

made in H.R. 2538 are purely technical in nature. There are no substantive modifications to the criminal law made by this bill. For example, the bill corrects a number of misspelled words, and errors in punctuation and other items of grammar. The bill also corrects a number of cross-references in the criminal law that resulted when several new laws were added to title 18 in last year's crime bill. The bill also deletes several specific statutory fine amounts that unintentionally remain in the printed code, notwithstanding the fact that several years ago Congress deleted specific fine amounts from title 18 in favor of a uniform fine statute applicable to all crimes.

Mr. Speaker, some may ask why we are even bothering to make such changes if they are not substantive in nature. Well, I believe it is appropriate that the Congress ensure that the written Federal law, as read by both practitioners and the public, reflects an appropriate level of care for detail and the true intent of Congress. This, among other benefits, strengthens the public's confidence in the legislative branch.

For example, I mentioned criminal fines. In 1987, Congress established a uniform fine of up to \$250,000 for a felony conviction. Criminal offenses established prior to that time contained other specific, and mostly lower, fine amounts. Those amounts are no longer effective as a result of the 1987 act, yet they remain on the books. This can be confusing to those who are unfamiliar with Federal criminal law.

This bill helps us achieve the goals I have outlined. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go through it, but this is as uncontroversial a bill as we are going to get. It has been carefully reviewed by our side to make sure it has no substantive changes in our Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2538, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise

and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

INCREASING PENALTY FOR ESCAPING FROM FEDERAL PRISON

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1533) to amend title 18, United States Code, to increase the penalty for escaping from a Federal prison.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1533

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 751(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "five" and inserting "10".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is simple and noncontroversial, and yet it makes an important improvement to Federal criminal law. As Federal law enforcement has increased its attack in recent years on serious violent criminals and major drug traffickers by imposing long prison sentences on these most dangerous offenders, the penalty for escaping from prison and other forms of Federal custody has not increased in a corresponding manner.

This presents a risk to the safety of Federal employees who work for the Bureau of Prisons, the Marshals Service, and the other enforcement agencies charged with maintaining the custody of persons convicted of Federal crimes. H.R. 1533 fixes this problem.

This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT]. I want to commend him for having the idea and for his initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT] so that he may explain his bill.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak on behalf of H.R. 1533, a bill which I introduced earlier this year. I especially thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] for his help in moving this legislation to this point of consideration for the full House of Representatives.

H.R. 1533 would simply double from 5 years to 10 years the maximum penalty that Federal escapees can receive. The penalty applies to all escapees and attempted escapees who are in the Attorney General's custody. Therefore this penalty would apply to those who escape or attempt to escape from a Fed-

eral prison, from the custody of the United States marshals while in transit or from a halfway house or from other non-Federal facilities such as a private prison or local jails.

I might add that the National Sheriffs' Association supports this bill because of that.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to raise the penalty for escaping from Federal custody. Currently a Federal escapee faces a maximum of 5 years in jail. Of course, due to the sentencing guidelines, he received the 5-year maximum penalty.

There are two primary reasons why such an increase is necessary and needed at this time. First, it would serve as a greater deterrent to those people who would be thinking about attempting to escape from jail, and second, it would maintain the alignment, a better alignment, if my colleagues will, with today's longer-based sentences. Federal prison escapes are up, and they have been going up since 1992 when over 550 Federal detainees jumped the fence, or held up a guard, or smuggled themselves out by way of a trash truck, did whatever they had to do to break out, break away from, the law and creep back into the society to resume their unlawful and in too many instances violent ways. That number has continued to increase to around 600 escapees in 1993 and up to 660 escapees last year.

A Federal marshal and a court security officer have already been killed in one of these attempted escapes in a senseless and intolerable act of misbehavior. This occurred in Chicago under circumstances that I happened to be in that city that day on business and followed that case very closely where a man in transit by a marshal in a Federal courthouse in the parking garage part somehow came into possession of a key to handcuffs and escaped and overcame the guard, the marshal that was accompanying him, took the gun and shot that marshal as well as another court security officer, certainly an example of a tragic incident where we need better and tougher laws against people who make attempts to escape.

□ 1745

Overall, to their credit, the U.S. Marshals Service has already done an outstanding job of handling these cases successfully, recapturing nearly 500 of the 660 prisoners who have escaped. But tracking these criminals certainly is not easy, let alone a criminal who has escaped and is trying to hide out. When an individual knows they are being pursued, just finding out where they are can cost literally hundreds of hours of investigative work and cause quite a few headaches. This successful record that the marshals have still leaves over 150 escapees from 1994 still out on the streets committing more crimes.

I mentioned earlier the consequences and the risks of escaping. Let us consider exactly what those consequences are and then ask ourselves, are these