

# ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Illinois, the whole number of the House is 430.

## RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)1 of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

### H. RES.—

Whereas in an interview published by National Journal Magazine on March 7, 2008, John Brennan, a foreign policy adviser to Sen. Barack Obama (D-IL) and former CIA official who once served as head of the National Counterterrorism Center, stated, "There is this great debate over whether or not the telecom companies should in fact be given immunity for their agreement to provide support and cooperate with the government after 9/11 . . . I do believe strongly that they should be granted that immunity, because they were told to do so by the appropriate authorities that were operating in a legal context, and so I think that's important . . . And I know people are concerned about that, but I do believe that's the right thing to do . . . I do believe the Senate version of the FISA bill addresses the issues appropriately;";

Whereas a bipartisan group of 25 state attorneys general recently wrote a letter to House of Representatives leaders in support of the Senate bill's passage, stating in part "A bipartisan majority of the United States Senate recently approved S. 2248 . . . But until it is also passed by the House of Representatives, intelligence officials must obtain FISA warrants every time they attempt to monitor suspected terrorists in overseas countries. Passing S. 2248 would ensure our intelligence experts are once again able to conduct real-time surveillance. . . . With S. 2248 still pending in the House of Representatives, our national security is in jeopardy;";

Whereas Ret. Admiral Bobby R. Inman, former director of the National Security Agency and deputy director of the CIA told the Austin-American Statesman last month that Americans are more vulnerable without the Protect America Act and "the only way for the country to prevent future terrorists attacks is to increase its ability to eavesdrop on their communication;";

Whereas Glenn Sulmasy, a Harvard national security expert, wrote in the February 15 edition of The Tampa Tribune that "the global technologies of cell phones, computers, the internet, and other such means of communication—which were not, and could not have been, envisioned by the drafters of FISA in the 1970s—have changed the way information moves around the world. . . . Herein lie the gaps meant to be filled" by the Protect America Act of 2007;

Whereas in its bipartisan findings the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence concluded in Oct. 2007 that "electronic communication service providers acted on a good faith belief that the President's program, and their assistance, was lawful;";

Whereas 20 Senate Democrats supported final passage of S. 2248, including Senate In-

telligence Chairman Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) and Kent Conrad (D-ND), Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee;

Whereas on February 12, 2008, after passage of S. 2248, the Senate amended the bill H.R. 3773 with the text of S. 2248 and sent the amended bill back to the House of Representatives for its consideration;

Whereas Sen. Kent Conrad (D-ND) wrote in a Feb. 28 letter to the editor of The Fargo Forum, "The FISA law needed reform to account for modern information technology, current patterns of communication and the nature of the threats facing our country. . . . [The bipartisan Senate bill] does include strong privacy safeguards and considerable judicial oversight to ensure that our fundamental freedoms are protected. . . . Leaving [telecommunications companies] completely subject to civil litigation could cause problems in vital intelligence collection in the future;";

Whereas 21 House of Representatives Democrats expressed support for the bipartisan Senate FISA bill in a Jan. 28 letter to Speaker Pelosi stating that, "we have it within our ability to replace the expiring Protect America Act by passing strong, bipartisan FISA modernization legislation that can be signed into law and we should do so—the consequences of not passing such a measure could place our national security at undue risk;";

Whereas in an editorial published by the Charleston Post and Courier on February 29, 2008, House of Representatives Democrat leadership was described as "indeed causing a potentially dangerous gap in the nation's defenses" and "creating an unnecessary cloud of uncertainty in a critical area of intelligence operations where there should be great clarity;"; and

Whereas the failure of the House of Representatives to expeditiously consider the bipartisan Senate-passed Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 Amendments Act of 2008 has brought discredit to the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives should immediately consider a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773.

□ 1645

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may offer his resolution.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution just noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

### H. RES.—

Whereas in an interview published by National Journal Magazine on March 7, 2008, John Brennan, a foreign policy adviser to Sen. Barack Obama (D-IL) and former CIA official who once served as head of the National Counterterrorism Center, stated, "There is this great debate over whether or not the telecom companies should in fact be given immunity for their agreement to provide support and cooperate with the government after 9/11 . . . I do believe strongly that they should be granted that immunity, because they were told to do so by the appropriate authorities that were operating in a legal context, and so I think that's important . . . And I know people are concerned about that, but I do believe that's the right thing to do . . . I do believe the Senate version of the FISA bill addresses the issues appropriately;";

Whereas a bipartisan group of 25 state attorneys general recently wrote a letter to

House of Representatives leaders in support of the Senate bill's passage, stating in part "A bipartisan majority of the United States Senate recently approved S. 2248 . . . But until it is also passed by the House of Representatives, intelligence officials must obtain FISA warrants every time they attempt to monitor suspected terrorists in overseas countries. Passing S. 2248 would ensure our intelligence experts are once again able to conduct real-time surveillance. . . . With S. 2248 still pending in the House of Representatives, our national security is in jeopardy;";

Whereas Ret. Admiral Bobby R. Inman, former director of the National Security Agency and deputy director of the CIA told the Austin-American Statesman last month that Americans are more vulnerable without the Protect America Act and "the only way for the country to prevent future terrorists attacks is to increase its ability to eavesdrop on their communication;";

Whereas Glenn Sulmasy, a Harvard national security expert, wrote in the February 15 edition of The Tampa Tribune that "the global technologies of cell phones, computers, the internet, and other such means of communication—which were not, and could not have been, envisioned by the drafters of FISA in the 1970s—have changed the way information moves around the world. . . . Herein lie the gaps meant to be filled" by the Protect America Act of 2007;

Whereas in its bipartisan findings the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence concluded in Oct. 2007 that "electronic communication service providers acted on a good faith belief that the President's program, and their assistance, was lawful;";

Whereas 20 Senate Democrats supported final passage of S. 2248, including Senate Intelligence Chairman Jay Rockefeller (D-WV) and Kent Conrad (D-ND), Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee;

Whereas on February 12, 2008, after passage of S. 2248, the Senate amended the bill H.R. 3773 with the text of S. 2248 and sent the amended bill back to the House of Representatives for its consideration;

Whereas Sen. Kent Conrad (D-ND) wrote in a Feb. 28 letter to the editor of The Fargo Forum, "The FISA law needed reform to account for modern information technology, current patterns of communication and the nature of the threats facing our country. . . . [The bipartisan Senate bill] does include strong privacy safeguards and considerable judicial oversight to ensure that our fundamental freedoms are protected. . . . Leaving [telecommunications companies] completely subject to civil litigation could cause problems in vital intelligence collection in the future;";

Whereas 21 House of Representatives Democrats expressed support for the bipartisan Senate FISA bill in a Jan. 28 letter to Speaker Pelosi stating that, "we have it within our ability to replace the expiring Protect America Act by passing strong, bipartisan FISA modernization legislation that can be signed into law and we should do so—the consequences of not passing such a measure could place our national security at undue risk;";

Whereas in an editorial published by the Charleston Post and Courier on February 29, 2008, House of Representatives Democrat leadership was described as "indeed causing a potentially dangerous gap in the nation's defenses" and "creating an unnecessary cloud of uncertainty in a critical area of intelligence operations where there should be great clarity;"; and

Whereas the failure of the House of Representatives to expeditiously consider the bipartisan Senate-passed Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 Amendments Act of