

statutory tools necessary to meet and defeat the international terrorist threat. Large majorities in both Houses passed the PATRIOT Act to lower the wall of separation between the intelligence and law enforcement communities that prevented the sharing of threat information that might have averted these attacks. I supported the inclusion of sunsets in the PATRIOT Act because I recognized that the enlargement of Federal law enforcement authority and the attendant risk to civil liberties required comprehensive examination and affirmative congressional reauthorization.

Since passage of the PATRIOT Act in October of 2001, I have led aggressive congressional oversight of the implementation of the PATRIOT Act before the House Committee on the Judiciary, and the legislation has been exhaustively examined by the House Committee on Intelligence, as well as companion committees in the other body. The PATRIOT Act conference report is more protective of civil liberties than current law in dozens of areas, and is the product of extensive and bipartisan legislative and oversight, as well as intensive bipartisan and bicameral negotiations. On December 14, the House passed the PATRIOT Act conference report by a bipartisan vote of 251–174.

Last night, the other body ignored the will of the House, a majority of PATRIOT Act House-Senate conferees, and a clear majority of Senators bypassing a 6-month extension of the PATRIOT Act that contained none of the important civil liberties provisions carefully negotiated by House and Senate conferees.

The security of the American people should not be subordinated to the partisan brinkmanship of a minority of obstructionist Senators. It is imperative that the PATRIOT Act not be permitted to expire in order to ensure that our Nation's law enforcement and intelligence communities are provided the statutory mandate necessary to detect and defeat terrorist threats.

Let me respond to assertions that the conference report does not strengthen the civil liberties provisions of the original PATRIOT Act.

Senator SCHUMER and others have said that we ought to "mend it, not end it." Senator SCHUMER and others fail to recognize that conferees have already extensively mended it, and that further mending will have the effect of ending the vital antiterrorism provisions contained in this legislation and heighten the risk of future terrorist attack.

With respect to civil liberties enhancements, the PATRIOT Act conference report contains at least 30 additional civil liberties safeguards, many of which were requested by minority conferees. This conference report tightens the criteria necessary to obtain a multipoint wiretap, heightens reporting requirements of their use, increases safeguards for the use of delayed notice search warrants, imposes stringent requirements for the acquisition of business records under section 215 of the legislation, requires the approval of such orders from the FBI Director of other senior executive officials if they pertain to library, medical, educational or other records, limits the scope of material obtained through these orders, and prohibits the dissemination of information obtained.

The conference report also requires that the DOJ Inspector General conduct two separate audits of the FBI's use of section 215 orders that will examine: any noteworthy facts or cir-

cumstances relating to 215 orders, including any improper or illegal use of the authority; the manner in which such information is collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the FBI; and an assessment of whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.

Allows recipients of National Security Letters (NSLs) to consult with legal counsel and creates an explicit right to judicial review of NSL requests.

Permits a reviewing court to modify or set aside an NSL if compliance would be unreasonable, oppressive, or otherwise unlawful—this is the same standard used to modify or quash a subpoena in a criminal case.

Requires the DOJ Inspector General to conduct two comprehensive audits of the FBI's use of NSLs and requires the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of applying minimization procedures to NSLs to ensure the protection of constitutional rights of U.S. persons.

Adds a new "sunshine" provision that requires annual public reporting on NSLs. Provides for expanded congressional access to significant FISA reporting currently provided to the Intelligence Committees.

Includes a provision requiring the FISA Court to submit its rules and procedures to Congress. Creates new reporting requirements for the use of emergency authorities under FISA. Requires new reporting on the use of emergency disclosures of communications information made under section 212 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

Requires the Department of Justice to submit a report to Congress on the Department's data-mining activities.

As you can see from this list of changes, the conference report does more than just mends the PATRIOT Act, it overhauls it in important ways that a minority of Senators refuse to recognize.

In order to ensure that this vital antiterrorism legislation does not expire at the end of this month, I offer legislation that provides a 5-week extension of the PATRIOT Act. The PATRIOT Act has already been subject to the most exhaustive congressional consideration of any modern legislation. A 5-week extension will permit both bodies to again examine the legislation to ensure that it enhances the security of the American people while preserving our civil liberties. It will also ensure that the vital antiterrorism provisions contained in the act do not expire as some in the other body have openly advocated.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to renew the critical antiterrorism tools contained in the PATRIOT Act by supporting passage of H.R. 4647.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### 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 the bill, H.R. 4647, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### USA PATRIOT ACT 6-MONTH EXTENSION

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 2167) to amend the USA PATRIOT ACT to extend the sunset of certain provisions of that Act and the lone wolf provision of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 to July 1, 2006, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to simply ask at the proper time that I may be allowed to insert a statement from Mr. CONYERS in the RECORD with respect to the PATRIOT Act.

And I have been asked by the distinguished minority leader, Ms. PELOSI, to read the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object to this 1-month extension of the PATRIOT Act provision contained in this legislation. We would have preferred a 3- or 6-month extension to allow the American people a longer time to discuss the very serious impacts of these provisions on the civil liberties of the American people. But it appears we will only be given 1 month for that national debate.

"I also want it to be clear that this legislation involves only a small portion of the PATRIOT Act. Ninety percent of that act is law and remains law, regardless of what we do here today.

"The portion of the law in dispute is the very controversial section that affects the basic civil liberties of the American people. The rights of our citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution, should not be shoehorned into a tight timeframe. We should have the time for a vigorous and thorough debate. In the meantime, the overwhelming majority of the PATRIOT Act is in place, and will remain in effect.

"Mr. Speaker, there is a very crucial debate in this country today about the rights of American citizens to privacy, and about the proper role of the Congress and courts in assuring that no one, not even the President, tramples on those basic privacy rights without complying with the law. In this atmosphere, it is appropriate to give additional time to examine the implications of these controversial provisions of the PATRIOT Act."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2167

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF SUNSET OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT AND THE LONE WOLF PROVISION OF THE INTELLIGENCE REFORM AND TERRORISM PREVENTION ACT OF 2004.**

Section 224(a) of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT ACT) Act of 2001 (18 U.S.C. 2510 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2005” and inserting “July 1, 2006”.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SENSENBRENNER

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 1, strike “July 1, 2006” and insert “February 3, 2006”.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object to this one-month extension of the PATRIOT Act provision contained in this legislation. We would have preferred a three or six month extension to allow the American people a longer time to discuss the very serious impacts of these provisions on the civil liberties of the American people. But it appears we will only be given one month for that national debate.

I also want it to be clear that this legislation involves only a small portion of the PATRIOT Act. Ninety percent of that Act is law and remains law, regardless of what we do here today.

The portion of the law in dispute is the very controversial section that affects the basic civil liberties of the American people. The rights of our citizens, as guaranteed by the Constitution, should not be shoehorned into a tight timeframe: we should have the time for a vigorous and thorough debate. In the meantime, the overwhelming majority of the PATRIOT Act is in place, and will remain in effect.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very crucial debate in this country today about the rights of American citizens to privacy, and about the proper role of the Congress and the courts in assuring that no one—not even the President—tramples on those basic privacy rights without complying with the law. In this atmosphere, it is appropriate to give additional time to examine the implications of these controversial provisions of the PATRIOT Act.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the September 11, 2001 attacks, Congress recognized that our Nation's intelligence and law enforcement communities lacked the statutory tools necessary to meet and defeat the international terrorist threat. Large majorities in both Houses passed the PATRIOT Act to lower the wall of separation between the intelligence and law enforcement communities that prevented the sharing of threat information that might have averted these attacks. I supported the inclusion of sunsets in the PATRIOT Act because I recognized that the enlargement of federal law enforcement authority and the attendant risk to civil liberties required comprehensive examination and affirmative congressional reauthorization.

Since passage of the PATRIOT Act in October of 2001, I have led aggressive congressional oversight of the implementation of the PATRIOT Act before the House Committee on the Judiciary, and the legislation has been exhaustively examined by the House Committee

on Intelligence, as well as companion committees in the other body. The PATRIOT Act conference report is more protective of civil liberties than current law in dozens of areas, and is the product of extensive and bipartisan legislative and oversight, as well as intensive bipartisan and bicameral negotiations. On December 14, the House passed the PATRIOT Act conference report by a bipartisan vote of 251–174.

Last night, the other body ignored the will of the House, a majority of PATRIOT Act House-Senate conferees, and a clear majority of Senators by passing a six-month extension of the PATRIOT Act that contained none of the important civil liberties provisions carefully negotiated by House and Senate conferees.

The security of the American people should not be subordinated to the partisan brinkmanship of a minority of obstructionist Senators. It is imperative that the PATRIOT Act not be permitted to expire in order to ensure that our Nation's law enforcement and intelligence communities are provided the statutory mandate necessary to detect and defeat terrorist threats.

Let me respond to assertions that the conference report does not strengthen the civil liberties provisions of the original PATRIOT Act.

Senator SCHUMER and others have said that we ought to “mend it, not end it.” Senator SCHUMER and others fail to recognize that conferees have already extensively mended it, and that further mending will have the effect of ending the vital antiterrorism provisions contained in this legislation and heighten the risk of future terrorist attack.

With respect to civil liberties enhancements, the PATRIOT Act conference report contains at least 30 additional civil liberties safeguards, many of which were requested by minority conferees. This conference report tightens the criteria necessary to obtain a multipoint wiretap, heightens reporting requirements of their use, increases safeguards for the use of delayed notice search warrants, imposes stringent requirements for the acquisition of business records under section 215 of the legislation, requires the approval of such orders from the FBI Director or other senior executive official if they pertain to library, medical, educational or other records, limits the scope of material obtained through these orders, and prohibits the dissemination of information obtained.

The conference report also requires that the DOJ Inspector General conduct two separate audits of the FBI's use of section 215 orders that will examine: any noteworthy facts or circumstances relating to 215 orders, including any improper or illegal use of the authority; the manner in which such information is collected, retained, analyzed, and disseminated by the FBI; and an assessment of whether the minimization procedures protect the constitutional rights of United States persons.

Allows recipients of National Security Letters (NSLs) to consult with legal counsel and creates an explicit right to judicial review of NSL requests.

Permits a reviewing court to modify or set aside an NSL if compliance would be unreasonable, oppressive, or otherwise unlawful—this is the same standard used to modify or quash a subpoena in a criminal case.

Requires the DOJ Inspector General to conduct two comprehensive audits of the FBI's use of NSLs and requires the Attorney Gen-

eral and the Director of National Intelligence to submit to Congress a report on the feasibility of applying minimization procedures to NSLs to ensure the protection of constitutional rights of U.S. persons.

Adds a new “sunshine” provision that requires annual public reporting on NSLs. Provides for expanded congressional access to significant FISA reporting currently provided to the Intelligence Committees.

Includes a provision requiring the FISA Court to submit its rules & procedures to Congress. Creates new reporting requirements for the use of emergency authorities under FISA. Requires new reporting on the use of emergency disclosures of communications information made under section 212 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

Requires the Department of Justice to submit a report to Congress on the Department's data-mining activities.

As you can see from this list of changes, the conference report does more than just mend the PATRIOT Act, it overhauls it in important ways that a minority of Senators refuse to recognize.

In order to ensure that this vital antiterrorism legislation does not expire at the end of this month, I offer an amendment to the Senate-passed reauthorization that extends the PATRIOT Act until February 3, 2005. The PATRIOT Act has already been subject to the most exhaustive congressional consideration of any modern legislation. A five-week extension provides ample time for both bodies to again examine the legislation to ensure that it enhances the security of the American people while preserving our civil liberties. It will also ensure that the vital antiterrorism provisions contained in the Act do not expire as some in the other body have openly advocated.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to renew the critical antiterrorism tools contained in the PATRIOT Act by supporting passage of this amendment to S. 2167.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed to learn that the Senate voted to extend the PATRIOT Act for just six months, rather than making it permanent or at least extending key provisions for the next few years.

As everyone in the House and Senate knows, the provisions of the PATRIOT Act have been used against drug lords and mafia kingpins for years, it is common sense that we are allowed to use these same tools in the war on terror.

I am also chagrined to see that the bill that the Senate sent over does not contain any of the cargo theft or port security provisions that we passed overwhelmingly in this body.

Back in July, we passed the port security/cargo theft provisions onto the PATRIOT Act reauthorization by a remarkable 381–45 vote. These measures were so important that, even though the Senate did not include them in their version of the PATRIOT Act reauthorization, conferees from both the House and Senate decided to put these provisions in the final conference report.

From a personal perspective, the issue of cargo theft is one that I have worked on for two years. I will not rest until these cargo theft prevention measures have been signed into law by the president.

These cargo theft provisions would have gone a long way in helping law enforcement fight the widespread and costly crime.

But if we must delay further action for six more months, that is six more months where criminals can steal cargo and make billions. That is half a year of handicapping our law enforcement, hurting our businesses and passing the cost on to American consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman SENSENBRENNER for his tireless efforts providing oversight over the PATRIOT Act and working on reauthorizing this critical legislation, including by now extending the PATRIOT Act for just one month. This allows us to work on making these provisions permanent and on including the cargo theft measures as soon as possible.

I also commend Chairman COBLE, Mr. FORBES and Mr. SCHIFF, as well as all the law enforcement and industry groups that worked on the port security and cargo theft provisions.

I say to our fellow Americans and our law enforcement communities, that I will do everything that I can to make the PATRIOT Act permanent, and that I will not rest until we finally enact these cargo theft prevention measures into law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### 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 the bill, S. 2167, just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### CORRECTING ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 2863, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 74) making appropriation for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, more than a year ago when Mr. LEWIS was elected chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he came to me and asked if we could have an understanding that we would express our substantive differences, but still cooperate in moving bills forward in an orderly way once those differences were expressed. We did that.

Time and time again, the minority was denied the opportunity to offer different sets of priorities, priorities that did not offer huge tax cuts for those who have the most in society, paid for with cuts in education, health care,

and worker protection for those who have the least. Despite the fact that the rules of the House were used to block our efforts to obtain on-the-record votes on a number of our alternatives, Democrats continued to cooperate procedurally even as we made clear our differences on policy.

The Republican majority wanted to finish all of these bills by the end of the fiscal year, and we did not procedurally obstruct them, because while we differed strongly with the values that lie behind their budget priorities, we respected the fact that they are in the majority, and we respect and revere this institution. But because of internal divisions between the majority party, divisions within the House GOP caucus, and divisions between House and Senate Republicans, the fiscal year ended with the Labor-HHS bill and the Defense appropriations bill that represents 67 percent of the discretionary spending in our budget bill still being hung up in the legislative process.

Now in the closing days of this Congress, the Republican leadership has decided to use the must-pass Defense appropriations bill to force down the throats of the American people a number of wholly unrelated gifts to special interests. They decided to hold funds for our troops hostage in order to force Congress into removing protections against oil drilling in ANWR.

To make room for their tax giveaways, they even imposed a second round of cuts on education, health, worker protection, and even imposed a \$4 billion additional cut in military spending. Senate action yesterday has corrected one provision inserted in the bill by the abuse of power, the strong-arm attempts at drilling in ANWR, and for that I applaud the Senate. I led the opposition to ANWR's inclusion in the conference, and I am happy that the Congress was not blackmailed into accepting it.

But, frankly, Mr. Speaker, continuing under my reservation, ANWR was not the biggest problem with the conference report. The biggest problem is that it shortchanges our economic future by refusing to make adequate investments in education. And it cruelly neglects to strengthen support for programs that help provide critical health care services to people who desperately need them.

But we have lost that fight. This Congress has made the decision to cut critical health, education, worker protection, and social service funding by \$3 billion below last year's level. What I find so gutless about Congress' performance on this bill is that those cuts could not pass the Senate on a rollcall vote, so the majority party had to arrange for their Senators to duck this vote, thereby hiding from accountability by arranging for the bill to be passed through the Senate without a rollcall vote. That means the majority party has denied critical help to families most in need of help, but has not had the courage to forthrightly defend

their votes to the people affected in the public arena.

This bill makes that problem \$1.4 billion worse for those programs and because of the across-the-board cut, it makes other ill-advised cuts in critical funding for the FBI and local law enforcement, and it even cuts an additional \$4 billion out of the Defense bill. If I could do anything to change that, I would; but it is clear the die is cast.

Continuing under my reservation, Mr. Speaker, there is a second outrageous problem with this bill. The majority has turned the proposal to prepare for a flu pandemic into a giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry. When the President requested \$7 billion to begin a much-belated crash program to develop a new generation of vaccines and antiviral drugs to combat a potential flu pandemic, the Republican majority responded by cutting it in half. When I asked Senator STEVENS in conference why we shouldn't fund the rest of the administration's request so that it was clear that the government had a long-term commitment to the development of needed vaccines and antivirals, he responded that because liability protection language for manufacturers was not being adopted, long-range funding should be withheld.

The conference committee ended its work with the understanding, both verbal and in writing, that there would be no legislative liability protection language inserted in this bill. And because the majority told us it did not want any compensation program for victims to be applied against the discretionary portion of the budget, no funding was provided for that, either.

But after the conference was finished at 6 p.m., Senator FRIST marched over to the House side of the Capitol about 4 hours later and insisted that over 40 pages of legislation, which I have in my hand, 40 pages of legislation that had never been seen by conferees, be attached to the bill. The Speaker joined him in that assistance so that, without a vote of the conferees, that legislation was unilaterally and arrogantly inserted into the bill after the conference was over in a blatantly abusive power play by two of the most powerful men in Congress.

We then discovered that this language provided all sorts of insulation for pharmaceutical companies and that this insulation applied not just to drugs developed to deal with the flu but in fact applied to a far broader range of products. In essence, the provisions allowed the Secretary of HHS to issue a declaration that has the effect of almost completely prohibiting lawsuits in State or Federal courts by persons whose health was injured against manufacturers and various others for compensation for injuries caused by the use of covered countermeasures.

That determination would bar lawsuits against a wide range of covered persons involved with the countermeasures including manufacturers and