use a minuscule portion of the funding for programs under this chapter to determine whether or not the billions of dollars authorized under this bill, plus the hundreds of billions of dollars the prison grants program will encourage the States to spend, whether or not those expenditures actually reduce crime.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit a similar provision to evaluate programs funded under the Police and Prevention Block Grant when we take up H.R. 728. The amendment will set aside one-tenth of 1 percent for research and evaluation of the effectiveness of expenditures under the bill for crime reduction.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment assures that we will try to add not only truth-in-sentencing, but also truth in legislating, as we approach the attack on crime. We need to know whether or not the expenditures are actually having an effect.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen programs evaluated, like drug courts, that cost about one-twentieth of other initiatives and have an 80 percent reduction in crime.

We have seen studies of Head Start, Job Corps and other primary prevention programs that save more money than they cost and reduce crime.

We have even seen recreational programs studied, and significant reduction of crimes are found.

□ 1800

Mr. Chairman, according to the National Academy of Sciences, in various studies of potential years of life lost, violence prevention gets a small portion of the research. We spend $441 for heart, lung, and blood research for each potential year of life lost, $697 for AIDS research, $794 for each potential year of life lost for cancer, but only $31 for each potential year of life lost in research for violence.

Mr. Chairman, we should invest one-tenth of 1 percent of the funds under this bill to see whether we have wasted our money or whether the money could have been allocated better. Five years from now after we have spent $30 billion, we would then be considering spending another $30 billion or more, it would be nice to know what parts of the $30 billion actually had the effect of reducing crime and what part of the $30 billion had no effect at all.

This minuscule investment can give us the answers, and therefore I hope the House will adopt the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

If I might, Mr. Chairman, I wish to oppose this amendment, and I would like to argue in that behalf very briefly simply to state that what I am concerned about at this point in time is the fact that we already know that 30 percent of those who are convicted of all violent crimes in this country are on probation or parole at the time they are convicted. There is no question that prison time is a great solver in deterring crime. If somebody is in prison they cannot commit crimes, for gosh sakes. We do not need to spend one dime of research to determine that. I cannot imagine the value of it, and I cannot, as much as I respect the gentleman from Virginia, and know he is in good conscience offering this, I cannot for the life of me see why we should do it.

With all due respect, I am going to oppose the amendment. It just does not make any sense to me and I do not think there is much more I need to debate about it. I just do not have any reason to support it and I cannot.

So, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] assumed the Chair.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

VIOLENT CRIMINAL INCARCERATION ACT OF 1995

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia seek recognition?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, if we are not willing to spend one-tenth of 1 percent to find out where $10 billion is going in terms of programs, construction, and effectiveness, I do not know how anybody could support this program without having this one safety corrective.

We just passed slightly earlier an amendment that would allow for evaluating and mandating the efficiency of the construction of prisons, and prison construction. Now we are saying to look at the efficacy of this entire program, the construction and the prisons and the programs contained within this bill is unnecessary because we already know, it is the height of arrogance on our part. If we already knew this we would have built prisons a long time ago. As a matter of fact, the debate is very much in doubt as to how much effectiveness building prisons really is.

So I urge the support of the Scott amendment as being very vital to this bill.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not seek recognition. I have no other speakers that I know of except me as a closing speaker.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I support the Scott amendment. I support the Scott amendment basically because it questions the blind drive without further study toward incarceration over prevention. Why should we not spend a small amount of money to determine the effectiveness of incarceration?

The bill assumes a government block grant, H.R. 728, will pass next week, and so therefore if it passes it will have an opportunity to eliminate many of the programs that will help policing and community prevention.

I support community policing and prevention programs and therefore I certainly intend to vote against that bill. But at least we should, fiscal responsibility would say we should set aside a small amount to determine if we are spending all of this money in the right way and to what extent it is being effective.

Therefore, State and local governments that have been very supportive with community policing and having resources to prevent crime will find they will be far more vulnerable if the block grants pass and assuming they will be most vulnerable, the likely community policing and technology that should there will not be available. This simply gives an opportunity to study the effectiveness of incarceration.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Scott amendment. The amendment requires that point 1 percent of all prison funding be used for studying the effectiveness of prisons as a crime control device. In other words Mr. Speaker, the Scott amendment questions the blind drive toward incarceration over prevention as an approach to law enforcement in America.

This bill assumed that the Local Government Block Grants Act, H.R. 728, will pass next week. That act will eliminate community policing and the crime prevention programs that we passed last year. I support community policing and prevention programs, and I therefore intend to vote against this bill.

When we passed the crime bill last year, we were comforted by the prospect of putting another 100,000 police on the streets. Those police were expected to help stem the rising tide of crime and to make our streets safe again. State and local governments have responded enthusiastically to community policing.

More than 8,000 applications have been made for grants to put more police on the streets. Last year's crime bill made sure that

the resources would be used for more police and police related activities, such as new technology and overtime pay. The language of H.R. 728, which allows for block grants, would broaden the use of the funds. That broader use will effectively dilute resources for community policing and would allow funds to be used for such things as street lights and disaster preparation. Those are important uses, but those uses are not as important as more police.

There is absolutely no requirement in this bill or in H.R. 728 that the funds authorized must be used for police. Last year's bill gave sufficient flexibility to the State and local governments while ensuring that the police would be hired to patrol our streets. This bill and H.R. 728 provide no such guarantees. In addition, any block grant funds that might be used for police under this year's bills, may well be threatened by the budget axe under the mandate of a balanced budget constitutional amendment. Block grant funds are far more vulnerable to such a result.

We may not have any new police on the streets, if these bills pass. More importantly, under block grant funding, the critical prevention programs we passed last year are at risk.

Over the next 5 years, under last year's bill, my State of North Carolina would receive millions of dollars in funds to help prevent violence against women. Twenty-seven million dollars would have gone for police, prosecutors, and victims services. And $9 million would have gone to grants for shelters for battered women and their children. There is doubt that those funds will be available under these bills.

Under last year's bill, North Carolina would have received $6 million to treat some 5,400 drug-addicted prisoners, housed in our prisons. We would have received $21 million, over the next 5 years, for afterschool and in-school safe havens for our children. All of those funds will be in doubt, with passage of these bills. We would have received $39 million in direct grants for a variety of local programs for education and jobs programs. And, we would have been eligible for millions more in discretionary grants, money for boys and girls clubs, and antigang grants. Those funds are now in doubt.

Mr. Chairman, it is by now well established that it is far more costly to incarcerate an individual than it is to train or educate him. Prisons are warehouses and training grounds for further criminal activity. If we are serious about crime prevention, we should put more police on the streets and provide resources for programs that discourage crime. The Scott amendment keeps us moving in that direction.

I urge support for the Scott amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding me this time. I rise in support of this amendment.

One of the concerns I had about last year's crime bill and about every crime bill that we have considered since we have been here is that we seem to be in a posture where we are just throwing money out there at crime without any real assessment of whether that money is really having any impact on the crime rate. I do not support throwing money at anything without having some reasonable evaluation of whether it is working, whether it is crime or any other thing. This is the people's money that we are using and it is our responsibility as responsible legislators to use it in a responsible way. And whether it is a prevention program, the building of prisons, the increasing of sentencing, whatever we are doing in the crime context, however frustrated we are in trying to address crime, we still have a responsibility to know that what we are doing is working to actually have some impact.

I do not know how anyone could object to trying to go through some process, setting aside some small amount of funds to make a determination of whether a program or a set of programs or a series of programs is actually having an impact on the crime rate.

For the life of me, I cannot understand why anybody could be in opposition to this amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER], the Show-Me State.

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment, because it is very obvious to me when you read this bill we are not going to build any prisons. And that has happened as a result of the Rogers amendment, we are going to be diverting money that should go to the cops on the beat, on the streets in our local communities and we are going to give it to FBI and DEA and BATF and all of these other agencies, so that they could have money when we cut back on spending in a couple of years.

I never saw such a diversion as I just saw from my office in the Rogers amendment. Anyhow, they admit they are not going to spend the money on prisons. Otherwise, they would not use that amendment.

So I would rather use it for cops on the beat any day, and I think that is right there locally where they need to fight crime, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

□ 1810

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, just in closing, we have heard a lot of rhetoric on the floor about how safe we are going to be if we build these prisons. Let us see it. Let us study one-tenth of 1 percent of the billions of dollars we are going to spend on the bill, hundreds of billions of dollars that we are going to encourage States to spend. Let us see if it made any difference.

I can understand how people would not want to study it so that they can hide behind the rhetoric.

If these expenditures, if these tens of billions of dollars we are going to spend are doing any good, let us see it. Let us spend one-tenth of 1 percent to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I assure you, I will not consume much.

I just want to reiterate the opposition that we on our side have to this amendment. It is not that the gentleman wants to do anything all that egregious. It is the expenditure of money on proving something that I think is self-evident, already known to us, and that is, by golly, with the high rate of recidivism we have got out there, if you keep people in prison longer, you are going to have a better crime statistic. You are going to have fewer crimes committed. We are having this revolving door and the repeat of violent offenders going through this process, and that is the reason why we are here having the money and trying to build the prisons we have to build to keep them off the streets and lock them up.

There may be some merit to the fact that there are some root causes of crime out there, some need-to-address poverty or causes that are perhaps in the communities around the country, but that is not something we can address tonight. That is not something that is our province to do in this crime legislation.

What we are about tonight is to try to produce a bill that provides enough resources to the States through grant programs so they can build sufficient prison beds to take off the streets and incarcerate for at least 85 percent of their sentences, in other words, abolish parole, for those committing serious violent felonies and getting out again and going around the horn and coming back and committing more of them again.

I just think it is self-evident we do not need to spend any of this bill to find out if it is true or it is not true if that would help the problem.

I, again, reiterate my opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATT of North Carolina: Page 3, line 11, strike the word ''assurances'' and insert in lieu thereof the word ''confirmation''

Page 3, line 17, strike the word ''and''

Page 3, line 20, strike the period and add ''; and''

Page 3, after line 20, insert the following:

''(4) decreased the rate of violent offenses committed in the State, taking into account the population of such State, at a level at least equivalent to the lesser of the percentage increase confirmed in sections (1), (2) or (3) above.''

Page 4, line 7, strike the word ''assurances'' and insert in lieu thereof the word ''confirmation''

Page 4, line 21, strike the comma and replace it with a semicolon

Page 4, after line 21, insert the following:

''(C) procedures for the collection of reliable statistical data which confirms the rate of serious violent felonies after the adoption of such truth-in-sentencing laws.''

Page 6, line 7, strike the ''—'' and insert instead ''confirms that''

Page 6, line 8, strike the word ''and''

Page 6, line 12, strike the period and insert instead ''; and (3) the rate of violent felony offenses committed in such State has decreased since such State commenced indeterminant sentencing for such offenses.''

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] seek time in opposition?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Indeed I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is very similar to the Scott amendment which was just considered. However, Mr. Chairman, under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT], he would have allocated a small amount of funds under this bill in a fund at the national level to make an assessment of whether the bill was having any impact on violent crime in this country. This amendment gives that responsibility to the States or the localities which are applying for funds under this bill.

Basically what it says is if you have an 85-percent service requirement, your prisoners have to serve 85 percent of their time, give us what indication you have that that has had some impact on the incidence of violent crime in your State; do not ask us to just throw money out there after this problem. If the purpose of your building new prisons or increasing sentencing or providing for longer sentencing is in fact to reduce crime, tell us that that is what has happened in your State, taking into account the increase in population.

The second part of the bill requires that the States track the incidence of violent crime and keep statistical information so that that information can be available to the residents of that State and to the American people, that we are not wasting $10 billion, $12 billion, $15 billion of their money on something that is really not having any impact on violent crime.

So instead of accepting that responsibility, taking it out of the fund at our level, this imposes on the States, which will be applying for funds under this bill, to have an assessment process and present some indication that this money that we are giving them is having some impact on violent crime.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is totally unacceptable to this side, because, frankly, what it does is it makes it next to impossible, I would suggest impossible, for some States to ever get any money under this bill. It makes the standard and the conditions for getting it increased. If somebody on the other side of the aisle was complaining about never getting any money under the bill as it exists now, you sure as heck would not get it after it is amended by this amendment.

You have got to prove as a State your crime rate will actually drop as a result of getting money under here, and the crime rate will actually have to go down, and you will have to show the Attorney General it is going down as a result of getting money and building more prisons.

The truth of the matter is States like Florida and other growth States may very well have their crime rate go up no matter what they do simply because there is an influx of people, because we do not have barriers from people moving from one State to another, and while per capita or whatever, maybe the crime rate is going down, but if you kept it the same and did not have more criminals moving in, but it presents an impossible situation, a condition that a State has got to show its crime rate in fact is dropping.

It is something the gentleman offered in committee. I opposed it, and we defeated it there. I have to oppose it again here today.

I hope the gentleman does not seek a recorded vote on this if he loses, but if he does, I want to announce to everybody here we will rise at that time. I will move to rise, and we will not have any more recorded votes out here tonight.

If the gentleman's amendment does not have a recorded vote ordered on it, then at that point in time we might proceed to a couple of other amendments that are not likely to have recorded votes, but there will be no more recorded votes here tonight. So no one has to worry about it.

But, again, I want to reiterate my opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Watt amendment, and I find it absurd that accountability or how you plan to address crime is asking any State too much.

It is, indeed, for the very reason we are appropriating these monies that this amendment makes abundantly good sense. It simply says that there should be an assessment by the applicants themselves so as to how they propose, indeed, that crime can go down.

□ 1820

Second, statistical data is always helpful in determining if in fact you have been effective. So, to suggest that a State could not be accountable when they make an application seems absurd. It flies in the face of reality and certainly flies in the face of logic of this Member.

I would assume that this is simply to suggest that States who have a commitment to address the issue of crime are willing to say how they propose to do it in their assessment. These are the methods and this is the strategy.

Further, they would be required to give statistical data showing that they indeed shall be successful in using that money. Accountability is what is at the back of this issue, simply saying we are not throwing money and we are also asking them to be responsible, and I think most States would be responsible.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have no more speakers at this time, and I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to say that I understand the resolution of this may have been worked out. I yield 1 minute to the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time, and I compliment the gentleman for his amendment because it has led to the possible resolution of the objective sought by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] and the gentleman from California.

If we do have an agreement on a subsequent amendment known as the Zimmer-Scott amendment, I would implore my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] to withdraw this amendment and we would move forward.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we do have an agreement about both the Scott proposal and the Zimmer proposal. It just has been pointed out to me, since we have discussed this, I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] that the Scott amendment should stand on its own as a separate amendment. We have no objection to it. We would suggest both be offered, both Zimmer and Scott, and we will accept both of them.

Mr. CONYERS. We will do this.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ZIMMER

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIMMER: Add at the end the following new title:

TITLE—PRISON CONDITIONS

SEC. . PRISON CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall by rule establish standards regarding conditions in the Federal prison system that provide prisoners the least amount of amenities and personal comforts consistent with Constitutional requirements and good order and discipline in the Federal Prison system.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to establish or recognize any minimum rights or standards for prisoners.

SEC. . ANNUAL REPORT.

The director of the Bureau of Prisons shall submit to Congress on or before December 31 of each year, beginning on December 31, 1995 a report setting forth the amount spent at each Federal correctional facility under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Prisons for each of the following items:

(1) The minimal Requirements necessary to maintain Custody and security of prisoners.

(2) Basic nutritional needs.

(3) Essential medical services.

(4) Amenities and programs beyond the scope of the items referred to in paragraphs (1) through (3), including but not limited to—

(A) recreational programs and facilities;

(B) vocational and education programs; and

(C) counseling services, together with the rationale for spending on each category and empirical data, if any, supporting such rationale.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, the gentleman from New Jersey will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Michigan seek to claim the time on this amendment?

Mr. CONYERS. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, prison perks are bad public policy, and they are an abuse of taxpayer money.

My amendment is aimned at eliminating them from Federal prisons. In some prisons, inmate amenities are better than what law-abiding Americans on the outside get, and all this is at taxpayer expense.

At the Lompoc, CA, Federal penitentiary, they offer all-channel cable TV, movies 7 days a week, pool tables, handball, tennis, and miniature golf. The Duluth, MN, Federal prison is called Club Fed. It provides a movie theater, musical instruments, softball field, gamerooms.

The Manchester, KY, Federal prison, in which some former State legislators reside, has a jogging track, several basketball courts, and multiple TV rooms.

Mr. Chairman, prisons should be places of detention and punishment, not vacation spas. Prison perks undermine the concept of jail as deterrence, and they also waste taxpayer money.

My amendment would end the taxpayer abuse by requiring the Attorney General to set specific standards governing Federal prisoners that do not exceed what is necessary for prison order, discipline, and constitutional requirements.

The amendment also requires the Bureau of Prisons to submit an annual audit to Congress listing exactly how much is spent at each Federal prison for basics and how much is spent for extra perks and amenities.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] to know that under the constraints of time, we accept his amendment on this side, and I would yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. ZIMMER. I thank all my colleagues who are waiting patiently to speak on behalf of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the No Frills Prison Act as an amendment to the Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995. This legislation would deny Federal funds to States who give inmates special privileges.

I believe that we've lost our perspective in this Nation when prisoners eat better than our children, and inmates enjoy air conditioning while senior citizens in nursing homes swelter. Removing such luxuries as Stairmaster's premium cable TV, and weight rooms is essential to ensuring that our prisons are not country clubs, but are instead true place of punishment for crime.

I commend Mr. ZIMMER for his good work in creating a bill that is truly tough on crime, and I encourage my colleagues to support this worthwhile amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 7, line 24, insert ''(1)'' before ''The''.

Page 8, after line 3, insert the following:

''(2)(A) A State that receives funds under this title shall, in such form and manner as the Attorney General determines, and under such regulations as the Attorney General shall prescribe, require that the appropriate public authorities report promptly to the Attorney General the death of each individual who dies in custody while in a municipal or county jail, State prison, or other similar place of confinement. Each such report shall include the cause of death and all other facts relevant to the death reported, which the person so reporting shall have the duty to make a good faith effort to ascertain.

(B) The Attorney General shall annually publish a report containing—

(i) the number of deaths in each institution for which a report was filed during the relevant reporting period;

(ii) the cause of death and time of death for each death so reported; and

(iii) such other information about the death as the Attorney General deems relevant.

Mr. SCOTT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent request, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] seek recognition?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am not in opposition to the amendment, but I do seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any Member in opposition?

If not, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there have been recent press reports about deaths in local jails and prisons. This merely requires the States and localities, when there is a death in the jail, to report it to the Attorney General so there would at least be somewhere in the U.S. Government a record of the information that is available.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have no opposition to this amendment. The gentleman from Virginia is simply asking for States who receive funds under this proposal to report the deaths of those who die in their State prisons to the Federal Government, to the Attorney General, along with any causes.

I think such reporting would probably be beneficial to our committee and to the Congress, to know the answers to these things so that we can have statistics available. There are a lot of other statistics that are gathered, and they could probably submit this with no undue amount of burden,

since they keep those records, along with the other reports they submit.

We would be prepared to accept this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. I commend the gentleman from Virginia for his amendment and support it with strong support.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCOLLUM. I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to .

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. KOLBE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 667) to control crime by incarcerating violent criminals, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the name of Mr. GORDON be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3, a piece of legislation which I sponsored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAMES OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSORS OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 3

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. RIGGS be removed as cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 3, a piece of legislation that I also sponsored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to present to you the Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], the Federal agency charged with fostering scholarship and imparting knowledge in the humanities. Its work supports an impressive range of humanities projects.

These projects can reach an audience as general as the 28 million who watched the documentary Baseball, or as specialized as the 50 scholars who this past fall examined current research on Dante. Small local historical societies have received NEH support, as have some of the Nation's largest cultural institutions. Students from kindergarten through graduate school, professors and teachers, and the general public in all parts of the Nation have been touched by the Endowment's activities.

As we approach the 21st century, the world is growing smaller and its problems seemingly bigger. Societies are becoming more complex and fractious. The knowledge and wisdom, the insight and perspective, imparted by history, philosophy, literature, and other humanities disciplines enable us to meet the challenges of contemporary life.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1995.*

OMNIBUS COUNTERTERRORISM ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–31)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the ''Omnibus Counterterrorism Act of 1995.'' Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis. This legislative proposal is part of my Administration's comprehensive effort to strengthen the ability of the United States to deter terrorist acts and punish those who aid or abet any international terrorist activity in the United States. It corrects deficiencies and gaps in current law.

Some of the most significant provisions of the bill will:

—Provide clear Federal criminal jurisdiction for any international terrorist attack that might occur in the United States;

—Provide Federal criminal jurisdiction over terrorists who use the United States as the place from which to plan terrorist attacks overseas;

—Provide a workable mechanism, utilizing U.S. District Court Judges appointed by the Chief Justice, to deport expeditiously alien terrorists without risking the disclosure of national security information or techniques;

—Provide a new mechanism for preventing fund-raising in the United States that supports international terrorist activities overseas; and

—Implement an international treaty requiring the insertion of a chemical agent into plastic explosives when manufactured to make them detectable.

The fund-raising provision includes a licensing mechanism under which funds can only be transferred based on a strict showing that the money will be used exclusively for religious, charitable, literary, or educational purposes and will not be diverted for terrorist activity. The bill also includes numerous relatively technical, but highly important, provisions that will facilitate investigations and prosecutions of terrorist crimes.

It is the Administration's intent that section 101 of the bill confer Federal jurisdiction only over international terrorism offenses. The Administration will work with Members of Congress to ensure that the language in the bill is consistent with that intent.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislative proposal by the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 9, 1995.*

□ 1830

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Science, Committee on Small Business, and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there are no objections to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am advised by the leadership on our side that we have agreed to this, notwithstanding the fact that it is contrary to the proxy voting rule that is in effect and will deprive some people of the right to be on the floor and in committee at the same time.