association of Attorneys General to express our strong support for the Prison Litigation Reform Act, which we understand you intend to offer as an amendment to the Omnibus Bill. We urge you to support these reforms to address the problem of frivolous inmate litigation and to promote the interests of inmates, taxpayers, and states.

DEAR SENATOR DOLE: We write on behalf of the Inmate Litigation Task Force of the National Association of Attorneys General to express our strong support for the Prison Litigation Reform Act, which we understand you intend to offer as an amendment to the Omnibus Bill. We urge you to support these reforms to address the problem of frivolous inmate litigation and to promote the interests of inmates, taxpayers, and states.
The legislation to address this issue, the States alone cannot solve this problem because the vast majority of these suits are brought in federal courts under federal laws. We thank you for recognizing the importance of federal legislation to curb the epidemic of frivolous inmate litigation that is plaguing this country.

Although numbers are not available for all of the states, 33 states have estimated that together inmate civil rights suits cost them at least $54.5 million annually. Extrapolating this figure to all 50 states, we estimate that inmate civil rights suits cost states at least $81.3 million per year. Experience at both the federal and state level suggests that, while all of these cases are not frivolous, more than 95 percent of inmate civil rights suits are dismissed without the inmate receiving anything. Although occasional meritorious claims absorb state resources, nonetheless, we believe the vast majority of the $81.3 million figure is attributable to the non-meritorious cases.

We have not had an opportunity to discuss the specifics of the amendment with every Attorney General, however, we are confident that they would endorse it. We view this amendment will take us a long way toward curing the vexing and expensive problem of frivolous inmate suits. Thank you again for championing this important issue, along with Senators Hatch, Kyl, Reid and others, as it is a priority for us all, and for every Attorney General. Your leadership on this issue and your continued commitment to this common sense legal reform is very important to us and our colleagues.

Sincerely,

FRANKIE SUE DEL PAPA
Attorney General of Nevada, Chair, NAAG Inmate Litigation Task Force.

DAVID E. LINGREY
Attorney General of California, Chair, NAA Criminal Law Committee.

GRANT WOODS
Attorney General of Arizona, Vice-Chair, NAAG Inmate Litigation Task Force.

JEREMIAH J. LATS
Attorney General of Missouri, Vice-Chair, NAAG Crime Victims Committee.

Mr. HATCH, Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by the majority leader and Senators Kyl, Abraham, Reid, Thurmond, Specter, Hutchinson, Gramm, and Symington in introducing the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1995. This landmark legislation will help bring relief to a civil justice system overburdened by frivolous prisoner lawsuits. Jailhouse lawyers with little else to do are tying our courts in knots with an endless flood of frivolous litigation.

Our legislation will also help restore balance to prison conditions litigation and will ensure that Federal court orders are limited to remedying actual violations of prisoners' rights, not letting prisoners out of jail. It is past time to slam shut the revolving door on the prison system, which has been a vital safety net that is incapable of dealing with the key safely out of reach of overzealous Federal courts.

As of January 1994, 24 corrections agencies reported having court-managed population caps. Nearly every day we hear of vicious crimes committed by individuals who should have been locked up. Not only are the tragedies are the result of court-ordered population caps, of course, but such caps are a part of the problem. While prison conditions that actually violate the Constitution should not be allowed to persist, I believe that the courts have gone too far in micromanaging our Nation's prisons.

Our legislation also addresses the flood of frivolous suits brought by inmates. In 1994, over 38,000 lawsuits were filed by inmates in Federal courts, a staggering 15 percent increase over the number filed the previous year. The vast majority of these suits are completely without merit. Indeed, roughly 94.7 percent are dismissed before the pretrial phase, and only a scant 3.1 percent have enough validity to reach trial. In my State of Utah, 297 Federal civil cases were filed in Federal courts during 1994, which accounted for 22 percent of all Federal civil cases filed in Utah last year. I should emphasize that these numbers do not include hundreds of other cases concerning challenging the inmate's conviction or sentence. The crushing burden of these frivolous suits makes it difficult for courts to prioritize real claims.

In one frivolous case in Utah, an inmate sued demanding that he be issued Reebok or L.A. Gear brand shoes instead of the Converse he was issued. In another case, an inmate deliber­ately flooded his cell, and then sued the officers who cleaned up the mess because they got his Pinochie cards wet.

It is time to stop this ridiculous waste of the taxpayers' money. The huge costs imposed on State governments to defend against these meritless suits is another kind of crime committed against law-abiding citizens.

Mr. President, this legislation enjoys broad, bipartisan support from State Attorneys General across the Nation. We believe with them that it is time to wrest control of our prisons from the lawyers and the inmates and return control to competent administra­tors appointed to look out for our society's interests as well as the legitimate needs of prisoners. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and look forward to securing its quick passage by the Senate.

Mr. KYL, Mr. President, special masters, who are supposed to assist judges as factfinders in complex litigation, have all too often been improperly used in prison condition cases. In Arizona, special masters have micromanaged the department of corrections, and have performed all manner of services in behalf of convicted felons, from maintaining lairish law books to dis­tributing Christ­mas packages each year. Special masters appointed to oversee prison litigation have cost Arizona taxpayers more than $320,000 since 1992. One special master was even allowed to hire a chauffeur, at taxpayers' expense, because he said he had a bad back.

The Prison Litigation Reform Act, introduced as an amendment to the Commerce/Justice/State appropriations bill, requires the Federal judiciary, not the States, to foot the bill for special masters in prison litigation cases. Last July the Arizona legislature and Governor Symington cut off funds to special masters. It's time we take the Arizona model to the rest of the States.

The amendment also addresses prison litigation reform. Many people think of prison inmates as spending their free time in the weight room or the television lounge. But the most crowded place in today's prisons may be the law library. Federal prison lawsuits have risen from 2,000 in 1970 to 39,000 in 1994.

In the words of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, suing has become, recreational activity for long-term resi­dents, who have performed all manner of services can no longer ignore this litigation issue. The amendment also addresses prison litigation reform. Many people think of prison inmates as spending their free time in the weight room or the television lounge. But the most crowded place in today's prisons may be the law library. Federal prison lawsuits have risen from 2,000 in 1970 to 39,000 in 1994.

In Arizona, Attorney General Grant Woods, who is here with us today, used to spend well over $1 million a year processing and defending against frivolous inmate lawsuits in response to prisoners to me with impunity. After July the Arizona legislature and Governor Symington cut off funds to special masters. It's time we take the Arizona model to the rest of the States.

These prisoners are victimizing society twice—the first time by committing the crime that put them in prison, and second when they waste our hard-earned tax dollars while cases based on serious grievances languish on the court calendar.

In Arizona, Attorney General Grant Woods, who is here with us today, used to spend well over $1 million a year processing and defending against frivolous inmate lawsuits. The amendment also addresses prison litigation reform. Many people think of prison inmates as spending their free time in the weight room or the television lounge. But the most crowded place in today's prisons may be the law library. Federal prison lawsuits have risen from 2,000 in 1970 to 39,000 in 1994.

In the words of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, suing has become, recreational activity for long-term resi­dents, who have performed all manner of services can no longer ignore this litigation issue. The amendment also addresses prison litigation reform. Many people think of prison inmates as spending their free time in the weight room or the television lounge. But the most crowded place in today's prisons may be the law library. Federal prison lawsuits have risen from 2,000 in 1970 to 39,000 in 1994.

In Arizona, Attorney General Grant Woods, who is here with us today, used to spend well over $1 million a year processing and defending against frivolous inmate lawsuits. The amendment also addresses prison litigation reform. Many people think of prison inmates as spending their free time in the weight room or the television lounge. But the most crowded place in today's prisons may be the law library. Federal prison lawsuits have risen from 2,000 in 1970 to 39,000 in 1994.
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will play a critical role in restoring public confidence in government's ability to protect the public safety. Over and over, it will accomplish this important purpose not by spending more taxpayer money but by saving it.

I would like to focus my remarks on the provisions addressing the proper scope of court-ordered remedies in prison conditions cases.

In many jurisdictions, including my own State of Michigan, judicial orders entered under Federal law have effectively turned control of the prison system away from elected officials accountable to the taxpayer, and over to the courts. The courts, in turn, raise the costs of running prisons far beyond what is necessary. In the process, they also undermine the legitimacy and punitive and deterrent effect of prison sentences.

Let me tell you a little bit about how this works.

Under a series of judicial decrees resulting from Justice Department suits against the Michigan Department of Corrections, the Federal courts now monitor our State prisons to determine

First, how warm the food is; second, how bright the lights are; third, whether the public safety is assured; fourth, whether windows are comfortable; and fifth, whether prisoners' hair is cut only by licensed barbers; and sixth, whether air and water and the like are free from contamination.

This would be bad enough if a court had ever found that Michigan's prison system was at some point in violation of the Constitution, or if conditions there had been inhumane. But that is not the case.

To the contrary, nearly all of Michigan's facilities are fully accredited by the American Corrections Association. We have what may be the most extensive training program in the Nation for corrections officers. Our rate of prison violence is among the lowest of any State. And we spend an average of $4,000 a year per prisoner for health care, including nearly $1,700 for mental health services.

Rather, the judicial intervention is the result of a consent decree that Michigan entered into in 1982--13 years ago—that was supposed to end a lawsuit filed at the same time. Instead, the decree has been a source of continuous litigation and intervention by the courts into the minutia of prison operations.

I think this is all wrong. People deserve to keep their tax dollars or have them spent on projects they approve. They deserve better than to have their money spent, on keeping prisoners in conditions some Federal judge feels are desirable, although not required by any provision of the Constitution or any law. They certainly don't need it spent on defending against endless prisoner lawsuits.

Meanwhile, criminals, while they must be accorded their constitutional rights, deserve to be punished. Obviously, they should not be tortured or treated cruelly. At the same time, they also should not have all the rights and privileges the rest of us enjoy. Rather, their lives should, on the whole, be describable by the old concept known as "hard time."

By interfering with the fulfillment of this punitive function, the courts are effectively seriously undermining the entire criminal justice system. The legislation we are introducing today will return sanity and State control to our prisons.

Our bill forbids courts from entering orders for prospective relief (such as regulating food temperatures) unless the order is necessary to correct violations of individual plaintiffs' Federal rights. It also requires that the relief be narrowly drawn and be the least intrusive means of protecting the Federal rights. And it directs courts to give substantial weight to any adverse impact on public safety or the operation of the criminal justice system caused by the relief.

It also provides that any party can seek to have a court decree ended after 2 years, and that the court will order it ended unless there is still a constitutional violation that needs to be corrected.

As a result, no longer will prison administration be turned over to Federal judges for the indefinite future for the slightest reason. Instead, the States will be able to run prisons as they see fit unless there is a constitutional violation, in which case a narrowly tailored order to correct the violation may be entered.

This is a balanced bill that allows the courts to step in where they are needed, but puts an end to unnecessary judicial intervention and micromanagement. I thank all my colleagues for their interest in this matter and hope we will be able to get something enacted soon.

ADDITIONAL COPONSORS

S. 773

At the request of Mrs. Kassebaum, the name of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Stevens] was added as a cosponsor of S. 773, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for ensuring the public health in the processing of investigational drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. Pryor, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Leahy] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Lott] were added as cosponsors of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify provisions relating to church pension plans, to modify certain provisions relating to participants in such plans, to reduce the complexity of and to bring workable consistency to, the applicable rules, to promote retirement savings and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. Chafee, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Dorgan] was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make certain technical corrections relating to physicians' services, and for other purposes.

S. 949

At the request of Mr. Graham, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Dole], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Johnston], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Durbin], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Wellstone] were added as cosponsors of S. 949, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the death of George Washington.

S. 955

At the request of Mr. Chafee, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Conrad] was added as a cosponsor of S. 955, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of black Revolutionary War patriots.

S. 1006

At the request of Mr. Pryor, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Simpson] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1006, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the pension laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1052

At the request of Mr. Hatch, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Gregg] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1052, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions and to provide for carryovers and carrybacks of unused credits.

S. 1099

At the request of Ms. Snowe, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robb] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to establish and implement efforts to eliminate restrictions on the enclaved people of Cyprus.

S. 1219

At the request of Mr. Feingold, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Bingaman] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1219, a bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2784

At the request of Mr. Kerry his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2784 proposed to H.R.