

Meanwhile, similar efforts were going on in the House with the House Science Committee. The conference report that is on its way to the President is a result of bipartisan, bicameral compromise and cooperation.

Reconciling the House and Senate bills started before Memorial Day and involved the Senate Committees on Commerce, HELP, and Energy. In the House, it involved the Committees on Science and Education and Labor. All in all, it took the efforts of over 70 staff to complete this legislation. I want to thank the members of these committees for their bipartisan effort and long-term vision on keeping our Nation competitive.

I want to thank in particular the staff of these committees, all of whom put in long, hard hours, in many cases juggling the demands of other bills that their committee had on the floor. In the Senate, once things got underway 2 years ago, the process by which we operated was completely transparent—there was never a meeting held that did not include staff from both sides of the aisle. There was a remarkable lack of acrimony, and a striking absence of partisanship. I could not be more proud of this process and the staff that undertook it, and I think the conference report we passed last night reflects that process. It should serve as a model for the way this body should operate.

Mr. President, let me quote from the "Rising Above the Gathering Storm"—

Without a renewed effort to bolster the foundations of competitiveness, we can expect to lose our privileged position. For the first time in generations, the nation's children could face poorer prospects than their parents and grandparents did. We owe the current prosperity, security, and good health to investments of the past generations, and we are obliged to renew those commitments in education, research, and innovation policies to ensure that the American people continue to benefit from the remarkable opportunities provided by the rapid development of the global economy and its not inconsiderable underpinning in science and technology.

This legislation represents that much-needed renewed commitment to bolstering our national competitiveness.

Much of the good work that was contained in the legislation was a result of the report "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," which was issued by the Academies of Science at the urging of several of us in the Senate. This report set out specific actions that needed to be taken by this country in order to keep our economy competitive in the world. Clearly, most of those recommendations have been adopted, and now they have been legislated into law as part of this America COMPETES Act.

I thank my colleagues—Senator ALEXANDER, of course, Senator DOMENICI, Senator ENSIGN, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator KENNEDY, Senator ENZI, Senator INOUE, Senator STEVENS. A great many people in the Senate had a major part in this legislation. I thank them.

I also want to particularly thank the staff. The hard work that went into this legislation was truly extraordinary. There were numerous staff from both sides of the aisle who worked very hard to make this effort a success.

From the Commerce Committee: Beth Bacon, Jeff Bingham, Jean Toal-Eisen, Christine Kurth, Chan Lieu, Jason Mulvihill, Floyd Deschamps, and H.J. Derr; from the HELP Committee: Beth Buehlman, David Cleary, Anne Clough, David Gruenbaum, Lindsay Hunsicker, David Johns, Carmel Martin, Roberto Rodriguez, Missy Rohrbach, Ilyse Schuman, and Emma Vadehra; from my personal staff: Michael Yudin, who does the work in our office on education issues, was an essential part of the effort from the very beginning and made enormous contributions to the education sections of the report; Melanie Roberts, an AAAS policy fellow in my office, did as well, worked hard; from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee: Bob Simon, our staff director; Mia Bennett; Kathryn Clay; Sam Fowler; Amanda Kelly; Judy Pensabene, who is the committee counsel for Senator DOMENICI; and Matt Zedler; on Senator ALEXANDER's staff: Matt Sonnesyn and Jack Wells are the two with whom I am most familiar who have worked so hard; from Senator LIEBERMAN's staff: Craig Robinson, Colleen Shogan, and Rachel Sotsky.

I also want to acknowledge the great work done by our leadership staff: Jason Unger and Mark Wetjen on Senator REID's staff, and by Libby Jarvis on Senator MCCONNELL's staff. Let me express my special thanks to the Senate Legislative Counsel's Office for their tireless work in getting this legislation ready so it could be completed before the August recess: Liz King coordinated the conference efforts with the utmost patience; John Baggaley, Gary Endicott, Gary Koster, Amy Gaynor, and Kristin Romero.

Finally, let me mention John Epstein in my own office and who works on the Energy Committee staff. I am convinced that if it were not for John's tireless efforts to move this legislation forward and his unfailing commitment to a collegial, bipartisan process, the bill would not have been able to be passed in this timeframe. I am extremely grateful to him for his persistence and integrity throughout the process. Also, let me particularly thank Trudy Vincent, my legislative director, for the great work she did on this legislation from its inception to its completion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Missouri is recognized.

FISA MODIFICATIONS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I hope I have the attention of all of my colleagues because I believe we

have an opportunity—we have an absolute necessity—to pass the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act modifications prior to leaving for the August recess. It is absolutely critical for our national security that we change the law which currently, by its application, is denying our intelligence community a very significant portion of the signals intelligence they could collect on al-Qaida and other terrorist sources who may well be planning another 9/11 attack on the United States.

It has been publicly disclosed that al-Qaida's discussions are more active now than they had been since 2001 and even more since 2001, but we are, because of the application of this law, partially deaf to those communications. If we are to protect our homeland, the people of America, as well as our troops in the field, we have to collect better intelligence because that is our only significant weapon to fend off the attacks of those, through their misguided ideas, who want to inspire terror and kill as many Americans as possible.

The Director of National Intelligence, Mike McConnell, whom I believe the people in this body have come to know and respect, told us in April that it was urgent that we reform the FISA law. He sent us a proposal on April 27. He appeared before our committee in open hearings on May 1 and discussed at length the challenges and the threat we face and the need for revision of the FISA law. I had hoped we would move on that at the time, but some wanted to get more Department of Justice opinions. Nothing happened. I offered my version. My version, on behalf of Republican members, drew no response.

The DNI, Director of National Intelligence, Admiral McConnell, came before a session of the entire Senate in S-407, our classified security area, a month ago, and he told us about the need to reform the law and to reform the law now. A significant number—not a majority—of this body was there, but everybody who heard him speak recognized the absolute, compelling necessity to move. Since time was running out, he offered a slimmed-down proposal.

There are a number of things which need to be done with respect to FISA that can wait, and to accommodate the concerns of some on the other side of the aisle, he agreed to hold off dealing with issues such as carrier liability and streamlining FISA. But he presented to us a measure that he said was critically important, that must be passed so we don't remain deaf during August to discussions of threats being carried on by al-Qaida and others seeking to do us harm.

As a result of the submission he made, we had another hearing for all Members of the Senate on Tuesday night, and at that Tuesday night session, several Democratic chairmen raised concerns with him about his proposal and their desire to have a different form. I was not privy to their

negotiations, but through the good efforts of Director McConnell, I found out what they were proposing, and it was obvious to me, as it was clear to Director McConnell, that this would not allow him to do what he needed to do and would not allow NSA to move forward on collection of vital information needed for his job to keep America safe.

The next day, the admiral modified his original proposal to take into account some of the reasonable concerns the Democrats raised, things he thought he could live with. Leader MCCONNELL and I introduced that on Wednesday evening. Since that time, there have been several more iterations coming from Democratic staff and some Democratic chairmen that have been presented to Director McConnell. He has reviewed them, and they do not meet the needs. He has responded to them, to try to find ways to accommodate them, and he has not been able to accommodate them.

The admiral now is traveling and out of contact. He said that given the lateness of the hour and the fact that this is such a critical issue, the negotiations are over, and he said he would make one more accommodation to meet concerns of the majority party. So he has agreed that he would support and urge the President to sign the McConnell-Bond measure introduced on Wednesday night, with one accommodation; that is, to add a 6-month sunset to provisions of the law allowing the operations to continue under the orders put forward at that time.

It will be my intent, after discussions with the leaders, to attempt to call this measure up so we can go to work on it and get it done, to keep our country safe and to allow us to come back after the recess and work on other portions of the FISA law that may be necessary and I think are very necessary. But right now, to keep the country safe, we need to pass this measure.

The Director of National Intelligence said—

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BOND. I would be happy to.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I wish to ask the Senator about really the guts of what we are talking about because I want to make sure the American people thoroughly understand this. The FISA law is the law that deals with the collection of intelligence by our intelligence gatherers through the airways and through any other means we can seek to gather that information, whether it is e-mails, telephone calls, or whatever.

Is it correct that right now our intelligence community is telling us they are not just handicapped but they are hamstrung and they do not have the ability because of the delay of this body and of the House of Representatives in passing this legislation which would give them the tools with which to go out into the bad guys' territory and collect information on those bad

guys about what they are saying relative to potential attacks against Americans?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia—and a valuable member of the Intelligence Committee—is precisely right. What we have before us is what is absolutely necessary to keep our country safe. He asked for the basic provisions.

Basically, what Senator MCCONNELL has proposed—which is not a Republican proposal, it is not a Democratic proposal, it is the proposal of Admiral McConnell as the Director of National Intelligence—is that the Government, the intelligence community, can listen in on communications from foreign sources, foreign intelligence, of somebody located overseas. If they find a suspect in the United States—and we call that a U.S. person—then any collection has to go before the FISA Court, which was established in 1978, before any collection can start against that target. It allows the Attorney General, with the Director of National Intelligence, to authorize that collection.

Now, the DNI's proposal has made a number of accommodations to the points raised by our Democratic chairmen at that Tuesday night meeting. It includes having the FISA Court review the procedures to ensure that the targets of our collection without a warrant are overseas. I don't think court review is necessary, but it is an added layer of protection that several key Democratic chairmen wanted.

I have been to NSA. I have seen how the procedures are so carefully monitored, with layers of oversight, supervision, reviews of attorneys, reviews of the inspector general, to make sure that the only intelligence they are collecting without a warrant is where the target is a person reasonably believed to be outside the United States.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BOND. I would be happy to.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, is it not true that prior to September 11, certain of the September 11 hijackers were inside the United States and communicating outside the United States to the leaders of al-Qaida, who were giving them instructions, who were sending them money, and who were providing them the details of the circumstances leading up to the events of September 11? We did not have the capability at that time of intercepting those conversations because we did not have this particular program in place. Therefore, is it not true that we missed some of the intercepts of correspondence between the September 11 hijackers and their leadership overseas?

Is it not true that following September 11, the very essence of the program we are talking about now that the DNI says he needs, it was in place following September 11, but because of circumstances beyond his control, it is now not in place? Isn't it true that

what he is asking for is the ability to gather information from any prospective terrorist who we know may have the ability and the intent to attack Americans, either on foreign soil or on domestic soil, and that what is sought to be done here is not to intercept conversations between Americans, not to intercept conversations even between terrorists who are in America, but what the DNI needs is the ability to intercept conversations coming out of areas such as Pakistan and Waziristan?

Potential terrorists or actual terrorists who reside in the United States, much like happened prior to September 11—and we are about to get out of here for a month—we know this is a time when the Director and the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security have said it is a high threat month. Would the Senator not agree that it is imperative that we give the intelligence community the ability to listen to those terrorists' conversations, which may include—and I emphasize "may" because this is a moving target—may include listening in on the planning of potential activity inside the United States?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes to answer the questions that have been raised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague from Georgia for a very fine statement.

I don't remember all of the questions, but I do remember his last question, which was, is it imperative for national security that we adopt this now. The Senator is correct. We were unable to accept communications prior to September 11, 2001. After that tragedy occurred, the President instituted a program, which he revealed several years later, to intercept foreign calls from al-Qaida coming into the United States and, because of concerns and questions raised in oversight, the President put the program to intercept foreign intelligence under the FISA Court. Now, at this point, because of the change in technology since the time FISA was adopted in 1978, inadvertently the new technology being used comes under FISA and prevents, in many instances, the collection of information on a foreign target.

The foreign targets are the ones, as the Senator from Georgia so correctly pointed out, who were giving information, and still give information and direction and strategic operations, to terrorists who may well be in the United States. Yes, it is vitally important that we change this now. I hope my colleagues will review this and that we can get a large, bipartisan majority. This is not a Republican proposal. I tried my Republican proposal and didn't get a majority to support that. There are Democratic proposals and, to the extent they can be accommodated by the DNI and allow him to take the collections he needs against foreign

targets, without a warrant—unless we can change the law, he will be deaf and we will be endangered in August and thereafter.

Regarding the question my colleague from Georgia raised about terrorists communicating in the United States, if there is collection, if we have intelligence that there are terrorists communicating in the United States—they would be non-U.S. persons—we would still have to go to the FISA Court to get an order before anybody can collect on them. If a U.S. person receives a call, the U.S. person's participation is what they call minimized and it is put aside. That person does not become a target if he or she is a U.S. person, unless and until there is a FISA Court order included.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. BOND. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. First, I thank the Senator for his great leadership. The Senator said we have worked on this in a bipartisan way in the Intelligence Committee since April. The Senator and Senator MCCONNELL have proposed a fix to this particular issue that now is before the Senate. Is it not true that everybody on this side of the aisle is prepared to vote for that, vote their conscience on it, whatever it may be, and that we expect a number of Senators from the other side will also be supportive of that? Are we ready to vote on this, to give the DNI the authority he has asked for?

Mr. BOND. Yes. I have a very important message from the DNI:

We understand that the FISA court judges urgently support a more appropriate alignment of the court's caseload and jurisdiction away from the focus on non-U.S. persons operating outside of the United States. The judges have clearly expressed both frustration with the fact that so much of their docket is consumed by applications that focus on foreign targets and involve minimal privacy interests of Americans.

That is the end of the statement that has been communicated to us by electronics from the DNI—that FISA Court judges have asked today that we pass a law that gets them out of the business of overseeing foreign target collection.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from North Dakota be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GREGG. Reserving the right to object. May I ask the Senator from Missouri, the ranking Republican on the Intelligence Committee, a quick and simple question prior to that? It won't take more than 2 minutes to deal with.

Mr. HATCH. We only have about 8 minutes to go, but that is fine.

Mr. GREGG. I ask the Senator from Missouri if he could give his estimate of how much of a diminution of the ability of the intelligence community

occurs if we do not pass adequate FISA authorization? Would it be a 30-percent reduction in their ability, or is it 20 percent? Can the Senator give a ballpark figure?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. I am not at liberty to disclose the amount, but it is very significant. I cannot give him the percentages, but it is more significant than the Senator has suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I add to that that it is very significant. We do know that.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for his remarks because he is a leader in this area and certainly has no higher interest than protecting our country and our citizens.

Mr. BOND. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as Congress prepares to adjourn for the traditional August recess, I want to draw continued emphasis to a significant issue: FISA modernization.

I am greatly encouraged by the bipartisan negotiations concerning this topic. However, I remain troubled about the possibility of adjournment without resolution of this vital initiative. It is very—simple passing a bill with limited FISA modernization will contribute to a safer America. If passing this bill means we must delay our recess, then we must do it. We should be able to get together today, though.

Do you think al-Qaida takes a recess? It is essential that we not adjourn until we send an appropriate bill to the President.

While some issues that we debate in Congress necessitate that we persuade Members of a pressing need, this is not one of them. Every Senator in the 110th Congress knows that the current FISA statute has loopholes which are putting our country at increased risk.

How should we tackle this issue? I suggest we take a logical and sound approach: Identify the problem, discuss and debate solutions, implement the solution. In this case, we have identified the problem.

The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act has not been changed to reflect the vast technological changes that have occurred since this law was passed in 1978. Since the law has not been appropriately modified, our Nation is missing potentially valuable intelligence that is essential to protect our country. Getting this intelligence is essential for our safety. It is about getting the enemy's secrets—their plans and intentions—without them knowing we've got them.

The Director of National Intelligence, Mike McConnell, has done a tremendous job in explaining the exceptional problems that our intelligence community continues to encounter based on antiquated sections of the law. When the United States Director of National Intelligence says our country is at risk, I hope we are listen-

ing. Let me read a quote that Director McConnell recently stated:

Many Americans would be surprised at just what the current law requires. To state the facts plainly: In a significant number of cases, our intelligence agencies must obtain a court order to monitor the communications of foreigners suspected of terrorist activity who are physically located in foreign countries. We are in this situation because the law simply has not kept pace with technology.

This is a powerful statement that Director McConnell gives. However, I must disagree with one thing he says. I don't think most Americans would be "surprised" by what our current law requires, I think most Americans would be outraged by what our current law requires. A terrorist in Afghanistan speaks with a terrorist in Iraq, and U.S. intelligence agencies need a court order to listen to this conversation?

This is absurd.

We need to bring FISA back to its original intent to protect the rights and privacy of American individuals while allowing us to monitor foreign individuals outside of the United States.

The President of the United States has also recognized the perilous situation in which we find ourselves. In his radio address last weekend, he stated that "Our intelligence community warns that under the current statute, we are missing a significant amount of foreign intelligence that we should be collecting to protect our country."

Let's look closely at this. Our intelligence community is saying that we are missing a significant amount of foreign intelligence. Why are we missing this intelligence? Is it because we don't know how to get it?

No.

Is it because we don't have the ability or funds to get it?

No.

Is it because terrorist groups have technology that we can't exploit?

No.

It is because a law passed in 1978 has not been appropriately amended to conform with the technological advances that we have seen since that time. Why are we handcuffing ourselves?

I believe most Americans would look at this situation and simply shake their heads.

If we know we have a problem, and we know how to fix it, why don't we? Is the excuse that we might not have enough time before recess?

Of course we have time.

We'll make time.

It is outrageous that we would even consider a recess while this problem and other loopholes of the FISA law remain intact.

If we can't get this done, why are we here? It is no wonder that the approval ratings for Congress are approaching all time lows.

Quite simply, we have a problem, but we know how to fix it. I note that Senator BOND has introduced a straight

forward measure which we can pass today.

This bill will put the tools back in the hands of the people who work tirelessly in providing a safe environment for American families throughout this great country.

This amendment of FISA simply returns the law to its original intent, which is twofold: first, allowing surveillance of foreign targets, who were never underprotected under FISA; and second, guaranteeing the privacy and rights of U.S. persons, who remain protected.

It is time to address this situation. I would ask my colleagues to join me in pledging to pass legislation in this area before we recess. This is not about partisan politics.

This is about protecting Americans. We are all painfully aware of the continued dangers that our country continues to face at the hands of organized groups and dedicated individuals who desire nothing more than the collapse of our country as a superpower.

This is not a case of the boy who cried wolf. We know the threats are out there. However, each day that passes creates emotional distance between the nightmares of September 11, and each new day provides opportunities to heal.

We don't have to live our lives in fear, but we have to acknowledge that the world changed that day. Rather than obsessing over news reports, let's enjoy the tremendous opportunities that the greatest Nation on Earth provides.

And let's ensure that all of the dedicated and noble professionals who play a part in ensuring our liberty and safety are not hampered by nonpartisan problems that we have the ability to fix.

We always hear that the terrorists have an asymmetrical advantage over us: They do not operate as nation-states, and some of them are willing to die as suicide bombers.

But we have a massive asymmetrical advantage over them: Our technological prowess.

Are we to compromise one of our greatest strengths, when that strength is essential, effective and lawful?

I remind my colleagues that even though we will return to our States for the recess, our enemies and their threats don't go away. They don't adjust their schedules to fit ours.

Make no mistake, inaction on our part needlessly subjects every American to increased danger. We need to act.

We have two options: Cut into August recess if necessary to provide safety to Americans, or go home and leave this vulnerability intact.

The answer is an easy one: Let's ensure that our defenders have all of the tools they need for our continued safety, no matter how long it takes.

I urge my colleagues to join me in pledging to pass FISA modernization legislation before our recess. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 17 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, at 11:33 a.m., the Senate recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 8:08 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TESTER).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

THANKING THE PRESIDING OFFICER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I express my appreciation to you, the Presiding Officer. You have been very patient all day, as have all the Members but you especially, having to be on standby and calling us back into session. I appreciate that very much.

PROTECT AMERICA ACT OF 2007

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to debate concurrently S. 2011, now at the desk, and S. 1927, as amended with the changes now at the desk; that there be 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that no amendments or motions be in order with respect to either bill; that at the conclusion or yielding back of time, the bills each be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of S. 1927, as amended, to be followed by a vote on passage of S. 2011; that if either bill fails to achieve 60 votes, then the vote on passage be vitiated and the bill be placed on the calendar in the case of S. 2011 or returned to the calendar in the case of S. 1927, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2011) cited as the "Protect America Act of 2007".

A bill (S. 1929) to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide additional procedures for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence information and for other purposes.

The amendment (No. 2649) to S. 1927 is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide a sunset provision)

At the end, add the following:

(c) SUNSET.—Except as provided in subsection (d), sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall cease to have effect 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) AUTHORIZATIONS IN EFFECT.—Authorizations for the acquisition of foreign intelligence information pursuant to the amendments made by this Act, and directives issued pursuant to such authorizations, shall remain in effect until their expiration. Such

acquisitions shall be governed by the applicable provisions of such amendments and shall not be deemed to constitute electronic surveillance as that term is defined in section 101(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801(f)).

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask on our time that Senator ROCKEFELLER be given 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, the Rockefeller-Levin bill before the Senate will provide the Director of National Intelligence, Mike McConnell, the temporary authorities he needs to expand his ability to collect time-sensitive intelligence against foreign targets as the Congress continues to work on a more lasting effort to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA, after 6 months has passed.

I wish to make this very clear. The Rockefeller-Levin bill is the bill of the Director of National Intelligence, who was appointed by the President to be in charge and make all decisions with respect to this matter. In the statement DNI McConnell put out at 4:39 this evening, he said:

I urge Members of Congress to support the legislation I provided last evening to modify FISA and equip our intelligence community with the tools we need to protect our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the DNI's full statement at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. He is talking about our bill, the bill I am now talking about. The Rockefeller-Levin bill is the bill the DNI is referring to in his statement. I am not shy about saying that; I am proud of it. The bill he provided to us last evening—that is our bill, not the other one, our bill—is not the Bond bill that was filed 2 days ago. It is our bill.

Our bill takes the DNI's preferred bill and modifies it in a limited number of ways to make it stronger without in any way diminishing the fundamental intelligence authorities the DNI needs. Our bill includes a sunset provision of 6 months, the same sunset provision or period that is contained in the Bond bill, I might add, and we are told that the DNI accepted. In fact, he has told us specifically he accepts it.

Our modified DNI bill—Director of National Intelligence—would allow our intelligence community to begin the surveillance of terrorist suspects, targets located overseas, immediately upon the signing of the bill, even if those targeted calls enter the United States. In other words, you start immediately in the collection. Why is this? Because the collection is not complete. We are not going in all