

have a warrant you have to have voluntary compliance. And the liability issue, I think, continues to endanger future voluntary compliance, and I hope we can work together in that regard to move forward.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, both the RESTORE Act, which passed this House, and the Senate bill both are similar in giving prospective immunity to telecoms that voluntarily or pursuant to order cooperate with us in accomplishing that objective. We believe, of course, that FISA was established so that a court review on process would be appropriate to ensure, in fact, that the collection of information is on foreign-to-foreign.

We well understand that, as the DNI has indicated, prospectively you may not know so you need authorization. Our bill provides for that. The Senate bill provides for that. I really don't believe that is a major contention of the bill. That's prospectively.

A major contention is, which we believe has nothing to do with security, on what has been done, and, frankly, I'm not sure we know exactly what has been done. As you know, I've taken the opportunity to be up in the intelligence room, in the secure room, and go through the papers that have been provided. My own view is they're not dispositive of the issue; but irrespective of that, we're working on title II as well, and I look forward to having discussions on that with you as well.

Mr. BLUNT. I do, too. I do think this liability issue is important. We want to continue to have voluntary compliance. We also don't want to put these companies that have voluntarily complied in a situation where the only way to prove that what they did was appropriate is to produce documents that are at this point, we believe, in the national security of the country not producible; but maybe we can work through this.

I hope to see this bill on the floor next week. I think we've had 2 weeks that I and others feel that each day the process gets more cumbersome than the day before because of the way this process builds up, and I look forward to working with you on that.

Mr. HOYER. If I might comment on that, as you know, from our perspective, this is one of the problems. This is a very serious, important bill. It's critical to the defense of our country. I want to see that facilitated. I think every Member on both sides of the aisle wants to see that facilitated, but there are serious issues. There are serious constitutional issues involved here.

That's why FISA was passed in 1978, very frankly, as a result of an administration that intercepted communications here domestically. You will recall that, I know, and a great concern about that. FISA was adopted by the Congress and signed by the President in an attempt to try to ensure that those

kinds of things that happened in the early 1970s were not repeated by the intelligence community.

So these are serious issues. Unfortunately, the Senate which had our bill for 2½ months and had spent a lot of time considering a bill long before we passed our bill did not send us a bill until, as I said, about 14 days ago, and we have since that time, notwithstanding the fact we were on break, staff and Members have been working on that. As you know, we have invited the other side of the aisle, ranking members, to participate in that. Some have chosen not to, but we are hopeful that we can move ahead on this, and we hope there is room for positive resolution.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that. I do know that Senator ROCKEFELLER in the other body has said that our intelligence is being downgraded and has made the case that the people that voluntarily complied don't get paid for it. He said, in fact: "What do they get for this? They get \$40 billion worth of suits, grief, trashing, but they do it." Then he went on to say: "They don't have to do it, because they do have shareholders to respond to, to answer to."

I believe there is a way to address this issue. We need to find it, and I hope we can.

Last night, we had the Andean trade bill on the floor. This is a bill that allows access to our markets by Andean countries, including the country that we currently have a negotiated agreement with; and that country has changed dramatically since we put the first Andean bill in place 17 years ago. I'm wondering if the gentleman has any sense of where we might be on that outstanding agreement with Colombia. Certainly with the vote we took today they can continue to have the same kind of access to our markets that they've had for the last 17 years.

A trade agreement would give us substantially new access to their markets, and I'd like to hear any sense of when we may get to that bill and have a situation where the President would be encouraged to send a bill up to us so we could get to it.

I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend for yielding.

I've had discussions recently with Secretary Gutierrez, with Ambassador Schwab and others, and Secretary Paulson, who have also discussed this issue with me and I know with you and with many others. This is an issue of importance. We think the discussions are ongoing. Hopefully, they will result in some fruitful resolution. That has not been the case at this point in time.

We did have, as you well know, a very significant interface with the administration last year in which I think a very positive result in terms of workers' rights and environmental concerns were addressed by us and by the administration. Unfortunately, we have not

moved forward from that point on the other three agreements that were pending at that time, but I think that we will continue to have those discussions, hopefully positive and hopefully have some result.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman. I do think since those discussions began the Colombian Government has made changes in the agreement in those areas, all of which have now been passed by the Colombian legislature, and I look forward to moving forward with that.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 3, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday next, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 4, for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

RENEWAL OF FISA

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is with disappointment that I rise today. It is disappointment over the fact that this body still has not brought to the floor the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, the Protect America Act.

We have heard the colloquy that has taken place on this floor this afternoon. We know that a bipartisan solution to this was passed in the Senate with 68 votes. We also know looking at our calendar that obviously the issue is not about time. The issue is about having the will to pass this bill.

The Protect America Act has expired. We are now under the old surveillance laws that were written in 1978. The intelligence community has expressed their desire to see this passed because they know that they are having to waste valuable time working on bureaucratic red tape and legal paperwork and dealing with trial lawyers, instead of spying on terrorists who seek to do us harm.

I would encourage the majority to bring forward the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Let's work to keep America safe.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.