behind this request I have, as is the AARP, the AMA, and many support groups around the country. That is now in the RECORD. We put that in the RECORD yesterday.

So this is something we have to do. I would say to my friend, on the 30-day extension, I understand the seriousness of his proposal. I have said many times on this floor, I will not repeat it in detail, I have the greatest respect for the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. But it is my understanding that there has been an objection to my proposal, and he will go ahead and offer the 30-day extension, to which I will object.

I will be happy to seriously consider it but not too seriously.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a 30-day Medicare extension that is at the desk; that it be read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I think the point is, there are serious reservations on our side of the aisle, and I think legitimately other places, on the way the House has handled elements of the Medicare system in this bill and that is to undermine the ability of many seniors to participate in what is known as Medicare Advantage.

We think there is a better way to do it. We think the Senate can do a better job of this bill, and we think 30 days to work on it makes some sense.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008—MOTION TO PROCEED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 6304, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 827, H.R. 6304, an Act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain acquisitions of foreign intelligence, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank our leaders for getting us on this very important bill.

As we have discussed before, the failure to modernize and authorize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act last summer has caused serious gaps in our intelligence capability.

When the Protect America Act that was introduced by our Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and me last year finally passed, we put the intelligence community back in the business of intercepting critical intelligence communications from foreign terrorists talking to each other about possible activities in the United States, or against our troops and our allies elsewhere, and obviously any of those who were threatening the United States.

I can tell you, without going into detail, that the foreign intelligence collection from these has been about the most valuable piece of information we have with respect to terrorist intent. So I appreciate the fact that this body is ready to move forward.

I hope we will have a way forward to get it done by the time we leave for the Fourth of July recess. It is critical we get this done promptly. If we go into late July or even into August without getting it done, serious consequences will start to impact our ability to collect intelligence.

Again, I thank our minority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, for his kind words, especially about my very capable staff who have worked very hard, not only to help put this bill together, but we have briefed Members of both sides of the aisle, their staffs. We have spent a lot of time doing that.

Of course, as I outlined yesterday, we spent a very long 2½ months working with the House. As I indicated, the bill this body passed, the FISA amendments, we passed 68 to 29 in February with the good, strong support of the chairman of the committee, Senator ROCKEFELLER. We worked on a bipartisan basis. We worked with and listened to the intelligence community to do several things that were critical.

No. 1, we wished to make sure there was protection for the privacy and constitutional rights of Americans and U.S. persons here and abroad. For the first time, we included that. We also needed to protect the telephone companies or carriers who have participated in the terrorist surveillance program under the lawful orders issued by the President, under his constitutional authority in article II, an act in good faith by those carriers.

We provided that immunity, or retroactive liability protection, more accurately, that was critical to ensuring that they can continue to participate. They are loyal American citizens, and they wanted to be able to help. But when frivolous lawsuits, seeking billions of dollars in damages, are filed against them, whether they participated or not, and there is no assurance that any telephone company so sued has participated. They cannot use a defense that they did not participate. They have to have protection.

We built in that protection in a way that was acceptable to both sides in this body in the FISA amendments and also satisfied the concerns of the majority party in the House, which, as Leader MCCONNELL said, had the votes, if they had wished to pass our FISA amendments.

We believe this new bill we are considering, H.R. 6304, which passed the House with a strong majority vote of 293 to 129 last Friday, should be passed here.

As with the Senate's original FISA bill passed several months ago, the compromise that is before us required a little give-and-take from all sides. But, in essence, what we have before us today is basically the Senate bill all over again.

I am aware that some on the far left wish to paint this as some radical new legislation. But if you read the language, it is not different. The press picked up on this straight away last week and kept asking me to help them find the purported ''big changes'' in this bill that no one can find. I have not been much help to them because the answer is, there is not much that is significantly different, save some cosmetic fixes that were requested by the majority party in the House.

For example, I am pleased that the strong retroactive liability protections that the Senate bill offered are still in place, and our vital intelligence sources and methods will be safeguarded. I am pleased this compromise preserves the ability of the intelligence community to collect foreign intelligence quickly and in exigent circumstances without any prior court review.

I am also pleased the 2012 sunset, 3 years longer than the sunset previously offered in any House bill, will give our intelligence collectors and those parties we need to have cooperate with us the certainty they need in the tools they use to keep us safe.

I am confident the few changes we made to the Senate bill in H.R. 6304 will in no way diminish the intelligence community's ability to target terrorists overseas, and the Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General agreed. That had to be the test. They worked with us. They made compromises. When we had a proposal for additional protections for Americans, they agreed. But we had to work out the language to make sure we provided protections without destroying the basic integrity of the bill.

I believe we did that. We did that with the Senate bill, and we did it again with the minor changes the House wanted to make.

Let me address, for the time being, the banner issue of the legislation, which is Congress's affirmation that the telecom providers that may have assisted the Government after 9/11 should have the frivolous lawsuits against them dismissed.

I am confident in the standard of review in title II of the bill on which we agreed with Congressman HOYER and Congressman BLUNT, his counterpart in the House, namely, a ''substantial evidence'' standard, which will ensure that those companies that assisted the Government following the September 11 terrorist attacks obtain the civil retroactive liability protection they deserve.