

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentleman. The big problem here is a lot of these kids do not get anyone to pay attention to them until it starts to be too late. They commit so many crimes. They do not have the people intervene early when they show the predisposition to having a proclivity to commit crimes where they might just be calling out for help. And so the kind of grants that are going to be provided under this legislation ideally will be used as they are designed to be used in the prevention of kids getting into trouble. Because at the very outset, those children, if identified with mental illness, will get the treatment they need.

I have talked to both family court judges in Rhode Island and State court judges. The family court is very excited about the chance to have a mental health court where the child can be brought in and the family can be brought in and they can be given a treatment plan.

In the State court situations, the judges can talk about bail and say, listen, you have a chance. If you go to this treatment program you can avoid perhaps getting sentenced, if it is a minor petty crime.

So these things make sense not only for those who are caught up in our prison system, but of course it makes sense for all of us as a society to try to do the right thing early on, and I think this legislation goes in that direction. That is why I support it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I was expecting another speaker. I do not see that that person has arrived at this point. But let me in closing on this legislation ask my colleagues to support it.

Let me mention a fallen colleague, Senator Paul Wellstone, who I had the pleasure of having spend some time with me in my congressional district; and what the distinguished gentleman said from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY) is very accurate.

We visited juvenile detention centers and found in the course of that visit individuals who really needed to have intervention with respect to mental health concerns. We found that constantly. And I just want to mention that in Texas past treatments of mentally ill offenders certainly illustrates the need for this legislation.

Senior U.S. District Judge William Wayne Justice, who is experienced in dealing with mentally ill prisoners in Texas, ruled in 1980 that the Texas prison system is unconstitutional and placed under Federal control for 30 years. In Judge Justice's estimation, the Texas laws that apply to the mentally ill lack compassion and emphasize a vengeance.

KPFT News reported him as having said, "We have allowed the spirit of vengeance such unrivaled sway in our dealings with those who commit crime that we cease to consider properly whether we have taken adequate account of the role that mental impairment may play in the determination of moral responsibility. As a result, we punish those who we cannot justify blame. Such result is not I believe worthy of civil society."

This mentally ill offender treatment bill will answer the question long asked in the State of Texas and many other States. Maybe the bill will also give comfort to Lydia Roumo who called me today to indicate that her sister-in-law was diagnosed manic depressive. The family had sought help in many places but could not get her hospitalized due to laws in this particular Nation. Unfortunately, she stopped taking her medication, deteriorated and became homeless.

Certainly, this is part of the mental health concern. But the tragedy of her sister-in-law is as she became homeless she also became a victim of crime and was murdered just a few days ago.

The combination of homeless persons with mental impairment, the combination of people who perpetrate terrible acts with mental impairment and juveniles warrants an enthusiastic support of the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act of 2003. I thank the authors of this legislation. And to Lydia, let me say that this is one step towards trying to solve her problem and the problems of many, many families around the Nation who have experienced the devastation of mental illness.

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

□ 1515

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1194, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY OF SUPREME COURT POLICE, MODIFYING VENUE OF PROSECUTIONS RELATING TO SUPREME COURT BUILDING AND GROUNDS, AND AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS TO UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 2742) to extend certain authority of the Supreme Court Police, modify the venue of prosecutions relating to the Supreme Court

building and grounds, and authorize the acceptance of gifts to the United States Supreme Court.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2742

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT POLICE TO PROTECT COURT OFFICIALS OFF THE SUPREME COURT GROUNDS.

Section 6121(b)(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking "2004" and inserting "2008".

SEC. 2. VENUE FOR PROSECUTIONS RELATING TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT BUILDING AND GROUNDS.

Section 6137 of title 40, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) VENUE AND PROCEDURE.—Prosecution for a violation described in subsection (a) shall be in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia or in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, on information by the United States Attorney or an Assistant United States Attorney."

SEC. 3. GIFTS TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

The Chief Justice or his designee is authorized to accept, hold, administer, and utilize gifts and bequests of personal property pertaining to the history of the United States Supreme Court or its justices, but gifts or bequests of money shall be covered into the Treasury.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2742, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 2742 contains three provisions that will benefit the administrative operations of the U.S. Supreme Court.

First, the bill renews until 2008 authority provided under current law that allows the Supreme Court police to provide security for the Justices when they leave the Supreme Court premises. The Supreme Court police offer that protection, and without this extension, their services would be confined to the immediate area of the Court's grounds. In other words, they would not travel with the Justices when they vacation or speak out of the area, a responsibility that is imposed upon the Marshal's Service when necessary. The need for this protection is illustrated by the recent assault on Justice Souter near his home.

Second, S. 2742 creates statutory authority for the Court to accept gifts. The scope of this text was narrowed with the Committee on the Judiciary's input and is now limited exclusively to gifts "pertaining to the history of the Court or its Justices." The Court presently may accept gifts based on Comptroller General opinions.

Third, this legislation empowers the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, along with the D.C. Superior Court, to adjudicate cases relating to crimes committed in the Supreme Court building and on Court grounds. Under current law, all cases are referred to the D.C. Superior Court. Because some of the crimes committed on Court grounds implicate first amendment rights, the Court and the Department of Justice believe that a Federal court will do a better job of promoting uniform results since it is more experienced in handling constitutional challenges.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on the Judiciary, in a bipartisan fashion, worked with the Supreme Court and the other body to ensure that S. 2742 is devoid of controversy.

These changes are important to the operation of the Court. I urge Members to support the bill.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me also rise and thank the other body and thank the ranking member and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for legislation that I think is very important. I support the legislation introduced by Senator HATCH and cosponsored by Mr. LEAHY from Vermont.

The goals of this legislation are, namely, to extend to December 29, 2008, the authority of the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court police to protect the Justices and official guests of the Court away from the court building and grounds; add the U.S. District Court to the District of Columbia to venue provisions governing prosecutions relating to the Supreme Court building and grounds, where venue now lies in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; authorizes the Chief Justice to accept, hold, administer and use gifts of personal property to facilitate the work of the Supreme Court.

As a general matter, I am an advocate of extending the discretion and jurisdiction of the Federal courts. In the midst of this House's consideration and passage of several measures that patently strip the jurisdiction of the courts and the discretion of the judges, it is refreshing that we see a piece of legislation pass that actually works to enhance the Court and its security.

This legislation, S. 2742, is to add protection to the Supreme Court, and

it would renew their authority to provide security for their Justices when they leave the Supreme Court and surrounding area.

On May 1 of this year, Supreme Court Justice David Souter suffered minor injuries when a group of young men assaulted him when he jogged right in this vicinity. Other judges have had some experiences along those lines.

Another provision in this legislation allows the Supreme Court to accept gifts "pertaining to the history of the Supreme Court of the United States or its Justices." The Administrative Office of the Courts currently has statutory authority to accept gifts on behalf of the judiciary. This provision would grant the Supreme Court its own authority to accept gifts that would elevate or enhance its historical presence in this Nation. It would, of course, narrow the type of gift that can be received to historical items. This provision strikes the proper balance of maintaining the very favored place in history that the Supreme Court maintains, and then will improve the Court's overall function and administrative relief or issue and, as well, ensure the ethical considerations be made in order.

Again, prosecution of offenses against the Court now were moved to the district court. I think that is an appropriate way of handling these matters, and I would ask in light of the fact that our Supreme Court, now more than ever, is well-known to the American public, handling any number of controversial issues, I believe that S. 2742 is an appropriate legislative initiative to help us in the administration of justice.

With that, I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the legislation introduced by the Gentleman from Utah, Mr. HATCH on July 22, 2004 and co-sponsored by Mr. LEAHY from Vermont. The goals of this legislation, namely to:

Extend to December 29, 2008, the authority of the Marshal of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court Police to protect the Justices and official guests of the court away from the court building and grounds;

Add the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to venue provisions governing prosecutions relating to the Supreme Court building and grounds—where venue now lies in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; and

Authorizes the Chief Justice to accept, hold, administer, and use gifts and bequests of personal property to facilitate the work of the Supreme Court.

As a general matter, I am an advocate of extending the discretion and jurisdiction of the federal courts. In the midst of this House's consideration and passage of several measures that patently strip the jurisdiction of the courts and the discretion of the judges, it is refreshing to see a piece of legislation pass that actually expands the reach of the court.

The Gentlemen co-sponsored S. 2742 at the request of the Supreme Court. This legislation would renew their authority to provide security for their justices when they leave the Supreme Court.

On May 1 of this year, Supreme Court Justice David Souter suffered minor injuries when a group of young men assaulted him as he jogged right in this vicinity. He is not the first justice to be injured in this manner. Justice Stephen Breyer was thrown from his bicycle several years ago and suffered minor injuries. These reports underscore the importance of off-campus security for Justices. If no congressional action is taken, the authority of Supreme Court police to protect its Justices off to court grounds will expire at the end of this year.

Another provision in this legislation allows the Supreme Court to accept gifts "pertaining to the history of the Supreme Court of the United States or its justices." The Administrative Office of the Courts currently has statutory authority to accept gifts on behalf of the judiciary. This provision would grant the Supreme Court its own authority to accept gifts but it would narrow the types of gifts that can be received to historical items. This provision strikes the proper balance and will improve the courts's overall function.

Finally, this legislation also would provide an additional venue for the prosecution of offenses that occur on the Supreme Court grounds. Currently, the DC Superior Court is the only place of proper venue despite the uniquely federal interest at stake. This legislation would allow suit to be brought in United States District Court in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2742.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIXTEENTH STREET BAPTIST CHURCH BOMBING

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 389) honoring the young victims of the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church bombing, recognizing the historical significance of the tragic event, and commending the efforts of law enforcement personnel to bring the perpetrators of this crime to justice on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 389

Whereas the Sixteenth Street Baptist Church of Birmingham, Alabama was constructed in 1911 and served as a center for African-American life in the city and a rallying point for the civil rights movement during the 1960s;

Whereas on Sunday, September 15, 1963, segregationists protesting the mandatory integration of Birmingham's public schools