

H7161

[illegible]

H7161

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

ACCOUNTING INVESTING FOREIGN FINANCIALS —

ANNUAL RECORD—HOUSE

[illegible][illegible]

ATTENDS.—For purposes of this

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

[illegible]

(b) **FOIA OF CERTIFICATION.**—The certification described in subsection (a) shall be made by the head of the Federal agency or an officer or employee of the Federal agency whose appointment to the position is for a term of more than one year, or by the head of the Federal agency or an officer or employee of the Federal agency who is designated by the head of the Federal agency to act in his or her stead, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

[illegible]

[illegible][illegible]

[illegible]

October 23, 2001

[illegible]

resulted in the death of an individual, the aggravated form of the offense is established under this title on the basis of a term of years or life, or death.

In this section—

(1) the term "biological agent" has the meaning that term has in section 1761(a)(1);

(2) the term "biological weapon" has the meaning that term has in section 830(a)(1);

(3) the term "destructive device" has the meaning that term has in section 832(a)(1);

(4) the term "destructive substance" has the meaning that term has in section 833(a)(1);

(5) the term "transportation" has the meaning that term has in section 834(a)(1);

(6) the term "United States Code" has the meaning that term has in section 1101(a)(1).

[illegible]

by striking "and";
b. by striking the period
after "and"; and
c. by inserting the following:
"economic reform; maintain-
ing respect for human life;
of the criminal laws of
any State;
intended
or coerce a civilian population;
the policy of a government;
or coercion; or
conduct of a government;
assassination, or kidnaping,
or."

CORD — HOUSE

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

[illegible][illegible]

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

States on a "derivative basis" (the spouse or minor child of a non-immigrant who was killed or injured on September 11, 2001; adversely affected by the September 11 attacks) apply for benefits based on their liability to meet certain deadlines through no fault of their own. On September 11, 2001, the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks resulted in a \$1.15 billion lottery, advance parole and voluntary departure, immigration relief to the widowed widowers and orphan children of citizens and legal permanent residents who were killed in the September 11 attacks by airplane, automobile, or non-immigrant resident status to be adjudicated.

Prevents children from aging out of eligibility for the September 11, 2001 lottery. This was the result of the September 11, 2001 attacks and for temporary administrative relief to allow the temporary administrative relief to be applied for by the September 11, 2001 killed or seriously injured in the terrorist attack.

[illegible]

Special **17**
The Department of Justice has announced that it will pay up to \$1 million to the family of a man who was killed in a 1976 shooting in New York City. The man was a member of the Black Liberation Army. The Department of Justice is also seeking information about the man's whereabouts. The man's name is James Earl Ray. The Department of Justice is also seeking information about the man's whereabouts. The man's name is James Earl Ray. The Department of Justice is also seeking information about the man's whereabouts. The man's name is James Earl Ray.

conducting electronic surveillance of private citizens. The FBI's Office of Other Federal Law Enforcement Agencies has been ordered to conduct such surveillance only in the most "exceptional" cases, and to use only the most "effective" means. The Office of Other Federal Law Enforcement Agencies is also directed to use only the most "effective" means to conduct such surveillance. The Office of Other Federal Law Enforcement Agencies is also directed to use only the most "effective" means to conduct such surveillance.

colleges against U.S. government officials. The Department of Education Section 507. Disclosure of Educational Information. The Department of Education (Education and Workforce)—allows disclosure of student education records if it is necessary to the administration of the Department of Education for their decision making. The Department of Education is not doing so would reasonably be expected to result in the identification of a federal terrorism suspect or preventing a federal terrorism suspect from carrying out a national terrorism. Based on Administration's proposal, both § 507 and § 507(a) are limited to the purpose of obtaining information for the Department of Education and are limited to § 507(a) to obtain information for the Department of Education. Section 507. Disclosure of NOES Information. The Department of Education is not doing so would reasonably be expected to result in the identification of a federal terrorism suspect or preventing a federal terrorism suspect from carrying out a national terrorism. Based on Administration's proposal.

TITLE VII—PROVIDING FOR VICTIMS AND PUBLIC SAFETY OF OTHERS

SUBTITLE A—AND TO FAMILIES OF PUBLIC SAFETY OF OTHERS

CHAPTER 1—PROVIDING FOR VICTIMS AND PUBLIC SAFETY OF OTHERS

SECTION 507. DISCLOSURE OF EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION.

[illegible]

**TITLE VI--INCREASED REFORMATION
SLASHING**
The Seattle expands regional information to facilitate federal-state-local law enforcement responses to terrorism. Not in consideration's proposal.

Section 862. Definition of Domestic Terrorism.—Creates a definition for "domestic terrorism" for the limited purpose of providing for the activities of persons, organizations, or individuals (i.e., courts, schools, restaurants, etc.) for purposes of this title. The territorial jurisdiction of the territorial courts of the United States is that "it is dangerous to human life and violate criminal laws of the United States or Federal Government, or to be intimidated or coerced by the effect-to intimidate, threaten, or influence government policy (national or state) or destruction, or affect government operations or conduct, assassination, kidnapping, or other offenses." Same as Adm. Code, 28.1-101.01.

Section 863. Prohibition Against Harboring.—Makes it an offense when someone harbors or conceals another who knows or has reason to believe that he or she would have known had engaged in or was engaged in a federal criminal offense.

I47201

[illegible]

On October 1, 1982, the Attorney General announced that the Department of Justice was reviewing the proposal because it contains more measured language than the previous proposal. The Attorney General stated that the Department of Justice was reviewing the proposal because it contains more measured language than the previous proposal. The Attorney General stated that the Department of Justice was reviewing the proposal because it contains more measured language than the previous proposal.

Section 601. Technical Clarification Bill: This bill amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that the Federal Food and Drug Administration (FDA) publish a list of the names of the manufacturers of all drugs that are marketed in the United States. The bill also requires the FDA to publish a list of the names of the manufacturers of all drugs that are marketed in the United States. The bill also requires the FDA to publish a list of the names of the manufacturers of all drugs that are marketed in the United States.

located. Some Administration proposal for a "Section Five" of Federal Crime Act, which would require that "Federal agents, in furtherance of detection of offenses involving espionage, shall be permitted to use any weapon that is not reasonably justified under the circumstances, by a prophylactic, preventive, or deterrent purpose." The proposal is similar to Administration proposal except that provision stating that government does not have to establish means of defendant has been removed in the conference report.

[illegible][illegible]

the use in evidence in a criminal prosecution of information illegally obtained by foreign intelligence services operating abroad in criminal prosecutions in the United States, and the use of wiretap authority under the so-called FISA Act, even when the real purpose of the wiretap had little or nothing to do with intelligence gathering.

Now, we all know what happened here on the floor of the House when the committee bill came before the body.

much was accomplished in that committee. It has been mentioned time and time again that it was a unanimous vote, and both the chairman and the staffs on both side and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) really do deserve our gratitude.

However, in the aftermath of what happened here, many of us could not support the bill. I was one of those who voted against it. But the good news is that there were subsequent negotia-

The sunset provision obviously will give us a second look and correct the problems that we hope will not arise, but many of us fear. At this point in time I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Frank) because he participated in those negotiations and really did improve the bill that left the floor of the House. I just

HAYES said that, I still have no reservations about some aspects of the bill. For example, it does not require a secret grand national security official to issue a national security order without a court order. This is a serious departure from our criminal jurisprudence, and I cannot understand why it is included because securing a court order is a simple procedure. It would not hinder an investigation. However, notwithstanding such reservations, I have to acknowledge we have come a long way and I will support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. LINDBLAD.

[illegible]

lary measures. Probably the saving grace here is that the sunset provision forces us to come back and to look at these issues again when heads are cooled and when we are not in the heat of battle.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I am going to vote on this bill yet because I have not had time to read it. What I want to talk about now is my deep disappointment in the procedure. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Swensen), the chairman of the committee, has asked the members to look at things; but on the whole, his efforts have not been honored.

We now, for the third time, are debating on the floor a bill of very high importance. It is one of those bills that

found affirmative. In the history of our courts, there has never been a case like this. It is in either case has any Member been allowed to offer a simple amendment. At no point in the debate has a procedure of this kind been used. In this very profound set of issues have we had a procedure whereby the most democratic institution of Representatives, engaged in democracy, engaged in democracy, engaged in democracy. Who decided that to defend democracy we had to degrade it? Who decided that the very openness and the very participation which we have had at this time decided that we had a device at this time

This bill, ironically, which has been given all of these dignifying accolades, is the farthest thing from being a "Bill of Rights" as it stands up along the Star Spangled Banner bill, and being debated in the most undemocratic way in the history of Congress. If it is possible, and it is not worthy of this in-

C

[illegible]

thought members might have voted a 3-year sunset. They might have voted not to have the burden of proof be on someone to prove his innocence in a criminal case, the House has not been there. Mr. Speaker, the procedure which developed by a procedure which degrades democracy in the name of defending it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, no one has appreciated the attempts at fairness more than the

the Judiciary. The members of the Committee on the Judiciary had a free open debate; and we came to a bill which, I think, is the best that is even though imperfect, was unanimously agreed on. That was removed from us, and we are now debating at a hour of night, with only two copies of the bill that we are being asked to vote on. We cannot vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong with that process. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) first said that the bill was not available to Members on either side of the aisle. I am hoping on the other side of the aisle they at least have two copies.

[illegible][illegible]

What we need is we need to get the intelligence necessary to protect the people of the United States of America from whatever the enemy has up its sleeve.

What we have before us here today is the result of a preconference that has been a bipartisan and biethnic participation. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ROBERTS) presided over the last week there was a meeting presided over by our distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HASTERT), in attendance were the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AMER), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. GEFHARDT), the gentleman from

representing the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONTRAS), myself on the House side, and Senators DASHLEIGH, LOTT, LEAHY, and HATCH representing the Senate leadership and the chairman and ranking minority membership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I can tell that membership tonight is better than the one before us because I can tell that the bill which was passed on October 12 by a vote of 87 to 70. We were able to get it through in a shorter sunset. We were able to include money laundering provisions which were not in our bill because of jurisdictional problems, but which were in the bill passed by the other body and language was passed by us last week as a result of the efforts of the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services, Mr. [redacted].

LA FALCE.

MR. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. SENNENBRENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

MR. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, is this gentleman from Wisconsin in any position to assure Members of the House that there will be a conference on this measure?

MR. SENNENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that because this is the result of a preconference, it will be a conference.

the body would pass this bill unamended and send it to the Senate. The issues that would have been debated in the conference were debated in the preconference with the participants I just mentioned. There was compromise that took place between what the Senate passed and what the House passed.

I think that this bill again is better than the bill that we passed on October 12, and I believe that it is deserving of the support of all Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, we had a preconference before we had a bill and before there was a conference, and now we are not going to have a conference.

Mr. SENNENBERGER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the urgency of getting this job done is very great. If there were issues that were not discussed between this body

I think a conference would merely delay passing powers that law enforcement vitally needs. We have done a good job in balancing the need for stronger law enforcement powers and civil liberties. I would urge support of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEWART): The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEWART) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H. R. 3162.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore: In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, on that

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until tomorrow.

□ 2630

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SWENERT) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk

**Office of the Clerk,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC, October 22, 2001.**

**Re: J. DAVIS HARTZ,
The Speaker House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.**

DR. J. DAVIS HARTZ: Pursuant to the permission granted in House 203 of Rule U of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on October 22, 2001 at 4:44 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President, whereby he submits the FY 2002 Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board.

ANNUAL REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro Tempore (Mr. PLATT) held before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

the United States; which was read and together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:
I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Railroad Retirement Board for Fiscal Year 2000, pursuant to the provisions of section 7106(d) of the Rail-

SPECIAL ORDERS

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. (Under the Speaker's announced policy of June 1, 2003, members' remarks shall be limited to 5 minutes, unless otherwise announced.)

DISTRICT IN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a unanimous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Mr. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be back here where I feel most at home, on the House floor, and have felt that way for more than a decade.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor also to say that no city has had a greater number of direct consequences from the September 21 attack than the District of Columbia: The closure of National Airport; the shutdown of our major industry, tourism; the only real possibility that has come down upon us.

industry we have got here except government, the closure of the House, anti-war scares and now anthrax deaths. Like most of you, I know my constituents look to me, they have to look to me for leadership, especially in times of crisis. I am trying to help my people move on to avoid panic, and I need the help of this House and of the entire Congress.

[illegible]

to save to make, public officials have to make, warning postal workers and Americans of danger have eclipsed any message that we are Americans and Americans that we go on with our lives and not be terrorized by terror.