

Name:

Block:

Date:

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) on May 22, 2015, Part I

Senator Hatch's Actual Speech	The Meaning of The Speech
<p>Mr. President, today I wish to speak on a critical national security issue: the importance of renewing the authority for essential anti-terrorism tools which is set to expire by the time Congress returns to Washington after Memorial Day.</p>	<p>Mr. President, today I wish to speak on a critical national security issue: the importance of renewing the law that authorizes important anti-terrorism tools, which is set to expire when Congress returns to Washington after Memorial Day.</p>
<p>Every single Member of this body remembers where he or she was on September 11, 2001. I was here in the Senate. I remember evacuating the Capitol and the office building. I remember standing on the lawn outside, wondering if a plane was headed toward this very building.</p>	<p>Every Member of this Senate remembers where he or she was on September 11, 2001. I was here in the Senate. I remember evacuating the Capitol and the office building. I remember standing on the lawn outside, wondering if a plane was headed toward this very building.</p>
<p>That terrible day gave us a taste of what terrorists want to visit upon our country. We realized that these fanatics would stop at nothing to kill innocent men, women, and children and to bring our country to its knees.</p>	<p>That terrible day gave us a taste of what terrorists want to happen in our country. We understood that people with extreme views would stop at nothing to kill innocent men, women, and children and to bring our country to its knees.</p>
<p>Knowing the threat this country faced, we resolved not to let bureaucratic red tape hinder the ability of our law enforcement and intelligence communities to keep us safe. As the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, I joined with colleagues of both parties as well as the Bush administration to craft the USA PATRIOT Act, which passed the Senate 98 to 1.</p>	<p>Knowing the threat this country faced, we decided not to let government delays interfere with the ability of our law enforcement [police] and intelligence communities [groups of people who secretly gather information] to keep us safe. As the member of the Judiciary [related to judges and the court system] Committee, I joined with senators of both parties as well as the Bush administration to create the USA PATRIOT Act, which passed the Senate 98 to 1.</p>
<p>The PATRIOT Act and its subsequent reauthorizations have proven critical to our ability to investigate terrorist threats and prevent another mass-casualty attack on the homeland.</p>	<p>The PATRIOT Act and later versions of it have given us the ability to investigate [to find the truth about] terrorist threats and prevent another deadly attack on our homeland.</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>Let me make one matter perfectly clear: we continue to face a very serious terrorist threat. The evil that struck us on September 11 has metastasized and continues to present a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States. As the American people's elected representatives, it is our primary duty to keep this country safe. Accordingly, we must continue to provide the necessary tools to the law enforcement and intelligence communities that have helped keep this Nation safe for the past 14 years.</p>	<p>Let me make one thing perfectly clear: we continue to face a very serious terrorist threat. The evil that struck us on September 11 has spread and continues to present a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States. As the American people's elected representatives, it is our most important duty to keep this country safe. Because of this, we must continue to provide the necessary tools to the law enforcement [police] and intelligence communities [groups of people who secretly gather information] that have helped keep this Nation safe for the past 14 years.</p>
<p>Unfortunately, some of these tools have become quite controversial, despite the repeated showing of strong bipartisan support for them. The collection of telephone metadata under section 215 has drawn particular criticisms and worrisome calls for "reform." I find this development enormously concerning.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, some of these tools have caused arguments between people, even though there is strong bipartisan [both political parties] support for them. The collection of large amounts of telephone metadata [descriptive information, such as who was called, GPS location, etc.] under section 215 has worried some people who now want to reform [change] the law that make this possible. I find this very troubling..</p>
<p>Consider what President Obama himself had to say about our need for such a capability:</p> <p>The program grew out of a desire to address a gap identified after 9/11. One of the 9/11 hijackers, Khalid al-Mihdhar, made a phone call from San Diego to a known al-Qaeda safe house in Yemen. NSA saw that call, but it could not see that the call was coming from an individual already in the United States. The telephone metadata program under Section 215 was designed to map the communications of terrorists so we could see who they may be in contact with as quickly as possible.</p>	<p>Think about what President Obama himself had to say about our need to collect information:</p> <p>The program began as a way to deal with a gap identified after 9/11. One of the 9/11 hijackers, Khalid al-Mihdhar, made a phone call from San Diego to a known al-Qaeda safe house in Yemen. NSA saw that call, but it could not see that the call was coming from an individual already in the United States. The telephone metadata [descriptive information, such as who was called, GPS location, etc.] program that is allowed under Section 215 is designed to help law enforcement agencies collect and study the communications of terrorists so we could see who they may be in contact with as quickly as possible.</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>The President was absolutely right. The collection of telephone metadata in bulk facilitates our mapping of terrorist networks and our ability to disrupt terrorist plots. Contrary to the wild fantasies that critics frequently spout, this collection does not meaningfully intrude on our privacy. It does not involve the NSA listening in on anyone's calls. It is simply a very important means of finding a proverbial needle in a haystack. We should reauthorize this authority without delay.</p>	<p>The President was absolutely right. The collection of telephone metadata [descriptive information, such as who was called, GPS location, etc.] in bulk helps us find terrorist networks and disrupt terrorist plots. Contrary [opposite] to the fears of critics, collecting metadata like this does not invade the privacy of citizens. It does not involve the NSA listening in on anyone's calls. It is simply a very important means of finding a needle in a haystack [something that is hard to find]. We should allow the collection of metadata to continue.</p>
<p>A number of my colleagues have taken a different approach, taking up the cause of the so-called USA FREEDOM Act to "reform" our counterterrorism efforts. I find the name of this bill ironic, in the sense that their legislation aims to restore a freedom that was never under threat while sacrificing critical tools that secure our freedom.</p>	<p>Some my colleagues [fellow workers] have taken a different approach, and are promoting what they call the USA FREEDOM Act to "reform" or fix our efforts to fight terrorism. I find the name of this bill ironic [the opposite of what is expected] because their legislation [law] would restore a freedom that was never threatened while sacrificing very important tools that keep us safe.</p>

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT
 Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT) on May 22, 2015, Part II

Senator Hatch's Actual Speech	The Meaning of His Speech
<p>For instance, under this legislation, metadata would no longer be collected by the government but instead retained by private communications corporations. While this idea may seem initially appealing, I have strong reservations about such an approach. Their proposal contains no requirement for these companies to maintain this data for any length of time. Without such a requirement, the effectiveness of a search would obviously be compromised.</p>	<p>For instance, under this legislation [law], metadata would not be collected by the government but instead kept by private communications corporations. While this idea may seem appealing at first, I have strong concerns about this approach. Their proposal does not require companies to keep this data for any length of time. Because this is not required, this type of data collection would not be effective.</p>
<p>This is hardly my only concern. Consider also the provision of the so-called FREEDOM Act that would create a body of outside experts to advise the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court on the government's warrant applications. Such an unprecedented move would cause serious constitutional concerns and could undermine the adversarial system which at the core of the judicial branch.</p>	<p>This is not my only concern. Consider that the so-called FREEDOM Act would create a group of outside experts to advise the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance [secretly recording/watching people] Court on the government's warrant applications. Such an unprecedented [never-before-seen] move would cause serious constitutional concerns and could interfere with the adversarial [always fighting] system which forms the core of the judicial [law-related] branch.</p>
<p>For these and many other reasons, I cannot support the so-called FREEDOM Act. While I would prefer to pass a long-term extension of our current authorities, I will support a short-term extension to facilitate the search for a long-term solution. I urge my colleagues in both Houses to support this effort.</p>	<p>For these and many other reasons, I cannot support the so-called FREEDOM Act. While I would prefer to pass a long-term extension of our current law [Patriot Act], I will support a short-term extension to help the search for a long-term solution. I strongly encourage my colleagues [fellow workers] in both Houses to support this effort.</p>

Source: Congressional Record- Senate

<https://www.congress.gov/congressionalrecord/2015/05/22/senate-section/article/S3300-1>

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

Representative Thomas Massie (R-IA) on June 1, 2015, Part I

Representative Massie's Actual Speech	The Meaning of the Speech
<p>Mr. Speaker, I am here today because last night, at midnight, a wonderful thing happened. In what seems like a constant flow, a tide that has been washing away our liberties since the founding of this country, we experienced something unique.</p>	<p>Mr. Speaker, I am here today because last night, at midnight, a wonderful thing happened. In what seems like a constant flow, a tide that has been washing away our liberties [freedoms] since the founding of this country, we experienced something unique.</p>
<p>The tide reversed, thanks to one Senator, Senator Rand Paul of Kentucky, and now, we have some of our civil liberties restored. If only but for a brief second in history, they are restored. It may register only as an eddy current, but clearly, we changed the tide last night.</p>	<p>The tide reversed, thanks to one Senator, Senator Rand Paul of Kentucky, and now, we have some of our civil liberties [rights] restored. If only but for a brief second in history, they are restored. It may register only as an eddy [little swirling water current], but clearly, we changed the tide last night.</p>
<p>Now, what happened? The PATRIOT Act expired. How does a law expire, do you say? Why do we allow them to expire? It is because, when we enact laws, we know that we don't have the foresight to see how they will be carried out. We don't know everything that is going to happen as time transpires. It is important that we revisit these laws. In this case, this law expired.</p>	<p>Now, what happened? The PATRIOT Act expired. How does a law expire, do you say? Why do we allow them to expire? It is because, when we enact [put in place] laws, we know that we don't have the ability to see how they will be carried out. We don't know everything that is going to happen as time goes by. It is important that we review these laws. In this case, this law expired.</p>
<p>I would like to pretend that, if I were here when the PATRIOT Act passed after the attacks on our country, that I wouldn't have voted for it, but I can't say that. I am not going to pass judgment on my colleagues that were here when it did pass. I can barely imagine the incredible pressure they were under from their constituents, from everybody, to do something - to do something to protect our country, and so they passed the PATRIOT Act. I don't blame them. I wasn't here. I might have done the same thing.</p>	<p>I would like to pretend that, if I were here when the PATRIOT Act passed after the attacks on our country, that I wouldn't have voted for it, but I can't say that. I am not going to pass judgment on my colleagues [fellow workers] that were here when it did pass. I can barely imagine the incredible pressure they were under from their constituents [voters], from everybody, to do something - to do something to protect our country, and so they passed the PATRIOT Act. I don't blame them. I wasn't here. I might have done the same thing.</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>We have new facts today, so we revisit this law; we revisit the PATRIOT Act. What are the new facts? What are the things that have changed since it was issued? Let me list them.</p>	<p>We have new facts today, so we revisit this law; we revisit the PATRIOT Act. What are the new facts? What are the things that have changed since it was issued? Let me list them.</p>
<p>First of all, our Director of National Intelligence lied to us, lied to Congress about how the law was being implemented. In fact, he said, "I said the least untruthful thing I could," when he testified. Those were his words. He said the least untruthful thing he could.</p>	<p>First of all, our Director of National Intelligence lied to us, lied to Congress about how the law was being implemented [put into use]. In fact, he said, "I said the least untruthful [dishonest] thing I could," when he testified [spoke in court]. Those were his words. He said the least dishonest thing he could.</p>
<p>That is not good enough. He is in charge of all of our intelligence, and you are spying on Americans, and you lied to Congress about it, so that has changed.</p>	<p>That is not good enough. He is in charge of all of our intelligence, and you are spying on [secretly watching] Americans, and you lied to Congress about it, so that has changed.</p>
<p>What else changed? The NSA broke the law. How do we know this? The second highest court in the land said they broke the law. Just a few weeks ago, they ruled this. Surely, we can't trust them to enforce the laws that we are giving them now without some major reform.</p>	<p>What else changed? The NSA broke the law. How do we know this? The second highest court in the land said they broke the law. Just a few weeks ago, they ruled this. Surely, we can't trust them to enforce the laws that we are giving them now without some major reform.</p>
<p>What is the next thing that has changed since the PATRIOT Act first passed? The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence failed us. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is privy to information that the rest of Congress cannot have, and I understand that. It would be hard to keep a secret if 435 Members knew about it, so we entrust some of our Members to know the Nation's most important secrets.</p>	<p>What is the next thing that has changed since the PATRIOT Act first passed? The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence failed us. The Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has information that the rest of Congress cannot have, and I understand that. It would be hard to keep a secret if 435 Members knew about it, so we trust some of our Members to know the Nation's most important secrets.</p>
<p>What do we trust them with? Oversight, oversight over the intelligence community to make sure that the laws that all 435 of us vote on are being implemented in the way that we intended them to be implemented - and that was not the case, so that has changed.</p>	<p>What do we trust them with? Oversight [supervision], oversight over the intelligence community to make sure that the laws that all 435 of us vote on are being implemented [put into use] in the way that we meant them to be put into use - and that was not the case, so that has changed.</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>What is the fourth thing that has changed since the first PATRIOT Act was issued and the last time it was reauthorized? The FISA court, this is the secret court that issues the secret warrants, if you will - if you would call them warrants. I would not call them warrants.</p>	<p>What is the fourth thing that has changed since the first PATRIOT Act was issued and the last time it was reauthorized [allowed under the law again]? The FISA court, this is the secret court that issues the secret warrants, if you will - if you would call them warrants. I would not call them warrants.</p>
<p>They issued the mother of all general warrants. What are general warrants? These are warrants that are not specific. The warrant they issued would make King George III blush. Think about this: a warrant that covers every - every - American.</p>	<p>They issued the mother of all general warrants. What are general warrants? These are warrants that are not specific. The warrant they issued would make King George III blush. Think about this: a warrant that covers every - every - American.</p>

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

Representative Thomas Massie (R-IA) on June 1, 2015, Part II

Representative Massie's Actual Speech	The Meaning of His Speech
<p>Let me read the Fourth Amendment to our Constitution here, and this is specifically about your right to privacy: ``The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized."</p>	<p>Let me read the Fourth Amendment to our Constitution here, and this is specifically about your right to privacy: "The right of the people to be secure themselves, their houses, papers, and property against unreasonable searches and seizures, will not be violated, and no warrants will be issued unless there is probable cause (real reasons), supported by promises and statements, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the people or things to be seized [taken]."</p>
<p>The warrant that they issued, the one that went to Verizon which authorized the collection of everybody's phone records, was not constitutional; yet we trusted them with the oversight, and they betrayed us. They betrayed that trust.</p>	<p>The warrant that they issued, the one that went to Verizon which authorized [approved] the collection of everybody's phone records, was not constitutional [agreeing with, or related to, the Constitution]; yet we trusted them with the supervision and they betrayed us. They betrayed that trust.</p>
<p>Since 1979, there have been 34,000 surveillance orders requested of the FISA court by the intelligence community; 12 of the 34,000 have been denied.</p>	<p>Since 1979, there have been 34,000 surveillance orders requested of the FISA court by the intelligence community [people who work for the CIA]; 12 of the 34,000 have been denied.</p>
<p>Mr. Speaker, things have changed. I urge my colleagues not to reauthorize the PATRIOT Act. The Freedom Act does not go far enough.</p>	<p>Mr. Speaker, things have changed. I urge my colleagues [fellow workers] not to reauthorize [make something allowed under the law again] the PATRIOT Act. The Freedom Act does not go far enough.</p>

Source: Congressional Record- House of Representatives

<https://www.congress.gov/congressionalrecord/2015/06/01/house-section/article/H3583-4>

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

Senator Charles "Chuck" Grassley (R-IA) on May 22, 2015, part I

Senator Grassley's Actual Speech	The Meaning of the Speech
<p>Mr. President, I wish to explain why I support a short-term reauthorization of the national security authorities that expire on June 1, and why I will not vote for cloture on the latest version of the USA FREEDOM Act at this time. These authorities need to be reauthorized and reformed in a way that appropriately balances national security with the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans. I am hopeful that during the next few weeks we can do a better job of doing just that.</p>	<p>Mr. President, I want to explain why I support a short-term reauthorization [allowed under the law again] of the national security powers that expire on June 1, and why I will not move for a vote on the latest version of the USA FREEDOM Act at this time. These powers need to be reauthorized [allowed under the law again] and reformed in a way that appropriately balances national security with the privacy and civil liberties [rights] of all Americans. I am hopeful that during the next few weeks we can do a better job of doing just that.</p>
<p>I start with the premise that these are important national security tools that shouldn't be permitted to expire. If that were to happen, there is little doubt that the country would be placed at greater risk of terrorist attack, at a time when we can least afford it. This isn't exaggeration or hyperbole.</p>	<p>I start with the idea that these are important national security tools that shouldn't be permitted to expire. If that were to happen, there is little doubt that the country would be placed at greater risk of terrorist attack, at a time when we can least afford it. This isn't an exaggeration.</p>
<p>We have recently witnessed the emergence of ISIS, a terrorist organization that controls large swaths of Iraq and Syria, including, as of just days ago, the capital of the largest province in Iraq. ISIS is beheading Americans and burning its captives alive for propaganda value. And fueled in part by black market oil sales, ISIS reportedly has at least \$2 billion.</p>	<p>Not long ago we saw the emergence coming into view of ISIS, a terrorist organization that controls large areas of Iraq and Syria, including, as of just days ago, the capital of the largest province in Iraq. ISIS is beheading [chopping off of the head] Americans and burning its captives [prisoners] alive for propaganda [talk or information that tries to change people's minds] value. And because of illegal oil sales, ISIS reportedly has at least \$2 billion.</p>
<p>The organization isn't just sitting on that money. Members of ISIS and related groups are actively recruiting would-be terrorists from around the world to come to Syria. They are inspiring attacks, often using social media, in the West, from Paris, to Sydney, to Ottawa, and even here</p>	<p>The organization isn't just sitting on that money. Members of ISIS and related groups are actively recruiting would-be terrorists from around the world to come to Syria. They are inspiring attacks, often using social media, in the West, from Paris, to Sydney, to Ottawa, and even here</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>in the United States, in places like New York City, Ohio, and Garland, TX. Director Comey has reported that the FBI has investigations of perhaps thousands of people in various stages of radicalization in all 50 States.</p>	<p>in the United States, in places like New York City, Ohio, and Garland, TX. Director Comey has reported that the FBI has investigations of maybe possibly thousands of people in different stages of radicalization [process where someone starts believing extreme things] in all 50 States.</p>
<p>So this isn't the time to let these various authorities expire. This isn't the time to terminate the government's ability to conduct electronic surveillance of so-called "lone wolf" terrorists - people who are inspired by groups like ISIS but don't have direct contact with them. And this isn't the time to end the government's ability to seek roving wiretaps against terrorists. After all, this is a tool that prosecutors have used in criminal investigations since the mid-1980s.</p>	<p>So this isn't the time to let these different powers expire. This isn't the time to end the government's ability to conduct electronic surveillance of [secretly recording/watching] so-called "lone wolf" terrorists - people who are get ideas from groups like ISIS but don't have direct contact with them. And this isn't the time to end the government's ability to use wiretaps against terrorists. After all, this is a tool that prosecutors [lawyers who try to prove people guilty] have used in criminal investigations since the mid-1980s.</p>
<p>Most of all, this isn't the time to sunset the government's ability to acquire records from businesses like hotels, car rental agencies, and supply companies, under section 215, in a targeted fashion. These kinds of records are routinely obtained by prosecutors in criminal investigations, through the use of grand jury subpoenas. It makes no sense for the government to be able to collect these records to investigate bank fraud, insider trading and public corruption, but not to help keep the country safe from terrorists.</p>	<p>Most of all, this isn't the time to end the government's ability to get records from businesses like hotels, car rental agencies, and supply companies under section 215. Prosecutors get these kinds of records in criminal investigations through the use of grand jury subpoenas [orders to make something known for a trial]. It makes no sense for the government to be able to collect these records to investigate bank fraud [stealing from a bank], insider trading and public corruption [crime], but not to help keep the country safe from terrorists.</p>
<p>While we must re-authorize these authorities, however, it is equally important that we reform them. But we don't yet have a reform bill that I am satisfied with.</p>	<p>While we must approve these powers, however, it is equally important that we reform [update/change] them. But we don't yet have a reform bill that I am satisfied with.</p>
<p>The American people have made clear that they want the government to stop indiscriminately collecting their telephone metadata in bulk under section 215. They also want more transparency</p>	<p>The American people have made clear that they want the government to stop carelessly collecting their telephone metadata [descriptive information such as person called, GPS location,</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

from the government and from the private sector about how section 215 and other national security authorities are being used. They want real reform. I want to be clear that I emphatically agree with these goals. They can be achieved responsibly, and doing so will restore an important measure of trust in our intelligence community.

etc.] in bulk under section 215. They also want more honesty from the government and from the private sector [people and businesses that are not part of the government] about how section 215 and other national security powers are being used. They want real reform [change]. I want to be clear that I absolutely agree with these goals. They can be achieved responsibly, and doing so will restore an important measure of trust in our intelligence community.

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

Senator Charles "Chuck" Grassley (R-IA) on May 22, 2015, part II

Senator Grassley's Actual Speech	The Meaning of His Speech
I agree with these reforms because the civil liberties implications of the collection of this type of bulk telephone metadata are concerning. This is especially so, given the scope and nature of the metadata collected through this program.	I agree with these reforms [changes] because the impact of the collection of this type of bulk telephone metadata [descriptive information, like who was called, GPS location, etc.] on the civil liberties [the freedom] of citizens concerns me. This is especially true given the extent and the type of metadata collected through this program.
Now, there haven't been any cases of this metadata being intentionally abused for political or other ends. That is good. I recognize that the overwhelming majority of those who work in the intelligence community are law-abiding American heroes to whom we owe a great debt for helping to keep us safe.	Now, there haven't been any cases of this metadata [descriptive information, like who was called, GPS location, etc.] being intentionally [on purpose] treated unfairly for political or other reasons. That is good. I recognize that the almost all of the people who work in the intelligence community [people who work for the CIA] obey laws and are American heroes to whom we owe a great deal for helping to keep us safe.
But other national security authorities have been abused. Unfortunately, to paraphrase James Madison, all men aren't angels. I've been critical, for example, of the Department of Justice's handling of the so-called LOVEINT cases uncovered by the NSA's Inspector General.	But other national security powers have been abused. Unfortunately, to paraphrase [say in different words] James Madison, all men aren't angels. I've been critical, for example, of the Department of Justice's handling of the so-called LOVEINT cases uncovered by the NSA's National Security Agency] Inspector General.
Given human nature, then, the mere potential for abuse makes the status quo concerning the bulk collection of telephone metadata under section 215 unsustainable, especially when measured against the real yet modest intelligence value the program has provided.	Given human nature, then the possibility for abuse makes the way things are working now with the bulk collection of telephone metadata under section 215 impossible to do especially when measured against the real yet modest intelligence value the program has has given.
The USA FREEDOM Act would in some ways reauthorize and reform section 215 along these lines. It would end the bulk collection of	The USA FREEDOM Act would in some ways reauthorize [make something allowed under the law again] and reform section 215. It would end

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>telephone metadata in 6 months, and transition the program to a system where the phone companies hold the data for targeted searching by the government. But the bill's serious flaws cause me to believe that we can do better. Let me discuss just a few.</p>	<p>the bulk collection of telephone metadata in 6 months, and change the program to a system where the phone companies hold the data for targeted searching by the government. But the bill's serious flaws cause me to believe that we can do better. Let me discuss just a few.</p>
<p>First, while the system to which the bill would transition the program sounds promising, it does not exist at present, and may well not exist in 6 months. Intelligence community leaders don't know for sure how long it will take to build. They don't know for sure how fast it will be able to return search results to the government. They don't know for sure whether the phone companies will voluntarily keep the metadata for later searching by the government.</p>	<p>First, while the system to which the bill would change the program sounds promising, it does not exist now, and may well not exist in 6 months. Intelligence community leaders don't know for sure how long it will take to build. They don't know for sure how fast it will be able to return search results to the government. They don't know for sure whether the phone companies will voluntarily [without being forced] keep the metadata for later searching by the government.</p>
<p>On this score, then, this bill feels like a leap into the dark when we can least afford it. While we need certainty that the bulk collection of telephone metadata under section 215 will end, we also need more certainty that the new system proposed will work and be effective.</p>	<p>On this score, then, this bill feels like a leap into the dark when we can least afford it. While we need certainty [feeling of being completely sure] that the bulk collection of telephone metadata [descriptive information, such as who was called, picture date, GPS location, etc.] under section 215 will end, we also need to be more sure that the new proposed system will work and be effective.</p>
<p>Second, the bill contains reforms to the FISA Court that are unneeded and risky. I am strongly in favor of reforming the court to make clear that it can appoint a traditional amicus, or a friend of the court, to help it get the law right. This is a well understood legal concept.</p>	<p>Second, the bill contains changes to the FISA Court that are unneeded and risky. I am strongly in favor of reforming the court to make clear that it can assign a traditional amicus, or a friend of the court, to help it get the law right. This is a well understood legal concept [idea.]</p>
<p>But this bill goes further - potentially dangerously so. Under certain circumstances, the bill directs the FISA Court to name a panel of outside experts who would, in the words of the New York Times, "challenge the government's pleadings" before the court. Especially when the bill already</p>	<p>But this bill goes further - possibly dangerously so. Under certain circumstances [conditions], the bill directs the FISA Court to name a panel of outside experts who would, in the words of the New York Times, "challenge the government's pleadings" before the court. Especially when the</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>ends the kind of dragnet intelligence collection under section 215 that affects so many innocent Americans, this is wholly unnecessary. And for this reason, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts sent a letter alerting Congress to its concerns that this outside advocate could "impede the court's work" by delaying the process and chilling the government's candor.</p>	<p>bill already ends the kind of intelligence collection under section 215 that affects so many innocent Americans, this is completely unnecessary. And for this reason, the Administrative related to managing and running a company or organization Office of the U.S. Courts sent a letter warning Congress to its concerns that this outside advocate could "impede [get in the way of] the court's work" by delaying the process and cooling the government's honesty.</p>
<p>In addition, this proposed advocate is contrary to our legal traditions, in which judges routinely make similar decisions on an ex parte basis, hearing only from the government. Mobsters don't get a public defender when the government seeks to wiretap their phones.</p>	<p>In addition, this proposed advocate [fighter for something] goes against our legal traditions, in which judges regularly make similar decisions on an ex parte basis, hearing only from the government. Mobsters don't get a public defender when the government tries to wiretap their phones.</p>
<p>Crooked bankers don't get a public defender when the government seeks a search warrant for their offices. There is no need to give ISIS a public defender when the government seeks to spy on its terrorists to keep the country safe.</p>	<p>Crooked bankers don't get a public defender when the government wants a search warrant for their offices. There is no need to give ISIS a public defender when the government wants to spy on its terrorists to keep the country safe.</p>

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

Senator Charles "Chuck" Grassley (R-IA) on May 22, 2015, part III

Senator Grassley's Actual Speech	The Meaning of His Speech
<p>Third, the bill also contains language that amends the federal criminal code to implement a series of important and widely-supported treaties aimed at preventing nuclear terrorism and proliferation.</p>	<p>Third, the bill also contains language that changes the federal criminal code to put in place a series of important and widely-supported treaties [agreements between countries] aimed at preventing nuclear terrorism and growth.</p>
<p>However, the bill doesn't authorize the death penalty for nuclear terrorists. Nor does it permit the government to request authorization from a judge to wiretap the telephones of these terrorists or allow those who provide them material support to be prosecuted. These commonsense provisions were requested by both the Bush and Obama Administrations, but for unknown reasons they were omitted from the bill.</p>	<p>However, the bill doesn't authorize [approve] the death penalty for nuclear terrorists. Nor does it permit the government to request authorization [approval] from a judge to wiretap the telephones of these terrorists or allow those who provide them material support to be prosecuted. These common sense rules were requested by both the Bush and Obama Administrations, but for unknown reasons they were left out of the bill.</p>
<p>In fact, Senator Whitehouse and I have introduced separate legislation, the Nuclear Terrorism Conventions Implementation and Safety of Maritime Navigation Act of 2015, which would implement these treaties with these provisions included.</p>	<p>In fact, Senator Whitehouse and I have introduced separate legislation [potential laws], the Nuclear Terrorism Conventions Implementation and Safety of Maritime Navigation Act of 2015, which would put in place treaties [agreements between countries] with these rules included.</p>
<p>Recently, I have been heartened that there is a bipartisan group of members of the Judiciary and Intelligence Committees who share these and other concerns. We have been discussing an alternative reform bill that would also end the bulk collection of telephone metadata under section 215. But it would also do a better job of ensuring that our national security is still protected.</p>	<p>Recently, I have been pleased that there is a bipartisan [two-party] group of members of the Judiciary [related to judges and the court system] and Intelligence Committees who share these and other concerns. We have been discussing an different reform bill that would also end the bulk collection of telephone metadata under section 215. But it would also do a better job of making sure that our national security is still protected.</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>So I support a short, temporary reauthorization with the hope that an alternative reform bill can be crafted that addresses the core reform goals of the American people and that appropriately balances national security with the privacy and civil liberties of all Americans. There is work ahead, but it is important that we get this reform right.</p>	<p>So I support a short, temporary reauthorization [making something allowed under the law again] with the hope that an different reform bill can be created that addresses the core reform goals of the American people and that appropriately balances national security with the privacy and civil liberties [freedoms] of all Americans. There is work ahead, but it is important that we get this reform right.</p>
--	--

Source: Congressional Record - Senate

<https://www.congress.gov/congressionalrecord/2015/05/22/senate-section/article/S3302-1>

SPEECHES ON THE RENEWAL OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT

Representative Barbara Lee (D-CA) on May 20, 2015

Representative Lee's Actual Speech	The Meaning of The Speech
<p>Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act. This bill makes important improvements to the PATRIOT Act, including to Section 2154, which is the underpinning of the National Security Agency's (NSA) nationwide bulk collection program.</p>	<p>Mr. Speaker, I am against H.R. 2048, the USA Freedom Act, which makes improvements to the Patriot Act, in particular Section 2154, which forms the basis of the National Security Agency's (NSA) nationwide program to collect bulk information about citizens.</p>
<p>Yet a ruling last week by the Second Circuit found that the bulk collection of phone records under this section violated the law. The right to privacy is a fundamental American value. And it is clear that the practice of unconstitutional bulk data collection endangers that right.</p> <p>Last week's court decision underscores this - and makes clear that more robust surveillance reforms are needed. While the USA Freedom Act is a good step forward, it does not go far enough. And I recognize the hard work of my good friend and colleague, Ranking Member John Conyers, Jr., on this important bill.</p> <p>More than thirteen years after the passage of the PATRIOT Act, Congress must do more to balance our national security with the protection of our civil liberties.</p>	<p>But last week, the Second Circuit Court ruled that the bulk collection of phone records under this section violated the law. The right to privacy is a basic American value. And bulk data collection clearly violates that right to privacy and is unconstitutional [goes against something in the Constitution].</p> <p>Last week's court decision makes it clear that stronger rules about surveillance [secretly watching people] are needed. While the USA Freedom Act is a good step in this direction, it does not go far enough. I know that my good friend and fellow worker representative John Conyers, Jr., worked hard on this important bill.</p> <p>More than thirteen years after the PATRIOT Act was passed, Congress needs to do more to balance our national security with protecting our citizens' right to privacy.</p>
<p>The USA Freedom Act should include more robust protections to prevent the surveillance of individuals with no nexus to terrorism or any specific investigation. This would ensure adequate protections against indiscriminate surveillance from the government and ensure that Section 215 cannot be used to collect Americans' records unrelated to any specific investigation. We should also be working for</p>	<p>The USA Freedom Act should include stronger rules to protect citizens from being secretly recorded when it is not related to terrorism or any particular legal investigation. This would protect citizens right to privacy against unnecessary surveillance by the government and make sure that Section 215 cannot be used to collect their records if it is not related to a specific investigation. We should also be working</p>

Name:

Block:

Date:

<p>more robust minimization procedures to ensure that information collected under Section 215 is not stored in databases for years. This type of provision was included in a previous version of this bill and must be restored. We should also work to limit additional authorities outside of Section 215 that have been used to collect Americans' records in bulk.</p>	<p>for stronger rules to make sure that information about citizens that is collected under Section 215 is not kept in databases [computer files full of information] for years. This rule was included in an older version of this bill and should be put back in. We should also reduce other reasons beyond Section 215 that the government can collect Americans' information or records in bulk.</p>
<p>We know that the government has used other authorities - such as administrative subpoena laws - to collect Americans' records in bulk.</p>	<p>We know that the government has used other ways to collect Americans' information in bulk, such as administrative subpoena.</p>
<p>And finally, H.R. 2048 (USA FREEDOM Act) should be amended to ensure that the government does not use authorities under Section 702 as a backdoor to conduct surveillance on Americans. Section 702 allows the government to intercept contents of Americans' electronic communications with individuals abroad - and stores them in a database - without a warrant.</p>	<p>And finally, H.R. 2048 (USA FREEDOM Act) should be changed to make sure that the government does not use Section 702 as a backdoor way to secretly record or watch Americans. Section 702 allows the government to look at the contents of Americans' electronic communications [emails] with individuals in other countries - and keep them in a database - without a legal warrant.</p>
<p>Reforms to Section 702 should be included in this bill.</p> <p>Mr. Speaker, I applaud my colleagues for working in a bipartisan manner on this bill. Yet I believe that additional reforms were needed to adequately protect Americans' fundamental right to privacy. More than 13 years after the PATRIOT Act was first passed into law, it is time for Congress to let Section 215 expire and work toward serious and meaningful surveillance reform.</p>	<p>Changes to Section 702 should be included in this bill.</p> <p>Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues fellow legislators of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, for working together [bipartisan] on this bill. Yet I believe that additional changes are needed to fully protect Americans' basic right to privacy. More than 13 years after the PATRIOT Act became law, it is time for Congress to remove Section 215 and work to make serious changes to the rules for secretly recording or watching citizens.</p>

Source: Congressional Record - House of Representatives

<https://www.congress.gov/congressionalrecord/2015/05/20/extensions-of-remarks-section/article/E762-1>