

A TRIBUTE TO GLORIA CONWAY

**HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2006

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to an outstanding woman, Gloria Conway, the long-time editor of the Charlestown Patriot. She recently sold this neighborhood weekly, a publication that she owned with her husband, Jim, for nearly 40 years.

Gloria's passion for her neighborhood was evident in the pages of her paper and in the various charity events she champions with her husband. As editor of The Charlestown Patriot, she would honor a mother's wish to recognize a son's first little league homerun with the same importance as any news emanating from Washington, DC. Her paper creatively balanced a nostalgic tie to Charlestown's historic past while also covering today's relevant topics, and it was always done with a local flair.

The Patriot will remain in Charlestown with Gloria Conway as Publisher Emeritus. It has a different look and new owners, but the decades of positive influence that Gloria Conway provided will endure at the Patriot and within the Charlestown community for years to come. I wish Gloria, Jim and the entire Conway family all the best in whatever the future holds. I want to thank them for their friendship and commitment as they recorded Charlestown's most recent history in their pages.

HONORING JESSICA TURNER

**HON. RON LEWIS**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2006

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jessica Turner, an exemplary citizen from my district who was recently named recipient of the Elizabethtown Independent Schools' 2005-06 Excellence in the Classroom and Educational Leadership (ExCEL) Award.

A teacher for more than six years, Ms. Turner promotes a unique style in her classroom that incorporates hard work, cooperation and respect among her kindergarten and first grade students at the Helmwood Heights Elementary School in Elizabethtown, KY. Year after year, she continues to capture the attention of her students, encouraging them to feel comfortable with themselves and with each other as she blends activities with lessons to keep them engaged and learning.

In addition to her work in the classroom, Jessica Turner oversees the professional development of kindergarten, first-grade, and second-grade teachers and is a valuable resource to new faculty. Ms. Turner is also actively involved in numerous teacher training programs including the Kentucky Reading Project and the Louisville Writing Project.

I applaud Jessica Turner's accomplishments in public education, an occupation of great responsibility and even greater reward. On behalf of so many in the Elizabethtown area, I would like to express my profound appreciation for her service and inspiration as she mo-

tivates young people to recognize and develop their talents and abilities.

It is my great privilege to recognize Jessica Turner today, before the entire U.S. House of Representatives, for her achievements as an educator. Her unique dedication to the development and well-being of young people and the communities they will someday serve make her an outstanding citizen worthy of our collective honor and respect.

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

**HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2006

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, this February we commemorate Black History Month. Since 1976, the month of February has been the designated time for honoring the countless African-American contributions to American history and culture. We should all take this opportunity to learn about and understand the Black experience in this country. It has completely revolutionized our shared concepts of freedom, hope, and justice.

In celebrating the progress our country has made because of these contributions, let us also be honest and frank in determining what remains undone. We must work to ensure that all of America's communities have access to the American dream. We cannot ignore the reality that many Americans, particularly within the African-American community, still face serious obstacles in accessing the opportunities everyone deserves in education, health care, home ownership, and economic development. The devastation of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita only serve to highlight the remaining challenges of seeking equality and equal treatment under the law.

We must commit ourselves to challenging the social, political, and economic status quo so that each of us may realize the dream of equal opportunity envisioned by the late Dr. King, and now the late Coretta Scott King. This year, Black History Month will be dedicated to the memory of Ms. King.

Our Nation mourns the recent loss of Coretta Scott King, a true American icon who championed civil and human rights for all Americans. Widow of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., Ms. King first stepped into the international spotlight as the wife and faithful supporter of the famed minister, ultimately emerging as an influential civil rights advocate in her own right. She was 78 at her passing. I hope you will join me in remembering this great person and the precious values that her life embodied. She was not only a symbol of positive change but also a tireless agent of progress. May her work continue to influence future generations in the ongoing fight for justice in this Nation and throughout the world.

During the month of February, I encourage all Americans to honor African-Americans by attending local Black History Month events, or hosting a roundtable discussion about Black History Month at the local library with African-American activists from your community. The best way to honor the African American experience is to educate oneself and one's community. Use this month to expose yourselves to the ways in which the African American experience has already been made a part of your life.

HIGHLIGHTS OF CIVIL LIBERTY SAFEGUARDS CONTAINED IN PATRIOT ACT CONFERENCE REPORT

**HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 2006

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the following House Judiciary Committee press releases that highlight important civil liberty safeguards that are contained in the PATRIOT Act conference report.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #1—Requiring High-Level Approval and Additional Reporting to Congress for Section 215 Requests for Sensitive Information Such as Library or Medical Records:*

Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act authorizes the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or a designee of the Director to apply to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court for an order requiring the production of any tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items) for a foreign terrorism or spy investigation. This authority provides counterterrorism and law enforcement officials a helpful tool to uncover what activities suspected terrorists or spies are engaged in. The Department of Justice testified in April 2005 to the House Judiciary Committee that a Section 215 order had not been used to request sensitive information such as library, bookstore, medical, or gun records and no evidence has been presented to demonstrate otherwise. Nonetheless, some have raised concerns that this authority could be abused by mid-level officials to seek sensitive categories of records about law-abiding Americans.

To address these concerns, the conference report provides that when the documents sought relate to certain sensitive categories of records (such as library, bookstore, tax return, firearms sales, educational, and medical records), only the FBI Director, Deputy Director, or Official-in-Charge of Intelligence may approve the application before it can be submitted to the FISA court. Without the personal approval of one of these 3 officials, the 215 order for these sensitive categories of records may not be issued. Additionally, the conference report establishes enhanced reporting requirements to Congress regarding the use of Section 215, including a breakdown of its use to obtain library, medical, educational, and other sensitive types of records in order to further protect this authority from possibly being abused. These civil liberty safeguards contained in the conference report do not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #2—Statement of Facts Showing Relevance to a Terrorism or Foreign Spy Investigation Required for Section 215 Requests:*

Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act authorizes the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation or a designee of the Director to apply to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court for an order requiring the production of any tangible things (including books, records, papers, documents, and other items) for a foreign terrorism or spy investigation. This authority provides counterterrorism and law enforcement officials a helpful and less invasive tool to both uncover what activities suspected terrorists or spies are engaged in and clear innocent people suspected of terrorism or spying. Without Section 215 authority, counterterrorism and law enforcement officials seeking to discover whether a person is involved in

terrorism or spying activity would be forced to use more invasive investigative techniques such as obtaining a search warrant. Current law only requires that an application for a Section 215 order state that the requested records are sought for an authorized investigation to collect foreign terrorism or spy information.

The conference report requires that a Section 215 application must include a statement of facts demonstrating that the records sought are "relevant" to an authorized investigation to obtain terrorism or foreign intelligence information. This statement of facts requirement contains language offered by Senator Leahy. This statement of facts civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law. In addition, the conference report maintains the specific prohibition that the requested information not concern a U.S. person unless it is to protect against international terrorism or spying activities.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #3—Explicitly Allowing a FISA Court Judge to Deny or Modify a Section 215 Request:*

Under current law, upon receiving the Section 215 application, the FISA Court judge must approve or modify the order; the current law does not include specific authority for the court to deny an application. The PATRIOT Act conference report explicitly provides a FISA Court judge the discretion to not only approve or modify a Section 215 application, but also to deny an application. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #4—Requiring Minimization Procedures to Limit Retention and Dissemination of Information Obtained About U.S. Persons From Section 215 Requests:*

In order to address concerns that information sought in a Section 215 order might be unnecessarily retained or disseminated, the PATRIOT Act conference report requires that the Attorney General create minimization procedures for the retention and dissemination of this data and that the FBI use these procedures. Specifically, the A.G. must establish minimization procedures to minimize the retention, and dissemination, of nonpublicly available information concerning non-consenting United States persons consistent with the need of the United States to obtain, produce, and disseminate foreign intelligence information. This civil liberty provision provides another safeguard to ensure information about innocent U.S. persons is not kept or used in nefarious or inappropriate ways. This civil liberty safeguard is not contained in current law and was requested by Senator Leahy.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #5—Explicitly Providing for a Judicial Challenge to a Section 215 Order:*

Current law requires judicial review before a Section 215 order can be issued. Specifically, the FISA Court is required to review all applications before a Section 215 order is approved. However, current law does not provide a judicial review process after a 215 order has been issued. The pending PATRIOT Act conference report explicitly establishes a judicial review process after the 215 order has been issued to allow the recipient of a 215 order to challenge the order before the FISA Court. The FISA Court may quash a Section 215 request if it does not meet the requirements of the statute or is otherwise unlawful. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #6—Explicitly Clarifying that a Recipient of a Section 215 Order May Disclose Receipt to an Attorney or Others Necessary to Comply with or Challenge the Order:*

Current law prohibits the recipient of a 215 order from disclosing the receipt of such an order except to those necessary to comply with the order. This is done for 2 main reasons: 1) fear of tipping off terrorists or spies that they are being investigated; and 2) irreparably harming the reputations of innocent people by publicly disclosing their activities were investigated because of terrorism or spying links. Current law is silent as to whether a 215 order recipient may disclose the receipt of such an order to an attorney to comply with the order. The pending PATRIOT Act conference report clarifies this issue by stating explicitly that the recipient of a 215 order may disclose receipt to an attorney or others necessary to comply with or challenge the order. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #7—Requiring Public Reporting of the Number of Section 215 Orders:*

On April 6, 2005, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales testified before the House Judiciary Committee that as of March 30, 2005, the FISA Court had approved the Justice Department's request for a Section 215 order 35 times. However, under current law, the number of Section 215 orders is not required to be made public. At the request of Senator Leahy and other Senate Democratic conferees, the PATRIOT Act conference report requires the Justice Department to report to the public annually the aggregate number of Section 215 applications submitted, approved, modified, and denied. Despite the concerns of some that this public reporting requirement unnecessarily informs America's enemies of the sources and methods being used to thwart terrorism and spying, the conference reports includes this civil liberty safeguard to assuage any concerns that the Section 215 authority is being abused. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #8—Requiring the Justice Department's Independent Inspector General to Conduct an Audit of Each Justice Department Use of Section 215 Orders:*

The PATRIOT Act conference report provides additional public information and congressional oversight by requiring the Justice Department's independent Inspector General to conduct an audit for each Justice Department use of Section 215 orders. These audits will be compiled into two Inspector General public reports with classified annexes. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #9—Explicitly Providing for a Judicial Challenge to a National Security Letter (NSL):*

Current law does not specify that an NSL can be challenged in court and provides no process for challenging an NSL. The conference report provides explicit authority to challenge in court an NSL under all existing statutes authorizing NSLs. Specifically, the conference report provides that the recipient of an NSL may petition for an order modifying or setting aside the NSL request in the U.S. district court for the district where the recipient does business or resides. This civil liberty safeguard is stronger than the Senate-passed bill, which only addressed one of the NSL statutes, does not exist under current law, and was written by Rep. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.).

Originally created by a Democrat-led Congress and signed into law by President Carter, NSLs are a long-standing tool by which the FBI and other appropriate federal law enforcement officials request, for sen-

sitive foreign spying or international terrorism investigations, subscriber information and toll billing records of a wire or electronic communication service provider, such as a phone company or AOL.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #10—Explicitly Clarifying: that a Recipient of a National Security Letter (NSL) May Disclose Receipt to an Attorney or Others Necessary to Comply with or Challenge the Order:*

As NSLs may only be used in highly sensitive international terrorism or foreign espionage investigations with national security implications, current law prohibits the recipient of an NSL from disclosing the receipt of such an order. Current law is silent as to whether an NSL recipient may disclose the receipt of such an order to an attorney to comply with or challenge the order. The pending PATRIOT Act conference report clarifies this issue by stating explicitly that the recipient of an NSL may disclose receipt to an attorney or others necessary to comply with or challenge the order. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law and was written by Rep. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.).

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #11—Providing that a Nondisclosure Order Does Not Automatically Attach to a National Security Letter (NSL):*

Current law automatically prohibits the recipient of an NSL from disclosing receipt of it. The conference report amends the law so that a nondisclosure order does not automatically attach to an NSL. Instead, a nondisclosure requirement will attach to an NSL only upon a certification by the government that disclosure could cause one of the harms specified in the conference report, such as endangering a witness or threatening national security. This civil liberty safeguard does not exist in current law and was written by Rep. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.).

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #12—Providing Explicit Judicial Review of a Nondisclosure Requirement to a National Security Letter (NSL):*

Current law does not allow the recipient of an NSL to challenge a nondisclosure order attached to the NSL. The conference report changes this by explicitly providing for judicial review of a nondisclosure requirement to an NSL. The NSL recipient may challenge the nondisclosure requirement in the U.S. district court for the district in which the recipient does business or resides. This civil liberty safeguard does not exist in current law and was written by Rep. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.).

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #13—Requiring Public Reporting of the Number of National Security Letters (NSLs):*

At the request of Senator Leahy and other Senate Democratic conferees, the PATRIOT Act conference report includes—for the first time—public reporting on the aggregate number of NSLs requested for information about U.S. persons. Despite the concerns of some that this public reporting requirement unnecessarily informs America's enemies of the sources and methods being used to thwart terrorism and spying, the conference reports includes this civil liberty safeguard to assuage any concerns that the NSL authority is being abused. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #14—Requiring the Justice Department's Independent Inspector General to Conduct Two Audits of the Use of National Security Letters (NSLs):*

The PATRIOT Act conference report provides additional public information and congressional oversight by requiring the Justice Department's independent Inspector General to conduct two audits on the use of NSLs

during the years 2003–2006. These audits will be compiled into two Inspector General public reports with classified annexes. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #15—Requiring Additional Reporting to Congress by the Justice Department on Use of National Security Letters (NSLs):*

The PATRIOT Act conference report enhances congressional oversight over the use of NSLs by requiring additional classified reporting to Congress on the use of NSL authorities. Specifically, the conference report requires the House and Senate Judiciary Committees to receive all classified reports regarding use of NSLs; currently these committees only receive classified reports under one of the five statutes authorizing NSLs.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #16—Requiring the Justice Department to Re-Certify that Nondisclosure of a National Security Letter (NSL) is Necessary:*

The PATRIOT Act conference report explicitly allows an NSL recipient to challenge a nondisclosure requirement in U.S. district court. If an NSL recipient challenges the prohibition on disclosure more than a year after the NSL is issued, the Justice Department must re-certify that nondisclosure is necessary, or else the nondisclosure requirement lapses. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #17—Narrowing the Deference Given to the Justice Department on a National Security Letter (NSL) Nondisclosure Certification:*

The PATRIOT Act conference report provides greater judicial discretion by narrowing the deference given to certifications by the Justice Department on NSL nondisclosure requirements. Like the Senate-passed version, the conference report provides an additional level of deference if an NSL nondisclosure certification is made on the grounds that disclosure may endanger national security or diplomatic relations. At the request of Senator Leahy, this heightened degree of deference is only provided to certifications made by a few Senate-confirmed officials at the time the nondisclosure petition is filed. This civil liberty safeguard contained in the conference report does not exist under current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #18—Requiring a Report to Congress on Any Use of Data-Mining: Programs by the Justice Department:*

Data-mining programs take vast amounts of information and try to utilize it for specific purposes such as identifying a group with similar features. These programs can be helpful in “connecting the dots” and are becoming more useful as a tool to bolster homeland security. Congress wants to ensure that agencies using data-mining programs take all necessary steps to protect privacy and the unauthorized dissemination of information.

The PATRIOT Act conference report enhances congressional oversight of data-mining programs by requiring the Justice Department to report to Congress on the use or development of any of these programs by the Justice Department. This report will help inform Members of Congress of the civil liberty protections that are built into—or should be built into—these Justice Department data-mining programs. This new civil liberty safeguard contained in the PATRIOT Act conference report does not exist in current law and was written by Reps. Howard Berman (D-Calif.) and William Delahunt (D-Mass.).

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #19—Requiring Notice Be Given on*

*Delayed-Notice Search Warrants Within 30 Days of the Search:*

Prior to the enactment of the PATRIOT Act in 2001, the U.S. Courts had authorized delayed notice search warrants under limited circumstances. For these special situations, the PATRIOT Act adopted the Courts’ practice of requiring law enforcement to provide notice within a reasonable amount of time after the search has been carried out. Some were concerned that using a “reasonable amount of time” standard could allow abuse. Thus, the PATRIOT Act reauthorization conference report narrows and clarifies this standard by providing a Court the discretion to delay notice for up to 30 days after the search is executed. This new conference report civil liberty safeguard is not found in current law.

Notice has been delayed in only rare cases. As of January 31, 2005, the Justice Department has requested delayed-notice search warrants approximately 155 times since passage of the PATRIOT Act on October 26, 2001 out of the tens of thousands of search warrants authorized each year. These warrants make up fewer than 1 in 500 search warrants obtained in that period. Delayed-notice search warrants have been a valuable tool used by law enforcement for decades. Like all criminal search warrants, a delayed-notice search warrant is issued by a federal judge only upon a showing that there is probable cause to believe that a crime has been or will be committed and that the property sought or seized constitutes evidence of this criminal offense. Notice is delayed only to protect an on-going investigation and the safety of the American public. Not delaying notice could allow a terrorist or criminal to flee the country, destroy evidence about his activity, alert associates to go into hiding, or even kill witnesses who could implicate the individual.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #20—Limiting Delayed-Notice Search Warrants Extensions to 90 Days or Less:*

Like the versions passed by the House and the Senate, the PATRIOT Act conference report narrows and clarifies the permissible extension period by providing a Court the discretion to extend the delay of notice for up to 90 days except under exceptional circumstances. This new conference report civil liberty safeguard is not found in current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #21—Requiring an Updated Showing of Necessity in Order to Extend the Delay of Notice of a Search Warrant:*

To ensure that a Court considering extending a delay of notice has the best and most up-to date information, the PATRIOT Act conference report requires an updated show of necessity by the applicant in order to extend the delay of notice of a search warrant. This new conference report civil liberty safeguard is not found in current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #22—Requiring Annual Public Reporting on the Use of Delayed-Notice Search Warrants:*

To assuage concerns that delayed-notice search warrants could be abused, the PATRIOT Act conference report requires public reporting on the use of these search warrants. Specifically, the annual public report will include the “number of applications for warrants and extensions of warrants authorizing delayed notice, and the number of such warrants and extensions granted or denied during the preceding fiscal year.” This new conference report civil liberty safeguard is not found in current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #23—Requiring Additional Specificity from an Applicant Before Roving Surveillance May be Authorized:*

In an age of disposable cell phones, “roving” wiretaps are a reasonable and common-

sense updating of investigative techniques to account for technological advances. A “roving” wiretap follows the target rather than just a single phone or communications device. The PATRIOT Act conference report addresses concerns about vagueness in applications for “roving” wiretaps in foreign spying and terrorism investigations by requiring additional specificity in these applications in order for a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court judge to consider authorizing a “roving” wiretap. This civil liberty safeguard is not included in current law.

Congress has authorized criminal wiretaps for decades as an effective crime-fighting tool. Because of technological advances, including the use of cell phones, in 1986 Congress authorized “roving” wiretaps in criminal cases that allowed for the surveillance to target a person rather than a specific phone or communications device. However, prior to the PATRIOT Act, this authority did not exist for international spying or terrorism cases; thus, for these cases the government had to return to the FISA Court and apply for a new wiretap every time the suspected spy or terrorist used a different phone or communications device. This costly, cumbersome, and time-consuming requirement served as a major impediment in foreign spying and terrorism investigations. The PATRIOT Act extended the “roving” wiretap authority to international spying and terrorism cases by allowing a FISA Court judge to authorize a “roving” wiretap provided the applicant demonstrates there is probable cause to believe the target is a foreign spy or terrorist.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #24—Requiring Court Notification Within 10 Days of Conducting Surveillance on a New Facility Using a “Roving” Wiretap:*

The PATRIOT Act conference report addresses concerns the “roving” wiretap authority could be abused by requiring the investigators to inform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court within 10 days when the “roving” surveillance authority is used to target a new facility.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #25—Requiring Ongoing FISA Court Notification of the Total Number of Places or Facilities Under Surveillance Using a “Roving” Wiretap:*

The PATRIOT Act conference report enhances judicial oversight to address any concerns that the “roving” wiretap authority could be abused. Specifically, the conference report requires the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court to be informed on an ongoing basis of the total number of places or facilities under surveillance using a “roving” wiretap authority.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #26—Requiring Additional Specificity in a FISA Court Judge’s Order Authorizing a “Roving” Wiretap:*

The PATRIOT Act conference report addresses concerns about vagueness about the target in a Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Court judge’s order authorizing a “roving” wiretap in foreign spying and terrorism investigations by requiring additional specificity. The conference report requires the FISA Court judge’s order authorizing a “roving” wiretap to specify “the identity, if known, of the specific target” of the surveillance. Current law requires “the identity, if known, or a description of the target.” This new civil liberty safeguard is not included in current law.

*PATRIOT Act Conference Report Civil Liberty Safeguard #27—Providing a Four-Year Sunset on FISA “Roving” Wiretaps:*

Despite no evidence that the FISA “roving” wiretap authority has been abused, the PATRIOT Act conference report aggressively

attempts to avoid any potential abuse of FISA "roving" wiretaps by providing a four-year sunset of this authority. This civil liberty safeguard will ensure Congress revisits this authority in four years.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR TOURETTE SYNDROME RESEARCH

**HON. PETE SESSIONS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 1, 2006*

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to applaud Congress for including \$1.8 million for Tourette Syndrome research in H.R. 3010, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006, and to encourage the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to continue its partnership with the Tourette Syndrome Association (TSA).

The Tourette Syndrome education program provides intensive training and education about Tourette Syndrome for the public, physicians, allied healthcare workers, and teachers. Its objectives are to increase recognition and diagnosis, decrease the stigma, increase the provision of and improve the nature of treatments, decrease negative impacts on families, and improve academic outcomes for children with this disorder.

In May 2004, Chairman REGULA indicated in a letter to the CDC Director that the money Congress was appropriating to help those with Tourette Syndrome should be sole-sourced to the Tourette Syndrome Association. He respected TSA's expertise, and I congratulate him for recognizing that they would be the entity best able to undertake the following kinds of successful and efficient use of the funds. It is my sincere hope that CDC will continue to work in partnership with TSA, so they can build upon the successes they have demonstrated to date.

TSA, in partnership with the CDC, completed the first year of the program on August 31, 2005 and began the second year on September 1, 2005. In the first year, TSA offered 25 expert medical education programs, as well as five major education-allied professional programs. The medical programs trained 2,149 physicians, nurses and medical-related allied professional while the education programs trained 745 teachers and school-based allied professionals. These program sites were well distributed across the country.

An April 2005 analysis found that 73.5 percent of the physicians who responded to TSA's evaluation reported that over half of the material presented in the training was new to them.

The Tourette Syndrome Association also videotaped Dr. John Walkup's presentation on "Diagnosis and Treatment of Tourette Syndrome" which has been made available on TSA's website as the first of several Continuing Medical Education (CME) programs. To learn more about Tourette Syndrome or to view this presentation please, visit <http://tsa-usa.org>.

All ready for year two of this program, the Tourette Syndrome Association has scheduled twenty medical education programs and seventeen education programs. TSA also plans to videotape Dr. Jorge Juncos offering training

for neurologists in both English and Spanish for a future CME presentation on TSA's website.

It is in the best interest of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to continue its partnership with the Tourette Syndrome Association, so that this established program will continue to reach medical and education specialists across the country.

HONORING STEVE MONTGOMERY

**HON. RON LEWIS**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 1, 2006*

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay public tribute to Steve Montgomery, an exemplary community leader, businessman and citizen from Kentucky's Second Congressional District. A charter member of the CORE Committee at Fort Knox, Steve is stepping down from his duties after 14 years of dedicated service marked by tremendous growth and success.

Steve Montgomery first came to Radcliff, KY in 1983 to buy and operate an auto dealership. He has remained in the community for 22 years, distinguishing himself as a business leader and good neighbor. As a charter member, Steve has served on the CORE Committee since its inception. One of Steve's first recorded duties was to arrange a meeting for the group with MG Foley, then Fort Knox Commanding General. MG Foley was briefed on the details of CORE activities and objectives at the congressional, state and Fort Knox levels. Following their initial meeting with Senator MCCONNELL in 1992, the CORE Committee was directed to devote primary focus on securing the future of Fort Knox. In this effort, the Committee has ably managed numerous challenges throughout the years that have followed.

In 1992, the Committee played a major role in the decision to relocate USAREC Headquarters to Fort Knox after Fort Sheridan closed. Soon thereafter, the CORE Committee began conducting informational briefings for local governments and business requesting monetary support. Steve Montgomery was elected Vice Chairman in 1993 and immediately worked to build a strong rapport with Kentucky's Congressional Delegation. Steve was elected Chairman of the CORE Committee in 1996. During his Chairmanship, Fort Knox has endured an especially active decade as the post adapted to a new security environment, carried on a wartime training mission, managed BRAC considerations and the significant administrative changes that have followed.

Under Steve Montgomery's leadership, funding was secured to modernize facilities, such as the new STARBASE barracks, significantly enhancing Fort Knox's future viability. Perhaps Steve's greatest legacy will be his tireless promotion of Fort Knox's military value during Base Realignment and Closure proceedings in 2005. Because of his critical contributions, working with the Governor, Members of Congress, and private consultants, Fort Knox remains open today, adapting to a new mission as a vital multi-functional home to operational Army forces and various administrative commands. Steve leaves the CORE

Committee having completed the mission he was assigned many years earlier in the committee's nascence.

It is my great privilege to recognize Steve Montgomery today, before the entire U.S. House of Representatives, for his example of leadership and service. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him for his invaluable contributions to the CORE Committee, Fort Knox, and the Greater Radcliff community. His unique achievements make him an outstanding American worthy of our collective honor and respect.

REMEMBERING THE SPACE SHUTTLE "COLUMBIA" CREW

**HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO**

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 1, 2006*

Ms. BORDELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the astronauts of Mission STS-107 who lost their lives on February 1, 2003, when our Nation lost the Space Shuttle *Columbia*. The crew included Rick Husband, William "Willie" McCool, Michael Anderson, David Brown, Laurel Clark, Kalpana Chawla, and Colonel Han Ramon.

Commander William "Willie" C. McCool was a son of Guam. Commander McCool, who attended Dededo Middle School and John F. Kennedy High School on Guam, was the pilot of the *Columbia* on Mission STS-107. He proudly carried the Guam flag with him on the mission. Commander McCool's life and service to our Nation and our world holds special meaning to the people of Guam.

STS-107, like other Space Shuttle missions, sought to broaden our understanding of the world in which we live and of the heavens beyond. That mission, and the work of STS-107, represents the best of human endeavor. Willie McCool understood this. On January 29, 2003, Commander McCool reported from orbit high above the Earth, "From our orbital vantage point, we observe an Earth without borders, full of peace, beauty and magnificence, and we pray that humanity as a whole can imagine a borderless world as we see it and strive to live as one in peace." Willie McCool gave his life in pursuit of that dream. It is a dream that should be honored, and one that should be an inspiration to us as well as our children.

For that reason, on February 11, 2003, I introduced H.R. 672, a bill to rename the Guam South Elementary/Middle School after Commander McCool. The President signed H.R. 672 into law on April 11, 2003. And today, as namesake to the Commander William C. McCool Elementary/Middle School, Willie McCool's dream of a borderless world of peace lives on.

Exploration of space is exciting and inspiring. Rocketing into the heavens and returning to Earth represents the best of American ingenuity and courage. Manned space travel was once only a science fiction writer's dream. Our Nation made it a reality. Landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to the Earth was thought to be impossible. Our Nation proved the critics wrong. Routine missions to space flown by the Space Shuttle were considered frivolous. But our Nation remains proud of the Space Shuttle program, the Astronaut corps, and the contributions to