

proudly supports and defends his or her country and its way of life. Today we patriots rose to vote against this bill because we want to defend the American way of life. The way to do that is to restore some of the civil liberties taken away during the panic after 9/11.

□ 2230

Freedom in America does not mean granting the government unlimited and unchecked powers to snoop into private lives without any counterbalance. Yet 4 years ago, we were presented with a massive bill in the middle of the night. Fear governed and government suspended basic American freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. A sunset provision was the only thing that kept our American way of life from sunsetting.

Today we need to reclaim liberty and freedom and rename this act the Act of Patriotism. We can defend liberty without destroying freedom. We can make America safer without making America afraid. We can shoulder the burden of security without falling under the yoke of oppression. We cannot and we must not be afraid any longer.

We were afraid not long ago, and it set America on a terrible course where we willingly suspended the rule of law to be governed by the rule of fear: be afraid; be very afraid. And we were. We feared so much that in the PATRIOT Act we embraced national secrecy instead of national security. We granted broad sweeping powers to the government and removed the checks and balances that have made Americans free for 200 years.

At a time like this with the stakes so high, we should look back on history and learn. America has faced grave threats and perilous times before. We did so by defending American values, not by dismantling American principles.

At a time like this we should recall and heed the words expressed by our Founders. The geniuses who envisioned a Nation of free people, free expression and freedom knew that the hard work for America was not in crafting liberty, but in preserving it. What they wrote 200 years ago sounds like it was penned and delivered in this Chamber on this very day. Just listen:

“But a Constitution of government once changed from freedom can never be restored. Liberty, once lost, is lost forever.” Those are the words of John Adams in a letter on July 17, 1775.

Another quote: “However weak my country may be, I hope we shall never sacrifice our liberties.” Alexander Hamilton wrote that on December 13, 1790.

And another quote: “Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are the only safe depositaries.” Thomas Jefferson was the author in 1781.

You cannot get any advice any better than that written by people who risked torture and death to pursue liberty.

We have our marching orders, and we could not be any clearer. We cannot let fear govern who we are and what we stand for. We cannot let fear become the 28th amendment to the United States Constitution. Yet, that is precisely the grave danger facing America today.

The signs are everywhere. Without your knowledge, investigators can search your home or your office, copy records and photographs. Without your knowledge, the government can look at your medical records as if an x-ray will reveal your political ideology.

Without your knowledge, the government can access your library records and listen to roving wiretaps. And the threshold for all of this is unseen and unknown. A nameless, faceless person somewhere in the government can decide you are suspicious. The color of your skin or the accent of your voice could tip the scales.

They say no. But we do not know. How could we know? Everything is secret.

This climate of fear has produced arrogance which has led to an inevitable abuse of power. So a Republican committee chairman thinks nothing of turning off the microphones as if freedom of speech is governed by an off and on switch, as if liberty and justice for all is controlled by one man banging his gavel.

We have gone too far, and it is time to trade in fear and embrace fearlessness because that is what America is. We have gone too far, and it is time to restrain government because in this country the people rule and history teaches that absolute power corrupts absolutely.

We have gone too far, and it is time to stop fear-mongering and start protecting liberty. We do not need to destroy America’s founding principles in order to defeat America’s latest enemy. Do not let fear rule America and distort it into a country we do not even recognize.

Four years ago we put sunset provisions in the PATRIOT Act. It is time to put them back in and restore the checks and balances that keep America free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentle-

woman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### PATRIOT ACT PROTECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to control the time on the leadership hour here tonight.

As you know, and I hope a lot of America knows, last week and this week we have been through some intense debates on the PATRIOT Act. Last week as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I sat in on a 12-hour mark-up and some 40 amendments that came from the minority party. We hammered out a bill from the Committee on the Judiciary that we brought to the floor of this Congress here today for a long debate. And in this long debate we saw bipartisan support, a number of constructive amendments from both sides, and a bipartisan vote of 257 to 171.

We passed the PATRIOT Act off the floor of this House of Representatives and will send it over to the Senate for their consideration and deliberations and a conference committee to resolve any differences we might have. We will bring it back to each Chamber so we can extend the PATRIOT Act and preserve the safety and liberty of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but comment on the remarks that were made by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) who spoke just ahead of me and the allegation that the Republican committee chairman can think nothing of turning off the lights and shutting off the debate in the Committee on the Judiciary.

I was there that day and I am there every day hopefully standing up to defend the Constitution and fighting for freedom and fighting for the safety of the American people.

I will tell you that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSEN-BRENNER) runs that committee as good as any chairman I have served under or with in any level of government, be it in the State government or here in Congress. He announces the rules. He lives by the rules. He enforces the rules on us and on himself. When the time is up, the time is up and the gavel comes down and we move on to give another

individual an opportunity to speak on the issue.

If it was run any other way, we would not have that kind of an even-handedness that we have on the Committee on the Judiciary. And the day that was addressed by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDermott) was a day that had all Democrat witnesses. It was a hearing that was requested by them. They all signed a document demanding the hearing. Some of them that signed the letter did not show up, but we did; and we listened to the testimony all day long. The chairman followed the rules and when the hearing was over, the gavel came down. The committee hearing was adjourned and the microphones were shut off and the lights were shut off.

And I can tell you the gavel has come down on me. My microphone had been shut off. The lights have been shut off while I am standing there talking in the room. We follow the rules for Republicans and Democrats alike. I never felt an ounce of offense at that. I thought it was even handed, it was well balanced; and I think that the minority party is looking for something to, I will say, criticize and attack the most effective Members in this Congress.

We have this opportunity tonight to review what we have done with the PATRIOT Act and help clarify some of the murky issues that have been, I will say, demagogued here on the PATRIOT Act and our debate on the floor and also in committee. And there are a number of Members that are here tonight that know that there is more to be said. And hopefully when we finish this tonight we will put the lid on the PATRIOT Act here in Congress and let the Senate take it up and give it back to the American people as it appropriately ought to be.

To start this off for his perspective, I am honored to be here tonight with a gentleman from Texas (Mr. Carter) who I always considered my wing man on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Carter).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Iowa for yielding to me. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to address the comments that were made here just recently in this House just briefly.

We keep hearing this tirade that there is someone that is taking away liberty, taking away freedom in this country with the PATRIOT Act. And you heard the comments that they can go into all of your records and they do not tell you about it. As if just any old ordinary policeman or FBI agent could go out there with no control whatsoever and search your home, search your records and so forth. And they give that impression to the American public by their statements here tonight.

Nothing could be further from the truth. And they know that nothing could be further from the truth because they sat through the 12-hour hearing

that was held in the Committee on the Judiciary. They examined every one of these various sections that we have gone through tonight in heavy detail, and they know that there certainly are provisions where somebody oversees whether there is, in fact, probable cause for a search warrant to be issued. A judge makes that decision. That is the same judge that makes the decision in every case of a search warrant in the history of the United States. This is how we do search warrants. And he makes that decision.

What they are trying to make an inference on is they have this thing they call a sneak-and-peek warrant that they have entitled it. And they say that so it sounds like I said the other night, like we are talking about some kind of Peeping Tom.

That is not it at all. This is a device that has been used in criminal justice for many, many years. It is very simple, Mr. Speaker. This is not complex stuff. I will give you an example.

We have a warrant that says that in a drug case there is a suspicion that there is a methamphetamine speed lab in a certain building, and they have someone who gives them good evidence to that effect. They present it to the judge. He finds there is probable cause to believe there is a speed lab and stored drugs in the certain location. He sets out specifically in that warrant what exactly they are to go look for. And they go and they look, and sure enough there is a speed lab in that building. Sure enough there are drugs and the ingredients for making more drugs in that building. But they also discover there is no one there. And what are we trying to do here?

We are trying to get these drugs off the street, and we are trying to catch the people that are poisoning our children. And that is what the criminal justice system is trying to do in that case. And so they back off. They back off and they watch and they wait, so the perpetrators, and hopefully from top to bottom, from the mules that deliver it to the king pins that finance it, are somehow connected with that lab. And when they have gathered that evidence as a result of this look at this building maybe in a day, maybe a little longer, they come in and they seize them on the premises. They have the evidence, and they get convictions from top to bottom and get this vermin off the streets of America.

Now, if we use this to get the vermin off the streets of America that are doing drugs and poisoning our children, why in the world would we not use that same tool to get the enemies of America who are embedded, in many instances, in our country off the street and keep them from killing innocent American citizens?

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more vile on Earth than the terrorists, absolutely nothing. They have no credibility in any way, form, or fashion because they are not human beings enough to fight a real fight with some-

body that can fight back. You never see these terrorists out there trying to get in a knock down drag out punch out one-on-one with anybody. They hide and sneak and skulk up and down alleys and plant bombs and kill innocent human beings who they do not even know or care about. And they kill them by the hundreds and occasionally, like in the World Trade Center, by the thousands.

Just today, praise God, a faulty bomb did not go off entirely in Great Britain. We are still waiting to find out the damage that was done. Again, Great Britain, the United Kingdom, has been attacked by these terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with the picture that I have just painted to fight these terrorists? I say there is nothing wrong with it. It has been a procedure used by the law forever. And yet we hear from someone that it paints the picture as if somebody is totally walking all over people's rights without any warrant.

You never heard him say, they get a warrant to go in and look at your records. They get a warrant and go in and look at your premises. You did not hear that spoken from the other side here tonight. So the American public gets deceived into thinking that there are police officers and law enforcement officers walking all over their rights. That is not the case. It is the same way we always have handled it. We have a search warrant.

□ 2245

It just infuriates me, having worked in the courts for 20 years, for people to step up and make statements that hide the real truth of the matter with regard to the procedures we use in our courts. I am proud to have been a judge for 20 years. I am proud of the American judicial system. I am proud of the law enforcement officers that every day put their lives in harm's way. I am proud of the lawyers fighting terror in this country right now. Just like our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, those brave men and women that put their lives on the line, our law enforcement officers put their lives on the line, too, fighting these horrible vermin right here in our country. I am offended, and I think we should all be really suspicious of someone who gives us only a partial truth and not the whole story.

I would be glad to have anybody look at my library records. Who cares what is in your library records? But you do care when you find out that terrorists go to libraries because they believe, sometimes truly and sometimes falsely, that if they get on a computer at a library that every day they clean the hard drive of that computer. They know if they seize their computer back home they might be able to find out they were talking to al Qaeda and to their operatives overseas. But if they go to the public library and use that computer and it gets erased every day, who is going to know?

Well, I tell you who is going to know. The law enforcement officer that executes that warrant and examines that hard drive to find out that they were doing that. They should not be able to hide in one of our greatest institutions, a public library. Benjamin Franklin, one of the founders of this country, gave us the concept of the public library in the United States. Why should our enemies think they can hide in a public library on a computer or in the stacks reading their bomb manuals and we cannot find out about it, especially when we have gone through the proper ordinary procedures that every court goes through to be able to seek those records.

And, in fact, there are more procedures in the PATRIOT Act protecting those records than there would be if you went to a grand jury and got a grand jury subpoena to get the exact same information. So let us not have partial stories told here in this House tonight. Let us have the whole story. And the whole story is we have taken and given to the intelligence community and those who are defending us from terrorists the same tools we have given to law enforcement over the years to protect us from the vermin that would destroy us from within. Now we can use it against our enemies from without who are hiding within our country to protect the American citizens so that people can get up and go to work in the morning and raise their children and go to the park at night and not be afraid that some creep is going to blow up the means of transportation that they are on.

That, Mr. Speaker, is what a patriot in this country ought to be concerned about. That is what I think we have done here tonight. We have reaffirmed the tools of the war against terror within the United States and given our law enforcement officers weapons just like those rifles that our soldiers are carrying in Afghanistan that will protect our freedom.

We should never be ashamed for what we did here today. We should be proud. And I am proud that a bipartisan effort passed through this House of Representatives. I think that we can count the numbers and we will see that that is the truth, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) said.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for allowing me to have a chance to stand up here for just a few minutes. I do want to point out one more thing before I stop. I served on that Committee on the Judiciary for 2 years, and I served side-by-side with my colleague here, the gentleman from Iowa. In fact, we were partners right there at each other's elbow. I can tell you that the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) runs a perfectly tight ship in his committee. When he says the rules are going to be abided by, they are abided by.

I will also say this. I will defy anybody to check the record. He never gave a member of the Republican mat-

ter one extra second in their time limit, but he constantly gave extra time to the minority. And almost every day I served on that committee, they would ask for additional time and he granted it. I personally have asked for additional time on that committee and he did not allow me to have that additional time. I think his reason is clear. We are the majority. We know the rules. We should get our job done within the time limit. And I respected him for it.

But the facts are, they have had advantages in that committee and they are in here crying like we did not treat them fairly. Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

I had better calm down here and thank my friend from Iowa and give him the opportunity to talk for a while, and I thank my colleagues for being patient with me.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the presentation of the gentleman from Texas here tonight and his service here in the Congress. In the time we have served together on the committee I came to know the gentleman's ability, and the way that the gentleman has spoken to the issue of Chairman SENSENBRENNER and how he handles that committee, the gentleman and I share that belief and respect for the way he has handled it.

We have a PATRIOT Act that has passed the floor of this Congress tonight because of the way it has been handled through that committee. And it will protect Americans for a long, long time to come.

Mr. CARTER. It is, and it is something we should be very proud of, and I am personally proud and I know the gentleman is too.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I certainly am.

I want to move along in this discussion and celebrate this accomplishment here today and look forward to a future where we have more confidence in our security and safety and the ability to ferret out these terrorists before they hit us. That is the key to the PATRIOT Act. Not to just put resources in place to clean up the disaster, but preempting the disaster and being there to cut it off before it happens.

One of the people, Mr. Speaker, who has worked with some of the disasters, worked with health care and the safety of the people, and a gentleman who also handled the PATRIOT Act with regard to the Committee on Rules, a professional absolutely in his own right, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa and it is indeed a pleasure to be spending a little of the time with him this evening.

Of course, the gentlemen that are on the Committee on the Judiciary and those who have been in the justice system and the judiciary, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), my good friend who just spoke, they understand this PATRIOT Act I think far better, Mr. Speaker, than most of the Mem-

bers of this body, certainly than this Member, this physician Member. But as the gentleman from Iowa pointed out, I did have the opportunity today as a member of the Committee on Rules to carry the rule on this reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act.

In the hearing before the Committee on Rules Members had an opportunity to come before the committee, just as they did in the markup during the Committee on the Judiciary hearings, that were so fairly conducted by Chairman SENSENBRENNER. And the same thing basically, Mr. Speaker, occurred under the leadership of my chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). It was a fair and balanced hearing. There were some 47 amendments that were requested. About half of them were granted with an opportunity to be discussed on this floor. Five were Democrat amendments and six amendments were cosponsored by Republican and Democrat. So it was a very bipartisan rule, and I think the essence of fairness.

Mr. Speaker, I would just mention one in particular, and that amendment this evening was approved before we finally had our final vote and approved the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act in an overwhelming fashion, and that was the Flake-Schiff amendment, No. 59, that basically states that the director of the FBI must personally approve any library or book store request for records by the FBI under section 215.

Section 215 is exactly what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) was just talking about, this ability to look at business records. I do not know how this became known as the library provision, but in fact no United States citizen since the PATRIOT Act was enacted has had their library records looked at. My colleague from Texas pointed out the importance, however, of being able to do that when you are dealing with a potential terrorist. And the Flake-Schiff amendment makes that even tighter, such that the director of the FBI must personally approve any library or book store request for records by the FBI under section 215.

Earlier this evening, before we started this special order hour, during the 5-minute special orders, Mr. Speaker, we heard the gentleman from Washington say that in the PATRIOT Act we have replaced the rule of law with the rule of fear. I have heard other Members on the other side of the aisle say in one of the amendments, in fact, Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit with instructions it was said, well, let us go back and let us have a sunset on all of these provisions so that in 4 years we can go back to the norm.

Well, my colleagues, I want to tell you right now, from the standpoint of this Member, I like the new norm. I do not want to go back to the old norm. I do not think we can afford to ever do that in this country. We are in a different world and we have got to deal with these terrorists.

We have heard the other side talk about, well, let us put more money behind homeland security, and we need to make sure that we check every train and every bus and every bit of cargo at every port in this country. I am all for that, whatever we can afford to do, but the point is, as we know from what just happened again today in London, you cannot stop these people at that point. You have to get to them before they get to that point. That is what the PATRIOT Act is all about. And it is not, Mr. Speaker, giving up our personal civil liberties to protect our citizens.

I think that we have struck a fair balance, and I commend the Members on both sides of the aisle on the Committee on the Judiciary that worked through the chairman and ranking member. The same thing with the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that worked through this bill. They are heroes. And I think today we came together in a bipartisan fashion and we reauthorized an act that has taken us almost 4 years to finalize.

And the proof is in the pudding. They have not struck us in this country yet. I feel very good about this bill, and I do not think we have sacrificed anybody's freedoms. Maybe inconvenienced people, yes. I am willing to put up with some inconveniences for the safety of my children and my grandchildren, and I think everybody in this chamber should feel that way. And most of us today.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank again the gentleman from Iowa for bringing this special order tonight in such a timely fashion, on the day we did reauthorize the PATRIOT Act, as amended, and it will, hopefully, take us many more years before we have anything like what happened to us on 9/11. And so with that, I yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) for his wise words, and I would like to associate myself with those remarks, particularly with the philosophy that we have a new norm; that we will not be going back to an old norm. The old norm allowed for a wall of separation between intelligence and prosecution, and that may have been the wall of separation that allowed the September 11 terrorists to attack us.

So the PATRIOT Act has removed that wall and allowed for that cooperation and that sharing of information and records, and I believe that has been part of the reason why we have not had a terrorist attack in this country since September 11. This reauthorization that took place in this Congress today, and hopefully will make its way to the President's desk fairly soon, is an authorization for the new norm, the norm where we will be with our intelligence people, with our FBI, and using our resources far more wisely than we were before.

But, Mr. Speaker, not a single piece of the PATRIOT Act allows the law en-

forcement people to access any data or information or anyone's private records in any fashion with more latitude than exists already in a criminal investigation prior to the passage of the PATRIOT Act. It is true today that there are more protections in the PATRIOT Act for civil liberties than there are for criminal investigations on the domestic side. It will stay that way, and in fact we have even expanded those protections.

Mr. Speaker, joining us tonight is the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), who has brought a real talent to this Congress and someone who I really enjoy working with and look up to and admire for the energy she brings to this task. Mr. Speaker, I yield such to her for her comments tonight.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa. He has done such a wonderful job on the Committee on the Judiciary. I had the opportunity to serve with him on that committee last Congress, and I appreciate his wisdom, his expertise, and just his common sense way of approaching legislation.

So often he will say that he was out on his tractor thinking about this, that, or the other, and let me tell you what I think. I think there are many of my constituents in Tennessee that certainly relate to how he goes about that thinking process, and we appreciate that.

□ 2300

Mr. Speaker, we did pass the PATRIOT Act today and reauthorize that. We did this with bipartisan support. I would remind the body this is one in a continuing string of items of legislation that have been passed with bipartisan support in this body. Whether it be bankruptcy reform or extension of the death tax, the energy bill or the highway bill, I could go on and on. Supplemental budget, the REAL ID Act, we have done it with bipartisan support.

I think there is a reason that the minority votes with the leadership of this House and the majority on our agenda, and it is because the leadership of this House is in touch with what the American people think, what is on their mind, what they are focusing on.

One of the things that we know that they are focusing on is security, whether it be moral security or economic security or health care security or homeland security; and our focus today has been on homeland security.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is right, today with bipartisan support we reauthorized the PATRIOT Act. We did it with good reason. We did it because it is a cornerstone and an important part of fighting and winning the war on terror. And winning is something we have to be certain we do.

Now, there are a couple of points that I did want to make, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time. We heard quite a bit of bravado

today about abuses, and we have a poster here. The PATRIOT Act, section 223 of the PATRIOT Act allows individuals to sue the Federal Government for money damages if a Federal official discloses sensitive information without authorization. Number of lawsuits filed against the government: zero. And the source on this is the Department of Justice.

One of my colleagues earlier said let us look at the PATRIOT Act by the numbers. This is a pretty important piece to remember. This is there for a reason, and it is important.

Here are some more PATRIOT Act facts by the numbers. One of the things that I would like to call attention to is the third point. Since the attacks on 9/11, the people arrested by the Department of Justice as a result of international terrorism investigations, 395; convictions, 212. This is so important for us to keep in mind because this shows the PATRIOT Act is working. There is a reason for this. There is a reason that we have that.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) has talked about, and the gentleman from Texas talked about, the libraries and the importance of having access to the library records. The other night as we were discussing the PATRIOT Act, we talked about you had to have a court order. It is not just the ability to go in and say let me look at So-and-So's records. There is a process. It is the same process which has been in place for years. When we were looking at drug kings and racketeering, our Federal agents would use those powers at that point, always going to a judge, always receiving that permission.

But we know and we have had testimony given that some of the suspected 9/11 hijackers actually went in and used public libraries. We do not want our public libraries to become safe havens for terrorists. Those are the reasons for those provisions.

All in all the PATRIOT Act is one of those items that will add to achieving the security that we want here in our homes, in our communities, in our schools, in our public places and gathering places. It is another tool that can be used by our intelligence community, our defense community, and our law enforcement community to be certain they gather information and have the ability to share information that is necessary to keep this Nation safe.

I again thank the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for the excellent work that was done on this bill, bringing it to the floor; and I thank the members who voted and supported and worked in a bipartisan manner to see this finished today.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

A number of other subjects pop to mind as I listened to the gentlewoman from Tennessee. One of them is with sunsets. That has been a subject matter here in this debate and throughout

the markup last week, that is, the argument that we should sunset the PATRIOT Act so we force hearings so we can have legitimate oversight, and that oversight comes back on a regular basis.

The argument against that is we have had 3½ years of demagoguery on the PATRIOT Act and not a single lawsuit has been filed, even though there is a special provision, section 223 of the code, that provides for a person to seek redress of damages if they have been violated by the PATRIOT Act. Not a single lawsuit has been filed.

Section 215, looking into bookstore records and library records and the computer records in the public library, that major subject matter that has been brought before our national discussion board and on the Web for now several years, not a single time has the PATRIOT Act been used to look in bookstores or library records. But we want to preserve the ability to do that with law enforcement investigations. We know that the 9/11 terrorists did use the libraries, and we know that one of the optimum drop points for spies and surveillance and intelligence work is a library. You can write a note, put it in a certain page in a library book, put the book back on the shelf, and walk out of the library. That is the drop. And the pickup is the person that comes behind, knows the name of the book and picks up that information.

We must maintain that ability to look into libraries and bookstores, and we must also maintain appropriate government oversight responsibility. We preserved a couple of sunsets in the PATRIOT Act; but the fact remains, if the majority or minority party determines that they want to have hearings, if they are hearing complaints from their constituents, if there are complaints that are being filed or lawsuits being filed, we can call for hearings at any time, whether majority or minority, and get those hearings and get that public oversight and make the appropriate changes. I accept that. It is our responsibility to do.

One of the other points is the NSL, the national security letter. The argument is that could be used without appropriate oversight. In fact, the national security letter does not allow any FBI officer to read any documents and search into any telephone records or financial records except for the fact that it lets them look at the record of the records, the record of potential financial records or computer records to see if there is a pattern. If the pattern is there, then they have to go forward to get the warrant; and that warrant under the PATRIOT Act has a higher standard than under a criminal investigation.

That covers some of the things that have been an issue. We have quite a group of people here tonight. I am feeling a little out of place. I have a judge on my right, a judge on my left, and a judge behind me. When I look at these three judges, if I were actually King, I

would appoint them all to the Supreme Court; but since I cannot, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for his remarks.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman does not mind, I would like to have a dialogue. I would like to have a “quadolog” with our other colleagues here. I think we could have a good discussion because something good happened today. It was not just today; it was not just the hours and hours we spent on debate on this issue today. It was not just the 12 hours that we had during markup, or the hearings. I thought it was 11, the chairman said we had 12 hearings. I knew it was a lot. Or the dozens of witnesses we had on the PATRIOT Act, the oversight, the review of what needed to be.

□ 2310

But I do not now how it struck the gentlemen, but I think most of them were in here when the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) was making a floor speech just earlier tonight and he made the comment that we need to stop fear mongering. He told us to stop fear mongering. I do not know what news he is watching, but I do not think we have to say anything about fear. We are trying to fear, like that fine President Roosevelt did, “nothing to fear but fear itself,” but we do have to deal with people who do want to destroy us. And the news even this very day shows what demagoguery that is, to tell us to stop fear mongering when we have terrorists bent on our destruction, they are blowing up the subways, trying to blow up subways. In London those people have done a great job of resilience and trying to stand tall and firm through these crises. And we could have an attack tomorrow. I know the gentleman from Washington is on the Committee on the Judiciary with me at the current time. I do not know if my colleagues had a chance to go by and look at the top secret documents. I have had people say, Well, I would tell you, but I would have to kill you. They told me that if I told anybody that did not have the clearance then they would kill me for telling somebody else.

So, anyway, we cannot go into that stuff, but we can say that we know they have stopped terrorists by use of the PATRIOT Act. It has been used to keep Americans alive. That is not fear mongering. That is looking at the facts and just calling it like it is.

And I would like to point out, with all the mess that gets thrown into the air, there has been bipartisan debate. There has been rigorous debate. There are people on the other side of the aisle with whom I disagree. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) and I have had some rigorous discussions, debate. He has never lied to me, and he has been very honest and forthcoming. I voted for one of his amendments today, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), one of his amendments today. And the truth is on

the PATRIOT Act, there were six Democrat amendments that we took up today. Five of them passed. I do not know about my colleagues here, but I voted for five of them. I thought they were good amendments. There was one person that surprised me. Normally that particular Democratic congressman does not have all that good amendments and had a good one today. One of the things I like about being a Republican is the freedom we have. We can read the amendments, we can determine whether it is a good idea or not, and vote for it.

So I did not know the gentleman's feelings, but he had to notice there was bipartisan support and the Republicans were open to good ideas.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks on this. And I have read some of those records associated with the PATRIOT Act investigations. And, in fact, I read some of those records throughout an investigation I am somewhat familiar with, and if we read through that carefully with the idea of what this would have been like without the payment PATRIOT Act, what would we have had for information? I think with many of those investigations, it would easy to make the case that we would have had a disaster at the other end rather than an arrest and prosecution at the other end of that. So to preempt this is what we need to be doing, and I am absolutely all for that.

I cannot resist marking that the individual that accused us of fear mongering is also the individual that went to Iraq and surrendered before we liberated the Iraqis and the individual who refused to put his hand over his heart when he led Pledge of Allegiance here one morning to open the House Chamber for the day. So I would put that only within that context. I do not what drives that kind of thought process.

I am very proud of the patriots we have in this Congress, and they are on both sides of the aisle. They just seem to be in a bigger number over here where we have the majority at the present time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, being a Republican has allowed me to take issue with people I have deep respect for.

On this very Patriot Act, I have had some severe concerns. I am grateful that we had Democratic and Republican amendments that fixed the concerns that I was concerned about. And I believe with the sunset provisions we have, which of course it is a little bit different than what the Senate came out; so there will be some debate. There will be some give and take, but we will sunset provisions coming out of conference.

But through this process I talked personally with the Attorney General. He contacted me, Alberto Gonzales. I have great respect for him. He had been

on our Supreme Court there in Texas. He is a good man and he works for a great President. We have had frank discussions. There were things we disagreed on. I have talked with the Assistant Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General. I talked to the White House legislative liaison on these issues. We have been able to have a great debate, and we have come to a meeting of the minds on most of the things we disagreed about.

But I tell my colleagues I appreciate the freedom we have had to work on this because it is not about Democrats or Republicans. We are talking about the future of the United States of America, and I appreciate the dedication and the massive debates we have had on this.

And sometimes it scares me the way we make laws and we see each other running through the halls to try to get back to another hearing and vote on some issues. But we have done something good for America. And there is always room for improvement. There are always things we can do better. I do not know about my colleagues, but to talk about not doing or our job with oversight, as long as I am on the Committee on the Judiciary, we are going to do keep doing oversight. That is our job. We are going to do it.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman has brought out an important point here. And that is that this debate was envisioned to produce a product that brought view points in from each side and a properly functioning legislative process. Whether it be a city council or county supervisors or the State legislature or the United States Congress, we have an open debate and we put our ideas out there, and as the ideas get debated, the amendments are offered. Some are successful and some are defeated and some are negotiated. And, in fact, we negotiated the sunset to be a 10-year sunset. Some people thought it ought to be considerably sooner than that. Some thought we ought to split the difference out to a 4 or 5 year. Some people thought we should not have sunsets, and I was actually among those. And yet the negotiation came down to a 10-year sunset. That was a compromise that would get the ball moving down the field, and that is what we resolved on that particular issue. But when we reach that static position when each side makes their case in a legitimate open debate and we arrive at that center position that we can all live with, then we move forward. And that is something that has been classic in the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act, and that has been how the debate has brought us all together to the middle so that we could have this bipartisan vote of 257 votes here to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting here when we look at

this to note: Since the attacks of 9/11, the number of individuals arrested by the Department of Justice as a result of international terrorism investigations, 395. That is 395 that there was probable cause to believe were trying to do us harm, trying to destroy our way of life, and some of those have been very recent. And the PATRIOT Act, as the gentleman has said, wow, what a help to find these people before they kill fine innocent Americans.

The number of those individuals convicted, we are not talking about indicted and we are not talking about probable cause. We are talking about beyond a reasonable doubt. Two hundred and twelve of them have already been convicted. And the former judges here with us, they know that probably some of those that were convicted were because some of the others that were arrested and charged turned evidence and helped them out on those convictions.

So it is doing its job. We may have another attack tomorrow. But thank God it will not be because we did not give the law enforcement and the intelligence community what they needed to try to protect us.

And one thing I would like to add about that too. We know historically that evil people try to destroy good wholesome ways of life. They just do. Evil is around in the world. But thank God. Over the years there have been dark ages, there have been periods when people have been subverted and put into real terrible situations.

□ 2320

We have seen it even in the present day. But I thank God I live in a country where we are determined not to let that happen here, not now, not on our watch.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to another judge from Texas, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa yielding, and I appreciate his passion for the Constitution. The gentleman is very familiar with that sacred document and the history of the document, and the gentleman, as he does always, carries a copy of it in his pocket in case somebody wants to read it. As a former judge, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is beholden to the Constitution.

I was just counting up the years of judicial service between the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) and myself. The three of us have been on the bench with over 50 years of judicial experience.

Having served in Houston for over 22 years, I tried only criminal cases. I tried about 25,000 felony cases, numerous death penalty cases, and they were all criminal cases. I say that because the PATRIOT Act deals with crime, it deals with international terrorists. As judges, we dealt with local terrorists.

The Constitution is that sacred document that we have always been sworn to uphold. I think my record, as well as these two judges' records, speaks pretty clearly that we are strong law-and-order judges, if we can use that phrase. People that were convicted in my court, they were held to a high standard and there were consequences for those actions. Some of them are serving long sentences even tonight.

But also I, too, am a very strong supporter of the Constitution, especially the Bill of Rights. Some people think that a former law-and-order judge or a law-and-order judge is not a person who supports the Constitution. That is just not true. The first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, make us really a unique type of country because we show the worth of the individual.

The PATRIOT Act, some have been concerned about the allegations in the PATRIOT Act, whether or not it puts a dent in those Bill of Rights. I have studied the document, including the amendments tonight that were passed. I think all of those amendments and the document itself proves a point, that in this country we can have civil rights, individual liberty, and we can have security. We can have both.

History has always shown that people, all people throughout the world, were willing to give up freedom in the name of security, democratic countries and non-democratic countries. But in this country, we, through the PATRIOT Act, are continuing to show we can have both, we can have security and we can have civil liberties.

The PATRIOT Act does support that. I do not believe there has been one provision of the PATRIOT Act that has gone to court for judicial review that has been found unconstitutional. I think that is worth noting, that not one section has been found unconstitutional.

The PATRIOT Act calls for judicial review, as all of our laws should call for judicial review, and to make sure that judges throughout the land review the action of law enforcement. That is the standard of conduct in this country, it always has been and it always will be. The PATRIOT Act supports that.

So I am quite a supporter of the PATRIOT Act, especially as it has passed the House, as the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) says, with bipartisan support. It is something that is necessary.

There has been a lot of scare tactics that have been used and rhetoric about the PATRIOT Act, but the bottom line is the people who commit crimes against us need to fear the rule of law, need to fear the consequences for violating our safety and our freedom.

In this country we do have a lot of freedom, but yet we take a lot of precautions. Most folks tonight are doing the same thing before they went into their homes. Wherever they are in the United States, they probably locked the doors. They probably put chains on the front door and deadbolts. Some

people sleep with bars on their windows. We do that because of crime, of local criminals, outlaws and terrorists. That is a way that we have chosen to live because of the nature of criminal conduct in this country.

I think the PATRIOT Act is a statement that we are not going to live in fear, we are not going to live in terror, and we are not going to be afraid of those people who threaten us in remote portions of the world and come to try to make us continue to be imprisoned in our own homes, in our actions each day.

So I think this act goes a long way in making sure that we have freedom in this country and that we have liberty in this country and that we have security in this country, to let people know, woe be to you if you choose to commit a crime against the people of the United States, because this act gives law enforcement the ability to track those people down, hunt those people down and bring them to justice. That is really what the Constitution is about.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding, and I will yield back to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, re-claiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I appreciate the contributions here tonight.

I would like to take us back a little bit and recap what has happened here in the last 3½ going on 4 years, and that is that, yes, we were attacked from within and the vulnerabilities that are inherent in a free society were exploited by people that came here and people who have a hatred for our freedom and a hatred for anyone whom they declare to be a infidel. Their number one and number two targets, preferred targets, are Jews first and Christians second, but western civilization is their main enemy.

That thought process, that cult, that barbarism, is bred around the world in regions where they are taught in madrassas to hate anyone not like them, to kill anyone not like them.

There are something like 16,000 madrassas, hate teaching schools, just in Pakistan alone, and if you look at those schools around Saudi Arabia and if you look at the funding stream that runs around the world, that network is what brought al Qaeda into the United States for that September 11th attack, that network is what attacked London on July 7, and that may be the network that also attacked London today, although we do not have the records in today. It is part of the network that attacked Spain on that March 11 day that changed the political destiny of Spain and caused them to make a decision to pull their troops out of Iraq.

The worldwide war that we are up against, the PATRIOT Act addresses it domestically so that our FBI and our CIA, our domestic investigators and our terrorism investigators will cooperate together.

They will be able to do roving wiretaps in an era when trading cell phones

on the run is almost a normal procedure. We do not go back to a landline any longer and go home to make our phone calls. Our phone is with us. Our communication is where we are, and we have to have an act that catches up with technology and allows for roving wiretaps.

We have to be able to look at some financial records and some credit card records and maybe some bookstore and library records to see the pattern. If the pattern justifies a warrant to go in and take a deeper look, then a Federal judge will have to provide that warrant, a higher standard than if it were a regular criminal investigation.

We need all of these tools to preempt the terrorist attacks on us in this country, and those tools so far have been part of the reason why we have not been attacked again. Many of us believe though that those attacks are inevitable, and I am one of those people, and I think they will be worse next time. I think we need all of these tools and more.

By looking around the world also, the President's doctrine, the Bush doctrine that he laid out several weeks after the September 11, 2001, attacks, that the media just caught up with after he gave his second inaugural address here last January, the Bush doctrine of promoting freedom and liberty around the world, is that free people never go to war against never free people. That would be consistent with the history of this country.

So in Iraq and in Afghanistan we have created the habitat for freedom, and the Afghans have gone to the polls and voted and the Iraqis have gone to the polls and voted and helped select their leaders and are directed their national destiny and established a climate and culture where there is a growing desire for freedom.

If that freedom can continue to take root, and if that freedom can be contagious across the Arab world, from Afghanistan to Iraq and Saudi Arabia and Egypt and Syria and Jordan and the Middle Eastern countries all across the region, if freedom can be manifested there and take root in establishing the fashion that it is here, the way it is with our brothers in Great Britain, then there is a climate there that does not breed terrorists any longer. We will have eliminated the habitat for terror by replacing that habitat of a radical Islamic society with that of freedom and democracy.

#### □ 2330

Now, that does not solve all the problems. If that happens, we also know that from the London bombs, that we have second generation terrorists, sons of moderate Muslims that travel and establish themselves within Great Britain, and these children were either born there or naturalized there, but they were taught in a moderate Muslim, peaceful society, and yet they still found their Madrassas in the mosques and they still bought into the culture

of death, and they still blew themselves and 56 or so Londoners up and wounded however many others.

These terrorists, these radical Islamists, according to Benazir Bhutto, a former Prime Minister of Pakistan, told me there are not very many, perhaps 10 percent, are sympathetic to al Qaeda, but of about 1.2 or 1.3 billion Muslims in the world, 10 percent is 120 million to 130 million. I call that a lot; not "not very many," but quite a lot of potential either terrorists or terrorist supporters and sympathizers, and we cannot kill them all and we do not want to, but we have to defend ourselves from them.

Mr. Speaker, the Jihadists that are killing Londoners and Americans and Spanish and other Muslims around the world, these terrorist attacks that are taking place, they are parasites that live amongst the host, the Islamists. The terrorists are the parasites; the hosts is Muslim, the Muslim religion. So they feed off of the host, they travel with the host and on the host, they are funded through the host, through the mosques, so they can go anywhere in the world and find themselves a small core, a cell of sympathizers, a sleeper cell, and the network of funding is collected around the world, and the networks of communications and the network of training and where the training camps are all can be fed through the network of the Muslim religion.

I will call upon moderate Islam, if you exist out there, and I believe you do, then cleanse thy selves, rid yourselves of this parasite. We cannot do that for you. We can work with you and we can cooperate with you, but until you do, there will not be peace in this world, there will not be safety in this world, and there will not be an end to this war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank it is worth noting that these people who are bent on our destruction are so consumed with evil and hatred that they would blow up sweet little innocent Iraqi children. They are not just killing Americans, they will kill anybody that stands in their way. And the only thing these people in Iraq, we have met them, we have talked to them, they want to be, they want to live. Yet, they are so consumed with hatred they would blow those innocent people up, Muslims themselves, and they blow them up so treacherously.

I believe that all of us here share the same passion. Mr. Speaker, I do not want people at home in America to think, well, they think they have done it all, now that they have passed the PATRIOT Act. This is an ongoing thing. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance. It is an ongoing battle that we fight here for America.

But another thing that we have to take up is securing our borders. This is one of the tools, securing our borders will be another, and I think the gentleman shares my passion that that is

another thing we have to take up, it is another thing we have to do to protect America. I am proud to stand, to sit, to debate, to be on the same side with the gentleman.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, His Honor, Judge GOHMERT, and Judge POE from Texas, Judge CARTER from Texas, the gentlewoman from Tennessee, and the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY), all of us who have participated in this tonight. We have had an opportunity to discuss the PATRIOT Act and kind of put the final frosting on the cake here in the House, I hope, and maybe bring a better and more objective perspective to the PATRIOT Act for the American people, Mr. Speaker.

So we have a long road ahead of us. We will work with the PATRIOT Act to provide the maximum amount of domestic security and will continue the Bush doctrine to eliminate the habitat that breeds terrorists around the world. We are going to ask for the rest of the countries in the world to shut off the funding, shut off the training, shut off the feed mechanism that funds these terrorists. We are going to ask the moderate Islam to purge the parasites from your midst; you are the only ones that can do it. We are going to take a look at our borders, both north and south, and we are going to slow down that human river of about 3 million illegals that poor across there, that huge haystack of humanity that, amongst that 3 million or so, are hundreds and perhaps thousands of terrorists, certainly thousands of criminals that prey upon Americans.

Mr. Speaker, if we can all get that done by the end of the 109th Congress, I am going to take the day off.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KING of Iowa) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today and July 25.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 25, 26, 27, and 28.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today.  
Mr. KOLBE, for 5 minutes, July 22.  
Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, July 25.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 544. An act to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the improvement of patient safety and to reduce the incidence of events that adversely effect patient safety; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 3377. An act to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

#### A BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on July 19, 2005 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 3332. To provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 22, 2005, at 9 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2943. A letter from the RMA, Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Common Crop Insurance Regulations: Nursery Crop Insurance Provisions (RIN: 0563-AB80) received July 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2944. A letter from the Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics, USMC, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of the decision to convert the Transportation Operations and Maintenance Services functions at Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina to contractor performance, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2945. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Average Pro-

curement Unit Cost for the Global Hawk System Program exceeds the Acquisition Program Baseline values by more than 15 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2433(e)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2946. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Analysis, Department of the Army, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2947. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2948. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2949. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2950. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2951. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2952. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2953. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2954. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2955. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified materials supplied to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2956. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting certified