Federal funds to the American Printing House for the Blind annually for this purpose;

Whereas, for 150 years, the American Printing House for the Blind has identified the unique needs of people who are blind and visually impaired and has developed, produced, and distributed educational materials in Braille, large print, and enlarged print throughout the United States;

Whereas the American Printing House for the Blind serves more than 58,000 blind and visually impaired Americans each year; and

Whereas the American Printing House for the Blind each year attracts visitors from across the country and around the world to learn about the history of the education of the blind and to exchange information on the evolving needs of the population it serves: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the 150th anniversary of the establishment of the American Printing House for the Blind in Louisville, Kentucky, and

(2) recognizes the important role the American Printing House for the Blind has played in the education of blind and visually impaired students throughout the United States.

COMMENDING THE LSU TIGERS FOOTBALL TEAM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 422, which was submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 422) commending the Louisiana State University Tigers football team for winning the 2007 Bowl Championship Series national championship game.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 422) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 422

Whereas the Louisiana State University Tigers football team won the 2007 Bowl Championship Series national championship game, defeating The Ohio State University by a score of 38 to 24 at the Louisiana Superdome in New Orleans, Louisiana, on January 7, 2008;

Whereas the Louisiana State University football team won the Southeastern Conference Championship on December 1, 2007, defeating the University of Tennessee by a score of 21 to 14 in the championship game at the Georgia Dome in Atlanta, Georgia;

Whereas the Louisiana State University football team won 12 games during the 2007 season;

Whereas the Louisiana State University football team won 7 games against nationally ranked opponents during the 2007 season;

Whereas the Louisiana State University football team set a total of 12 school offensive records during the 2007 season including 541 points scored, averaging 38.6 points per game and 6,152 yards in total offense;

Whereas Craig Steltz was named first-team All-American and led the Southeastern Conference in interceptions;

Whereas defensive tackle Glenn Dorsey was awarded the Bronko Nagurski Trophy, the Rotary Lombardi Trophy, the Outland Trophy, and the Ronnie Lott Trophy, making him the most honored defensive player in Louisiana State University history;

Whereas quarterback Matt Flynn threw 21 touchdown passes during the 2007 season, including a career-high record of 4 touchdowns in the Bowl Championship Series national championship game;

Whereas running back Jacob Hester rushed for 1,103 yards during the 2007 season, scoring 12 touchdowns, and completed his collegiate football career of 364 carries without fumbling or turning over the football;

Whereas Louisiana State University head coach Les Miles has led the Tiger football program to 34 wins, 20 Southeastern Conference victories, 14 wins over nationally ranked opponents, and 3 double-digit win seasons as head coach; and

Whereas Louisiana State University is the first team to win 2 Bowl Championship Series national championship titles, having won 2 titles in 5 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Louisiana State University Tigers football team for winning the 2007 Bowl Championship Series national championship game;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, and support staff who were instrumental in helping the Louisiana State University football team during the 2007 football season;

(3) congratulates the citizens of Louisiana, the Louisiana State University community, and fans of Tiger football; and

(4) requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to Louisiana State University for appropriate display.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I regret I wasn't standing here with the congratulations of the Red Sox beating the Cleveland Indians earlier last year.

SEEKING THE RETURN OF THE USS ''PUEBLO''

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 423, which was submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 423) seeking the return of the USS Pueblo to the United States Navy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 423) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 423

Whereas the USS Pueblo, which was attacked and captured by the Navy of North Korea on January 23, 1968, was the first ship of the United States Navy to be hijacked on the high seas by a foreign military force in more than 150 years;

Whereas 1 member of the USS Pueblo crew, Duane Hodges, was killed in the assault, while the other 82 crew members were held in captivity, often under inhumane conditions, for 11 months;

Whereas the USS Pueblo, an intelligence collection auxiliary vessel, was operating in international waters at the time of the capture, and therefore did not violate the territorial waters of North Korea;

Whereas the capture of the USS Pueblo resulted in no reprisals against the Government or people of North Korea and no military action at any time; and

Whereas the USS Pueblo, though still the property of the United States Navy, has been retained by the Government of North Korea for 40 years, was subjected to exhibition in the North Korean cities of Wonsan and Hungham, and is now on display in Pyongyang, the capital city of North Korea: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) desires the return of the USS Pueblo to the United States Navy;

(2) would welcome the return of the USS Pueblo as a goodwill gesture from the North Korean people to the American people; and

(3) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit copies of this resolution to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State.

ELECTING LULA JOHNSON DAVIS SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY OF THE SENATE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 424, which is at the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Lula Johnson Davis, of Maryland, be and she is hereby, elected Secretary for the Majority of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I congratulate the new appointee.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 424) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 2008

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, January 24; that on Thursday, following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day,

and the Senate then resume consideration of S. 2248, the FISA legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Mr. DODD, the senior Senator from Connecticut, the Senate then stand adjourned under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

FISA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, let me begin my remarks, I know tomorrow we are going to begin more formal debate on the FISA legislation. This is to be a continuation of the effort, for those who wonder what this is, this is the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. This was the debate which was the last item of debate before the holiday break back in mid-December.

The legislation was withdrawn and was not completed. Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator BOND, the chairman and the ranking Republican, and members of the Intelligence Committee, Senator LEAHY, Senator SPECTER, and members of the Judiciary Committee, Republicans and Democrats have worked on this legislation.

I wish to begin my comments by thanking them for their efforts on trying to develop a piece of legislation that would reflect the realities of today.

There has been some history of this bill. My intention this evening is to spend some time talking about a section of this bill dealing with retroactive immunity, which my colleagues and others who followed this debate know I spent some 10 hours on the floor of this body back in December expressing strong opposition to that provision of this bill; not over the general thrust of the bill.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act is critically important to our country. It provides a means by which you can have a proper warrant extended or given out by governmental authorities to collect data, information, critical to our security.

For those who know the history of this, it dates back to the 1970s as a result of the Church Committee's efforts revealing some of the egregious activities of the Nixon administration in listening in, eavesdropping, wiretapping, without any kind of court order, warrant or legal authorities.

So the Congress, working in a bipartisan fashion, I think almost unanimously adopted the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in the late 1970s. Since that time, this bill has been amended I think some 30 or 40 times, maybe more, I know it has been a number of times over the years. In nearly every instance, almost unanimously amended to reflect the changes over the years and the sophistication of those who would do us harm or damage, as well as our ability to more carefully apprehend or listen in or gather information that could help us protect our Nation from those who would do us great harm.

That is a very brief history of this. We are once again at a situation to try and modernize and reflect the needs of our Nation. There is a tension that that exists between making sure we are secure and safe and simultaneously doing it in a manner in which we protect the basic rights of the American citizens.

There has been this tension throughout our history. But we are a nation grounded in rights and liberties. It is the history of our country. It is what made us unique as a people going back more than two centuries.

Over the years, we have faced very significant challenges, both at home and abroad. So we have had a need to provide for the means by which we collect data and information that would protect us, to make us aware of those who would do us harm, and yet simultaneously make sure that in the process of doing that, we do not abandon the rights and liberties we all share as Americans. The Constitution does not belong to any political party. I have said that over and over again. Certainly today, as we debate these issues involving the FISA legislation, I hope everyone understands very clearly my objections to the provisions of this bill have nothing to do whatsoever with the important efforts to make it possible for us to collect data that would keep us safe, but I feel passionately that we not allow this vehicle, this piece of legislation, to be used as a means by which we reward behavior that violated the basic liberties of American citizens by granting retroactive immunity to telecom companies that decided, for whatever reason, to agree, at the Bush administration's request, to provide literally millions of telephone conversations, e-mails, and faxes, not for a month or 6 months or a year but for 5 years, in a concerted effort contrary to the law of our land.

So that is what brings me to the floor this evening. It is what brought me to the floor of this body before the holiday recess, talking and expressing my strong opposition to those provisions of this legislation. There are other concerns I would point out about this bill that other Members will raise. Senator FEINGOLD has strong objections to certain provisions of this legislation, others have other ideas I am confident have merit.

But I commend Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator BOND. They have done the best job, in many ways, of dealing with these sets of questions. But why in the world we decided we are going to grant retroactive immunity to these telephone companies is what mystifies me, concerns me deeply, because of the precedent-setting nature of it.

There are those who would argue that in order for us to be more secure, we must give up some rights, that you have to make that choice. You cannot be secure, as we would like to be, if we are unwilling to give up these rights and liberties.

I think this false dichotomy is dangerous. In fact, I think the opposite is true. In fact, if you protect these rights and liberties, that is what makes us more secure. Once you begin traveling down that slippery slope of deciding on this particular occasion we are going to walk away from these rights and these liberties, once you begin that process, it gets easier and easier to do.

In this case, we are talking about telecom companies. We are talking about communications between private citizens, e-mails, faxes, phone conversations. Why not medical information? Why not financial information? When is the next example going to come up where companies that knew better, not should have known better, knew better, in my view.

One of the companies that may have complied with the Bush administration's request, in fact, was deeply involved in the drafting of this legislation in the 1970s, in putting the FISA bill together. This was not some first year law school student who did not know the law of the land in terms of FISA, they knew the law, they understood it.

In fact, there are phone companies that refused to comply with the request of the Bush administration absent a court order. Those companies said: Give us a court order, we will comply. Absent a court order, we will not comply.

So there were companies that understood the differences when these requests were made more than 5 years ago.

So this was not a question of ''everybody did it,'' the same argument that children bring to their parents from time to time, or ''we were ordered on high,'' in what is known as the Nuremberg defense which asserts that there were those in higher positions who said we ought to do this. That was the defense given in 1945 at the Nuremberg trials by the 21 defendants who claimed they were only obeying orders given by Hitler. Though this situation before us is obviously enormously different, a similar argument, that the companies were ordered to do this, defies logic and the facts of this case.

With that background and the history of the FISA legislation—and there are others who will provide more detail—let me share some concerns about this particular area of the law. I will be utilizing whatever vehicles are available to me, including language I will offer to strike these provisions, to see to it that this bill does not go forward with retroactive immunity as drafted