

about a simple gun storage law, you know? We don't have it. And there is a series of children that have killed their siblings or their grandparents or their parents by having a gun lying around not locked, because there's no law, no requirement. Some States have it. We've done it and done a good job in bringing down that loss of life in Texas.

I'll be introducing legislation. I've been working with the General and the Department of Justice to ensure that we find a good balance. But there's a lot of work.

Sequestration is literally closing down teachers and child care units and cutting off civilians at military bases and stopping ICE enforcement officers and Customs and Border Protection and numbers of others are put on furlough because of sequestration.

Couldn't we get rid of H.R. 19? It says eliminate sequestration, go back to the budget or at least go to conference and treat the American people with respect so the services that you need are not shut down because of sequestration.

Why are we talking about perjury from the top legal officer where there has been no proven evidence that anything that he said in the Judiciary Committee was contradictory to what happened to Mr. Rosen? There's no proof. He recused himself. He's not involved. There's no indictment, no intention of indictment on the premise of what this particular issue was about, the leakage of national security matters.

□ 1350

And so my plea today is that we can do better. We can do better by our youngsters. In essence, we can stop the bleeding. We can do better by our children for health care. We can do better by better gun laws. We can do better by getting a better budget. We can do better by serving the American people. We can do better by building you new roads and bridges and infrastructure, fixings the dams, stopping the flooding.

All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, as I close, and I thank you, is to thank you, Mr. Holder, for your service. Do not resign. And to my colleagues, let's get to work to help the American people. I believe that will in fact be our finest hour.

I yield back the balance of my time.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*
Hon. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism,
Homeland Security, and Investigations,
Committee on the Judiciary, House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN GOODLATTE AND CHAIRMAN SENSENBRENNER: This responds to your letter to the Attorney General, dated May 29, 2013, requesting information about the Department's policies with respect to investigations involving members of the media and the Attorney General's knowledge of an investigation into the unauthorized disclosure

of classified information that was then published in a news article in June 2009.

The Attorney General takes the unauthorized disclosure of classified information by those who have committed to protecting it very seriously, especially as such disclosures can cause grave damage to our national security. The Attorney General also has the utmost respect for the vital role the media plays in an open society. To ensure the proper balance of these important interests, the President has directed the Attorney General to conduct a review of Department policies regarding investigations involving the media, and as part of that process, the Attorney General has initiated a dialogue with news media representatives and other interested parties. Furthermore, as the Attorney General explained in the hearing before you on May 15, 2013, he supports the media shield legislation currently under consideration by the Senate, which provides robust judicial protection for journalists' confidential sources while also enabling the Department to continue to protect national security and enforce criminal laws. We look forward to working with Congress on this measure.

The Department's current policies provide separate processes for subpoenas and search warrants in the course of investigations involving members of the news media. As you know, 28 C.F.R. §50.10 governs the issuance of subpoenas to members of the news media, including subpoenas seeking their telephone toll records. This regulation requires the Department in every case to consider the balance between the public's interest in the flow of information and the public's interest in effective law enforcement and the fair administration of justice. Thus, the regulation requires the government to take all reasonable alternative investigative steps before considering issuing a subpoena to a member of the news media or for the telephone toll records of a member of the news media. This regulation has not been substantively amended in more than 30 years, and is a subject of the review process currently being undertaken by the Attorney General at the President's direction. Search warrants for materials in the possession of a journalist whose purpose is to disseminate information to the public are governed by the Privacy Protection Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. §2000aa, et seq. That law outlines the limited circumstances under which the Department may seek Court approval for a search warrant. Specifically, under the Privacy Protection Act, the government may seek work product materials or documents in the possession of a journalist only where there is probable cause to believe that the journalist has committed or is committing a criminal offense to which the materials relate, including the crime of unlawfully disclosing national defense or classified information.

Your letter also asks for additional information about the investigation of the unauthorized disclosure of classified information to a reporter in 2009. At the outset, it is important to note the difference between an investigation and a prosecution. When the Department has initiated a criminal investigation in the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, the Department must, as it does in all criminal investigations, conduct a thorough investigation and follow the facts where they lead. Seeking a search warrant is part of an investigation of potential criminal activity, which typically comes before any final decision about prosecution. Probable cause sufficient to justify a search warrant for evidence of a crime is far different from a decision to bring charges for that crime;

probable cause is a significantly lower burden of proof than beyond a reasonable doubt, which is required to obtain a conviction on criminal charges. Prior to seeking charges in a matter, prosecutors evaluate the facts and the law and make decisions about who should be prosecuted. The regulation governing the issuance of subpoenas to the news media described above, which provides for consideration of the public's various interests, also requires that the Attorney General must approve any charges against a member of the news media. We are unaware of an instance when the Department has prosecuted a journalist for the mere publication of classified information.

The unauthorized disclosure of classified information that appeared in a June 2009 news article was a serious breach that compromised national security. The Federal Bureau of Investigation conducted a comprehensive inquiry into that unauthorized disclosure, and after exhausting all other reasonable options, the government applied for a search warrant for information in the reporter's email account believed to be related to the source of the unauthorized disclosure. The affidavit in support of the search warrant satisfied the requirements of the Privacy Protection Act, based on the facts alleged, and a federal judge granted that warrant. The Attorney General was consulted and approved the application for the search warrant during the course of the investigation. Ultimately, as you know, although a Grand Jury has charged a government employee with the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, prosecutors have not pursued charges against the reporter. At no time during the pendency of this matter—before or after seeking the search warrant—have prosecutors sought approval to bring criminal charges against the reporter. The Attorney General's testimony before the Committee on May 15, 2013, with respect to the Department's prosecutions of the unauthorized disclosure of classified information was accurate and consistent with these facts. As the Attorney General explained, these prosecutions focus on those who "break their oath and put the American people at risk, not reporters who gather this information."

We hope that this information is helpful. Please do not hesitate to contact this office if we may be of additional assistance in this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

PETER J. KADZIK

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

EVENTS OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today is a very important day, the day of the anniversary of the invasion on D-day during World War II. There is also another important aspect about today, because we learned about the administration's collecting of massive information, private information, about every Verizon customer's phone numbers, all the calls they made, outside the country and within the country. Staggering. It makes one think,

well, gee, if this administration was gathering information and got a court order, a secret court order, to get all this information from Verizon, then most likely they did from the other carriers as well. And as a Verizon representative has pointed out, look, when we get a court order demanding that we turn over information, then we have to turn it over. And that is what we do in a country where we believe in the rule of law, we are supposed to follow the law.

But what is staggering for those of us who have debated over the FISA courts, where you have a real, legitimate, nominated and confirmed Federal judge, presides over information that is considered so secret that the disclosure of even the request for information would create dangers to national security. We've debated that in the Judiciary Committee. That included my friend, Ms. JACKSON LEE. We've had these debates over these issues.

I was talking with my friend with whom I often disagree in Judiciary, a Congressman from New York, JERRY NADLER, and actually I recall him indicating during debates that if we didn't rein in the power of the Federal Government, these were the types of things that could happen. And I have to admit today that for any predictions or concern on the part of JERRY NADLER that if we gave the power under article 215 or section 215—basically, the PATRIOT Act, the FISA courts—that it could and would be abused, Mr. NADLER was right. We are now seeing affirmation of that.

But I do think it is important that we understand what we're talking about with regard to these phone records, and as a preface I think it's important to look at the order from the United States Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, Washington, D.C. It's entitled, Mr. Speaker, *In Re Application of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for an Order Requiring the Production of Tangible Things from Verizon Business Network Services, Inc. on behalf of MCI Communication Services, Inc. d/b/a Verizon Business Services*. It cites for its authority in this the law at volume 50 of the United States Code, section 1861.

In this order that is granting the request of this Justice Department under this Attorney General, who is under fire for other issues, it says, "The court having found that the application of the Federal Bureau of Investigation"—which is under the auspices of the Attorney General, the Justice Department—"for an order requiring the production of tangible things from Verizon Business," et cetera, the court finds that it satisfies the requirements of 50 U.S.C., section 1861.

It goes on to say that accordingly, these things are ordered, and it orders, and I'm quoting now:

An electronic copy of the following tangible things: all call detail records or "telephony metadata" created by Verizon for

communications (i) between the United States and abroad; or (ii) wholly within the United States, including local telephone calls.

Further down, it says:

Telephony metadata includes comprehensive communications routing information, including but not limited to session identifying information (e.g., originating and terminating telephone number, International Mobile Subscriber Identity (IMSI) number, International Mobile station Equipment Identity (IMEI) number), trunk identifier, telephone calling card numbers, and time and duration of call. Telephony metadata does not include the substantive content of any communication, as defined by 18 U.S.C., section 2510(8), or the name, address, or financial information of a subscriber or customer.

Now, this comes on the heels of information about just how invasive this administration had gotten when they went after the records of the Associated Press, the phone information of many, many phone numbers, and some of them coming from right up here in the area where the reporters use. This is in the United States Capitol. Many times these phones up here are used by reporters to call Members of Congress, who have another constitutional privilege under the Constitution that provides privilege for the information that is provided for or to a Member of Congress. It's not unlimited. But that's on top of the freedom of the press that's also granted in the Second Amendment.

It is amazing when our Attorney General said, gee, in essence, this was like the most egregious or one of the most egregious national security leaks I had ever heard about. It was so serious, we had to go after this material, and then we find out there were only a handful of people in the entire administration who knew the information that got leaked. And instead of just going without a warrant—they don't need a warrant to get their own administration phone call data. They didn't even need a court for that. It's their data. They could have gone to the handful of individuals that knew the information that got leaked and checked their phone logs to see who they called. But instead of doing that, they decide to go on a fishing expedition for all of this telephone information about the Associated Press.

□ 1400

They apparently wanted to know who the AP talks to, what they do, what they know, who they know. Let's get all of this information.

They didn't need that for their pursuit of the leaker. They didn't need it at all. They could have gone straight to their own sources and got what they needed from there; and then once they have a subject within the AP, if any one, then they could go for that information.

And as a former judge, if somebody came and said we have found the source of the leak, here's one of the five-or-so people that knew the information, he called this reporter at this

number, and so we have probable cause to believe that the leak was made to this reporter, and put other information in there that raises it to the level of probable cause to allow the judge to let them take a look at that one reporter's single phone logs.

But, no, they didn't do that. They went on an incredibly vast and very chilling fishing expedition.

And then we have the Attorney General testify before our Judiciary Committee, and I know my friends mentioned this before I got up, my friends on the other side of the aisle. They were talking about how he is such a great Attorney General, in essence, and certainly never perjured himself.

But I heard what he said. I've heard it replayed over and over; and when he says he wasn't aware of, he had not heard of, he never participated in—he didn't think it was a good idea was the basics of what he said—of ever prosecuting a reporter.

And then within a week or so we find out, actually, he approved of an affidavit that went before a judge with the request for a warrant from the court against James Rosen with Fox News.

Now, I've had people wake me up at all hours of the day and night. I've had people call when I was awakened at 2 or 3 in the morning and say, Judge, we need to come by your house. This is really serious. And they'd come by; and if they had enough data in their affidavits that established probable cause, then I would grant a limited warrant.

But there were times I would get upset with a law officer that bothered me with an affidavit and a request that clearly didn't have probable cause. We aren't going to grant that. If you're not sure if you have probable cause, talk to the DA's office, run it by them before you bring something in that clearly does not establish probable cause.

Fortunately, the law officers were so good that we normally dealt with that normally that was not a problem, but sometimes it was. And any responsible judge takes that very seriously.

And sometimes you would get a request for a warrant for information; and you go, okay, you've established probable cause in your affidavit, but your request is so global and broad, or so ambiguous, I can't sign the order you've prepared. Sometimes I would interlineate in the order and make it more specific. Sometimes they would know that I was going to be restrictive, and they would leave blanks for that.

But then to find out that the court granted this administration's demand, with an affidavit supporting it, under oath, that they needed all the records that Verizon had on phone calls inside the United States and to places outside the United States, and the judge just grants it.

And now, following on the heels of learning that the IRS targeted political enemies, political opponents, people in Tea Parties, people that were very pro-Israel, other groups, a group that was very pro-marriage between a

man and a woman, like has been the tradition in this country for the entire history of the country, until now, when it's come into question, and some think that nature totally failed when it created, biologically, a mating between a man and a woman, that it screwed up, it should have been a man and a man.

Well, that's a difference of opinion. But under this administration, they felt like it was worth going after and preventing a group like National Organization for Marriage from stepping up and standing on the traditional marriage and being able to deliver that message.

Now, it didn't prevent them from quickly granting legal status to groups that felt otherwise, or if somebody was related to somebody in the administration. We've seen those examples.

But, gee, they also knew within the IRS that if they granted or denied a request, well, a denial could be immediately appealed. And so in order to prevent justice from being done, prevent people from having the opportunity to politically express themselves as a group, they just sat on them, 1, 2, 3 years, to prevent them from being able to go public as a group.

I was shocked that a reporter asked the question, well, you groups, you were coming begging to the IRS. You're the ones that asked for legal status. And I'm sure this is a very fine reporter, but it just showed the ignorance—and there's nothing wrong. We're all ignorant of different areas—but showed the ignorance of where we have gotten to in this country where the Internal Revenue Code is so oppressive, if you, as an individual go out and say look, I don't have much money, I'm a working man, I'm just barely getting by. You're a working woman, you're just barely getting by, but if we pool our money, we might be able to express ourselves politically, maybe buy a commercial, or maybe send out flyers, or maybe buy a billboard, but something. If we pool together, maybe we can have an impact in politics on an issue like marriage.

And if you pool your money like that, and you don't have permission from the IRS, then they're going to come after you because you've got to have a legal status to do things like that now in America.

And it is further indication as to why this infernal Internal Revenue Code and the incredibly huge number of regulations that were never passed by any elected representative, they're just generated day after day after day by some bureaucrat somewhere, I used to say in a cubicle, but apparently we find out they've got some pretty luxurious offices and they spend millions on their conferences they go to.

Apparently they haven't spent enough on learning to line dance because I wasn't very impressed with their line dancing, but that's not part of their job, so maybe they need to get into a different area or a different profession.

But they have to obtain legal status if they're going to do anything politically, or the IRS can come after them for not doing so. So we have forced groups into getting government approval before they can ever express themselves politically. It's astounding.

And when you find out this administration has used so many aspects of its power to chill or prevent political opposition to their positions, to their reelection, then it really gets scary when you find out they're just out there wanting everybody's information on everybody they called in the country and out of the country.

And we had some pretty significant debates in Judiciary under FISA and under the PATRIOT Act; and we were assured, no, the law makes very clear you can only get information from an American citizen if they're in a foreign country and the foreign law allows that and they call a known or suspected terrorist.

But under these laws, we can't just go get information about an American citizen's personal records. We can't do that without probable cause they've committed a crime.

□ 1410

But under these incredible powers of the PATRIOT Act and the ability to go to the FISA court, as they did here, and get a secret order, we were told and we debated and some felt like even if an American citizen is in a foreign country, we don't think you ought to be able to get that American citizen's phone data, even if you just pull it out of the air. We don't think you should be able to get that.

So there was debate about those things. Well, what if they're calling a known terrorist, and we've got American intelligence agencies gathering in a foreign country and we can get that without a warrant? It's out there floating around in the air. We can get that. And this was debated—Yeah, but they're an American citizen. You ought to leave them alone. And some of us felt if they're an American citizen in a foreign country and our intelligence agencies can get intelligence data without violating the foreign law, then you need to know as an American citizen when you go into a foreign country, you may have our own intelligence agencies getting information about your telephone calls as long as they're not violating the law of the country they're in. And that's the way I felt.

But we were always assured that unless there was probable cause to believe an American citizen was calling a known or suspected terrorist or a hostile foreign government, that kind of thing, then no, we don't go after American citizens' information. And especially not if there's a call from an American citizen to another American citizen. That's none of our business, unless there's probable cause to believe a crime is being committed. Then we find out they have actually found a judge that signed off on this thing, and they got all this information.

Now I know there's some—even Republicans—who would say, Gee, I don't care if the government has my phone number. They've gotten it so they can go after terrorists. Well, unless you're a terrorist, the American government has no business monitoring what all you're doing and who you're calling, especially this administration, with all the abuses we've already seen. It's wrong. It should not be occurring. But they've done so.

There was a tweet today by Ace of Spades. The tweet was: We've all got an Obama phone now. Well, apparently we do. Because this administration is following every call being made by every phone in America—at least the ones on Verizon. So that leads you to believe they've probably gotten it from other information, too.

And I do appreciate my colleagues' on the other side concern that enough good things about ObamaCare are not coming out because some of us are concerned about the Attorney General's perjury. And I would submit, humbly, that a major reason not enough good things are coming out about ObamaCare is because there are not a bunch of good things coming out. People are losing their insurance. They're getting in trouble. And that is a big problem.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has approximately 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you.

This is the anniversary of D-Day. So many Americans died on the beaches at Normandy. So many free countries gave the last full measure of devotion there on those beaches. It wasn't Normandy but rather another beach where one of my constituents, who has since passed away, said that when they were landing at Anzio, they were doing it so early in the morning, there was no sunlight. But the Axis powers had such powerful lights that you could read a book in their landing craft. And they'd been taught that when the landing ramp went down when they got to shore, they were to all run out at the same time. And as they got closer, they heard the machine gun bullets going back and forth across the front of the ramp. He said, We were all so scared. We know when that ramp went down, we were all going to die.

And one of the guys—Paul Stanley recalled his name, I do not—but he exemplified the spirit of America. He finally looked around and said, Guys, we all know if we run out of this landing craft the way we've been trained, we're all dead. So here's what we're going to do. I'm going to go first. Everybody is going to put your weapon in your right hand and grab the belt of the man in front of you and we're going to run out single file. Some of us won't make it. But that way some of you have a chance.

Paul Stanley said he was third. The two in front of him were killed and everybody else made it. That's the spirit

of America that landed on the beaches of Normandy to take on the Axis powers who sought to take freedom from free people.

It was on this day in 1944 that Franklin Roosevelt said this prayer on national radio. Today, he would probably be excoriated because of some of the terminology.

He said:

My fellow Americans, last night, when I spoke with you about the fall of Rome, I knew at that moment that troops of the United States and our allies were crossing the Channel in another and greater operation. It has come to pass with success thus far. And so, in this poignant hour, I ask you to join with me in prayer.

Almighty God, our sons, pride of our Nation, this day have set upon a mighty endeavor, a struggle to preserve our Republic, our religion, and our civilization, and to set free a suffering humanity. Lead them straight and true; give strength to their arms, stoutness to their hearts, steadfastness in their faith.

They will need Thy blessings. Their road will be long and hard. For the enemy is strong. He may hurl back our forces. Success may not come with rushing speed, but we shall return again and again, and we know that by Thy grace, and by the righteousness of our cause, our sons will triumph. They will be sore tried, by night and day, without rest until the victory is won. The darkness will be rent by noise and flame. Men's souls will be shaken even with the violences of war.

For these men are lately drawn from the ways of peace. They fight not just for the lust of conquest. They fight to end conquest. They fight to liberate. They fight to let justice arise, and tolerance and good will among all Thy people. They yearn but for the end of battle, for their return to the haven of home. Some will never return. Embrace these, Father, and receive them, Thy heroic servants, into Thy kingdom.

And for us at home—fathers, mothers, children, wives, sisters, and brothers of brave men overseas—whose thoughts and prayers are ever with them, help us, almighty God, to rededicate ourselves in renewed faith in Thee in this great hour of great sacrifice.

Many people have urged that I call the Nation into a single day of special prayer. But because the road is long and the desire is great, I ask that our people devote themselves in a continuance of prayer. As we rise to each new day, and again when each day is spent, let words of prayer be on our lips, invoking Thy help in our efforts. Give us strength, too—strength in our daily tasks, to redouble the contributions we make in the physical and the material support of our Armed Forces. And let our hearts be stout, to wait out the long travail; to bear sorrows that may come, to impart our courage unto our sons wheresoever they may be.

And, O Lord, give us faith. Give us faith in Thee, faith in our sons, faith in each other, faith in our united crusade. Let not the keenness of our spirit ever be dulled. Let not the impacts of temporary events, of temporal matters of but fleeting moment, let not these deter us in our unconquerable purpose.

With Thy blessing, we shall prevail over the unholy forces of our enemy. Help us to conquer the apostles of greed and racial arrogances. Lead us to the saving of our country, and with our sister nations into a world unity that will spell a sure peace, a peace invulnerable to schemings of unworthy men. And a peace that will let all men live in freedom, reaping the just rewards of their honest toil.

Thy will be done, Almighty God. Amen.

Franklin Roosevelt, on this day in 1944.

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

□ 1420

FRAGER'S FIRE/APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for 30 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak a few minutes this afternoon on two subjects. The first involves both a wonderful evening for any Member of Congress and a tragedy in our Capitol Hill neighborhood nearby. The second involves the upcoming appropriations period.

Mr. Speaker, last night was a terrific evening if you happened to be there. Members of Congress—it looked like equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans; we are part of the so-called No Labels Caucus; these are Members of Congress who are trying to get beyond the needless polarization in this House—decided to go to the baseball game together, the Nationals Stadium, our new, terrific stadium here in the District of Columbia. It was a Nats-Mets game. I'm sorry to report the Nats lost badly. They also played the night before and won, if I may also report that.

I was coming back from this really wonderful bipartisan experience—we ate hot dogs together, we ate & drank together—me, wine, a lot of my colleagues beer—and we talked about anything but the House. We talked about what people have said Members need to do more. We talked about the game and what was happening in our lives.

I sat next to a Member I had never met before even though he's on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee with me. His name is RODNEY DAVIS. It was so funny to hear him talk about how I didn't know him, he said he was the lowest man on the totem pole. He apparently was, at least in seniority on our committee the last member and I'm near the top in seniority. We laughed about that. He laughed about how narrow was his margin in getting to the House. I mean, all of this was fun. And, yes, the game—the game, of course, was the baseball game.

He told me about his 12-year-old twin boys. That was really so touching—how he missed a suspension vote because he was coaching the baseball team where his boys played. So that was the setting of the evening. You can't help but feel good when you come home from an evening like that.

Because I have for many years lived on Capitol Hill—I represent the District, I am a native Washingtonian and I now live on Capitol Hill—I didn't have to go far from Nationals Stadium to come home. But I returned to find a pungent smell in the air because the

storied neighborhood hardware store, Frager's, was in the process of being burned to the ground. I could get only so far along Pennsylvania Avenue, then everyone had to take a detour. Even this morning, parts of Pennsylvania Avenue, Southeast were closed off because of, even then, hot spots from the fire. It was like losing a friend—a human friend, that is.

My first thought went to the employees; there are about 65 of them. I'm grateful to have learned that it appears no one was injured or hurt. This pungent odor—remember, this is a hardware store, so there's all kinds of things to go up in flames and all kinds of smells. And even though I'm a number of blocks—about six to ten blocks—I could smell the odor very deeply from the fire. In fact, the city announced that everyone should go in and turn on their air conditioning and not come out for a while.

The employees were still in the building—some of them—but got out of the way of the fire, and no one was injured or killed. I understand that there may have been a couple of firefighters who were injured. We certainly wish them the very best and thank them for fighting what was a horrendous, hot, and unusual fire in the middle of a wonderful residential neighborhood.

When a store that's been in the same location for 100 years goes up in flames, you begin to realize that it was more than a neighborhood hardware store, after all, and that after almost 100 years in the same location it had embedded itself into our Capitol Hill community as an institution all its own. It stirred in me something like the emotion that I felt when the Eastern Market—our historic, old market that was even older than Frager's—went up in flames a few years ago. Those are parts of your neighborhood we cannot imagine being without.

We have since rebuilt Eastern Market so that it looks very much like it always did—because it's a historic building and great pains were taken to see to it. Now, I'm not yet sure they will be able to do that at Frager's. After all, the Eastern Market is a publicly owned market. That's not the case with this private business, which has thrived in our neighborhood through the era of mega-hardware stores. Frager's had survived when the era of the corner grocery and the corner store of every variety seem to have gone by the way.

It says everything about Frager's that it could survive in that kind of competition, where these multipurpose mega-hardware stores are accessible if you want to get in your car. I guess that may be the key to why the best of these corner institutions have survived for so long.

Frager's was not a state-of-the-art building. That's part of the reason it could burn down. You go in and they have squeezed goods into Frager's that you will not find at our wonderful mega-hardware stores. There are