

has managed to twist this bill into one that only he finds acceptable.

As a Senior Member of the Intelligence Committee, I offered an amendment that would have extended the sunset for Section 6001 of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 until 2010. Section 6001, also known as the "lone wolf" provision, allows the government to define any individual non-US person as a terrorism suspect, even if that person has no clear ties to a foreign government. This new authority has been in place for a mere seven months and has yet to be subjected to meaningful review. Extending the sunset would give Congress a significant period of time in which to assess the impact of this considerable new authority. Members of the Intelligence Committee agreed; and my amendment had the support of almost every single Member of the Committee, both Republican and Democrat. Inexplicably, the amendment was later removed by the Judiciary Committee.

I asked Chairman SENSENBRENNER point blank in the Rules Committee hearing yesterday why my amendment was removed from the bill. His response—"I don't know." He doesn't know, then who does? I guess somewhere between the fourth floor of the Capitol and the Judiciary Committee, my amendment must have been lost.

I believe the partisanship and incivility of the Judiciary Committee has unfortunately, infected the bipartisan manner in which the Intelligence Committee has always approached its work. Regardless, I am still committed to pursuing my amendment and working with the conference committee in a bipartisan fashion to reinsert my amendment into this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is disappointing that, once again, I find myself protesting the manner in which legislation has been brought to the floor. Over sixty amendments were offered in the Rules Committee yesterday yet only twenty have been made in order. Forty amendments, including my own, will not be debated today. Even Representative HARMAN, the ranking Member on the Intelligence Committee, offered four amendments that the Rules Committee refused to make in order. In fact, none of the amendments offered by any Intelligence Committee Democrat is made in order under this rule. This is absolutely inexcusable.

America's national security is of paramount importance, but our security needs will not be met by limiting debate on the issue. The American people deserve a Congress that has fulfilled its Constitutional role by considering each and every idea put forth by its Members to improve this and all pieces of legislation.

Without a doubt the underlying bill could be improved. For example, this bill amends Section 213 of the Patriot Act to require the government to notify the subject of a search warrant within 180 days of the search but does not sunset the provision. Statistics provided to Congress show that only eleven percent of the searches conducted using this power were related to terrorism—eleven percent! Given that this overbroad search and seizure power is abused almost ninety percent of the time, isn't Section 213 the very model of a section in need of a sunset? Again, amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee addressing these issues but they were not made in order.

While no one in this body, Democrat or Republican, objects to this country's need to fight terrorism, the sweeping, un-checked powers

provided to our government through the provisions of the Patriot Act and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 are beyond worrisome. The inclusion of sunset provisions allows us to examine the practical effects, both positive and negative, before permanently allowing such a broad expansion of government power.

As a freedom loving society, we must diligently monitor any infringement on our civil liberties to ensure it is justified. But this bill, allowing the virtually unchecked monitoring of the average citizen on the flimsiest of justifications, is too broadly tailored to defend. After careful consideration and examination, I cannot support a bill that takes away so much while offering so little. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this closed rule and no on H.R. 3199.

HONORING TROY UNIVERSITY'S
TRANSFORMATION INTO "ONE
GREAT UNIVERSITY"

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 22, 2005

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a unique university based in my congressional district in southeast Alabama which is truly transforming itself into a global force in education.

On July 29th, Troy University, formerly Troy State University, will officially join its 60 campuses in 11 countries and 13 time zones across the world into "One Great University."

This change will unite the entire student body of each campus. All curriculums will be the same at each campus making it easier for students to transfer within the system. Besides a common curriculum, the students will now have unified identification cards, the same student handbook, as well as pay the same fees.

The unification of Troy University is more than a clerical notation, however. A long established leader in higher education in the Southeastern United States will officially raise its banner high enough to be seen around the world. This is a very proud moment for Troy University and Alabama.

I would also like to congratulate Chancellor Jack Hawkins and his staff on their great efforts to make this transition a success. Their hard work and dedication will be recognized and remembered for years to come as Troy takes center stage in uniting our world through the promise of higher education.

USA PATRIOT AND TERRORISM
PREVENTION REAUTHORIZATION
ACT OF 2005

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 21, 2005

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3199) to extend and modify authorities needed to combat terrorism, and for other purposes:

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, four years ago I voted against the bill that became

the "USA PATRIOT Act," more commonly called simply the "PATRIOT Act."

I agreed that our law-enforcement agencies needed increased power and more tools to fight terrorists. But I also thought then—and still think today—it was imperative for Congress to proceed carefully in order to protect Americans' civil liberties.

I take very seriously my duty to preserve and protect our Constitution. For me, this is a matter of conscience—and four years ago I concluded that I could not fulfill my duty and also vote for the legislation.

However, I took some comfort from the fact that a number of the most troublesome provisions of the new law were temporary and would expire unless Congress acted to renew them.

And the imminent expiration of those provisions is the reason this bill is before us today.

I think the value of such "sunset" provisions is shown by the debate we are having today. It is evidence that requiring Congressional action to renew agencies' authorities can and does result in ongoing Congressional oversight and periodic reconsideration.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today does not fully follow the good example of our procedure 4 years ago. Instead, the bill would make permanent no fewer than 14 of the 16 provisions of the original "PATRIOT Act" that were covered by the law's "sunset" clause—as well as other new authorities provided by last year's bill to reform the intelligence community—and under the bill the other two will not "sunset" for a full 10 years.

That is one of the main reasons I will vote against this bill. But it is not the only reason.

Neither the expiring provisions nor the other sections of the "PATRIOT Act" are limited to cases involving terrorism. This makes even more troubling their potential for abuse or misuse in ways that intrude on Americans' privacy and civil liberties.

Because of that potential, over the last four years more than 300 communities and seven States, including Colorado—governments representing over 62 million people—have passed resolutions opposing parts of the "PATRIOT Act."

Much of that public concern—a concern I share—has focused on the possible effects on the privacy of patrons and customers from the application of section 215 of the "PATRIOT Act" to libraries and bookstores.

Section 215 expanded the FBI's ability to obtain "any tangible thing" under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Previously, the government could obtain records only from hotels/motels, storage facilities and car rental companies, and only if the records pertained to agents of a foreign power. Now, it can seek "any tangible thing" from anyone at all as long as the information is relevant to an investigation.

Many of us think this is so broad that the government could investigate consumers' reading and Internet habits and private records (such as credit card information, medical records, and employment histories), without the requirement of relevance to any criminal activity that applies in grand jury investigations.

I would like to think that this authority will not be abused. But we cannot be sure that will never occur, and I think there are reasons to worry.

I understand, for example, that the American Library Association has confirmed that