



Department of Justice

STATEMENT

OF

ALBERTO R. GONZALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

AND

ROBERT S. MUELLER, III
DIRECTOR
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE
UNITED STATES SENATE

CONCERNING

THE HISTORY AND APPLICATION OF THE USA PATRIOT ACT
AND THE IMPORTANCE OF
THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978 (FISA)

PRESENTED ON

APRIL 27, 2005

Testimony of Alberto R. Gonzales, Attorney General of the United States
and Robert S. Mueller, III, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation
United States Department of Justice
Before the Select Committee on Intelligence
United States Senate
April 27, 2005

Chairman Roberts, Vice Chairman Rockefeller, and Members of the Committee:

We are pleased to be here today to discuss the government's use of authorities granted to it by Congress under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (FISA). In particular, we appreciate the opportunity to have a candid discussion about the impact of the amendments to FISA made by the USA PATRIOT Act and how critical they are to the government's ability to successfully prosecute the war on terrorism and prevent another attack like that of September 11 from ever happening again.

As we stated in our testimony to the Senate Judiciary Committee, we are open to suggestions for strengthening and clarifying the USA PATRIOT Act, and we look forward to meeting with people both inside and outside of Congress who have expressed views about the Act. However, we will not support any proposal that would undermine our ability to combat terrorism effectively.

I. FISA Statistics

First, we would like to talk with you about the use of FISA generally. Since September 11, the volume of applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISA court) has dramatically increased.

- In 2000, 1,012 applications for surveillance or search were filed under FISA. As the Department's public annual FISA report sent to Congress on April 1, 2005 states, in 2004 we filed 1,758 applications, a 74% increase in four years.
- Of the 1,758 applications made in 2004, none were denied, although 94 were modified by the FISA court in some substantive way.

II. Key Uses of FISA Authorities in the War on Terrorism

In enacting the USA PATRIOT Act, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002, and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, Congress provided the government with vital tools that it has used regularly and effectively in its war on terrorism. The reforms contained in those measures affect every single application made by the Department for electronic surveillance or physical search of suspected terrorists and have enabled the government to become quicker and more flexible in gathering critical intelligence information on suspected terrorists. It is because of the key importance of these tools to the war on terror that we ask you to reauthorize the provisions of the USA PATRIOT Act scheduled to expire at the

end of this year. Of particular concern is section 206's authorization of multipoint or "roving" wiretaps, section 207's expansion of FISA's authorization periods for certain cases, section 214's revision of the legal standard for installing and using pen register / trap and trace devices, and section 215's grant of the ability to obtain a Court order requesting the production of business records related to national security investigations.

In addition, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 includes a "lone wolf" provision that expands the definition of "agent of a foreign power" to include a non-United States person, who acts alone or is believed to be acting alone and who engages in international terrorism or in activities in preparation therefor. This provision is also scheduled to sunset at the end of this year, and we ask that it be made permanent as well.

A. Roving Wiretaps

Section 206 of the USA PATRIOT Act extends to FISA the ability to "follow the target" for purposes of surveillance rather than tie the surveillance to a particular facility and provider when the target's actions may have the effect of thwarting that surveillance. In the Attorney General's testimony at the beginning of this month before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he declassified the fact that the FISA court issued 49 orders authorizing the use of roving surveillance authority under section 206 as of March 30, 2005. Use of roving surveillance has been available to law enforcement for many years and has been upheld as constitutional by several federal courts, including the Second, Fifth, and Ninth Circuits. Some object that this provision gives the FBI discretion to conduct surveillance of persons who are not approved targets of court-authorized surveillance. This is wrong. Section 206 did not change the requirement that before approving electronic surveillance, the FISA court must find that there is probable cause to believe that the target of the surveillance is either a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power, such as a terrorist or spy. Without section 206, investigators will once again have to struggle to catch up to sophisticated terrorists trained to constantly change phones in order to avoid surveillance.

Critics of section 206 also contend that it allows intelligence investigators to conduct "John Doe" roving surveillance that permits the FBI to wiretap every single phone line, mobile communications device, or Internet connection the suspect may use without having to identify the suspect by name. As a result, they fear that the FBI may violate the communications privacy of innocent Americans. Let me respond to this criticism in the following way. First, even when the government is unsure of the name of a target of such a wiretap, FISA requires the government to provide "the identity, if known, or a description of the target of the electronic surveillance" to the FISA Court prior to obtaining the surveillance order. 50 U.S.C. §§ 1804(a)(3) and 1805(c)(1)(A). As a result, each roving wiretap order is tied to a particular target whom the FISA Court must find probable cause to believe is a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power. In addition, the FISA Court must find "that the actions of *the target* of the application may have the effect of thwarting" the surveillance, thereby requiring an analysis of the activities of a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power that can be identified or described. 50 U.S.C.

§ 1805(c)(2)(B). Finally, it is important to remember that FISA has always required that the government conduct every surveillance pursuant to appropriate minimization procedures that limit the government's acquisition, retention, and dissemination of irrelevant communications of innocent Americans. Both the Attorney General and the FISA Court must approve those minimization procedures. Taken together, we believe that these provisions adequately protect against unwarranted governmental intrusions into the privacy of Americans. Section 206 sunsets at the end of this year.

B. Authorized Periods for FISA Collection

Section 207 of the USA PATRIOT Act has been essential to protecting the national security of the United States and protecting the civil liberties of Americans. It changed the time periods for which electronic surveillance and physical searches are authorized under FISA and, in doing so, conserved limited OIPR and FBI resources. Instead of devoting time to the mechanics of repeatedly renewing FISA applications in certain cases -- which are considerable -- those resources can be devoted instead to other investigative activity as well as conducting appropriate oversight of the use of intelligence collection authorities by the FBI and other intelligence agencies. A few examples of how section 207 has helped are set forth below.

Since its inception, FISA has permitted electronic surveillance of an individual who is an agent of foreign power based upon his status as a non-United States person who acts in the United States as "an officer or employee of a foreign power, or as a member" of an international terrorist group. As originally enacted, FISA permitted electronic surveillance of such targets for initial periods of 90 days, with extensions for additional periods of up to 90 days based upon subsequent applications by the government. In addition, FISA originally allowed the government to conduct physical searches of any agent of a foreign power (including United States persons) for initial periods of 45 days, with extensions for additional 45-day periods.

Section 207 of the USA PATRIOT Act changed the law as to permit the government to conduct electronic surveillance and physical search of certain agents of foreign powers and non-resident alien members of international groups for initial periods of 120 days, with extensions for periods of up to one year. It also allows the government to obtain authorization to conduct a physical search of any agent of a foreign power for periods of up to 90 days. Section 207 did not change the time periods applicable for electronic surveillance of United States persons, which remain at 90 days. By making these time periods equivalent, it has enabled the Department to file streamlined combined electronic surveillance and physical search applications that, in the past, were tried but abandoned as too cumbersome to do effectively.

As the Attorney General testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee, we estimate that the amendments in section 207 have saved OIPR approximately 60,000 hours of attorney time in the processing of applications. Because of section 207's success, we have proposed additional amendments to increase the efficiency of the FISA process. Among these would be to allow coverage of all non-U.S. person agents for foreign powers for 120 days initially with each

renewal of such authority allowing continued coverage for one year. Had this and other proposals been included in the USA PATRIOT Act, the Department estimates that an additional 25,000 attorney hours would have been saved in the interim. Most of these ideas were specifically endorsed in the recent report of the WMD Commission. The WMD Commission agreed that these changes would allow the Department to focus its attention where it is most needed and to ensure adequate attention is given to cases implicating the civil liberties of Americans. Section 207 is scheduled to sunset at the end of this year.

C. Pen Registers and Trap and Trace Devices

Some of the most useful, and least intrusive, investigative tools available to both intelligence and law enforcement investigators are pen registers and trap and trace devices. These devices record data regarding incoming and outgoing communications, such as all of the telephone numbers that call, or are called by, certain phone numbers associated with a suspected terrorist or spy. These devices, however, do not record the substantive content of the communications, such as the words spoken in a telephone conversation. For that reason, the Supreme Court has held that there is no Fourth Amendment protected privacy interest in information acquired from telephone calls by a pen register. Nevertheless, information obtained by pen registers or trap and trace devices can be extremely useful in an investigation by revealing the nature and extent of the contacts between a subject and his confederates. The data provides important leads for investigators, and may assist them in building the facts necessary to obtain probable cause to support a full content wiretap.

Under chapter 206 of title 18, which has been in place since 1986, if an FBI agent and prosecutor in a criminal investigation of a bank robber or an organized crime figure want to install and use pen registers or trap and trace devices, the prosecutor must file an application to do so with a federal court. The application they must file, however, is exceedingly simple: it need only specify the identity of the applicant and the law enforcement agency conducting the investigation, as well as “a certification by the applicant that the information likely to be obtained is relevant to an ongoing criminal investigation being conducted by that agency.” Such applications, of course, include other information about the facility that will be targeted and details about the implementation of the collection, as well as “a statement of the offense to which the information likely to be obtained . . . relates,” but chapter 206 does not require an extended recitation of the facts of the case.

In contrast, prior to the USA PATRIOT Act, in order for an FBI agent conducting an intelligence investigation to obtain FISA authority to use the same pen register and trap and trace device to investigate a spy or a terrorist, the government was required to file a complicated application under title IV of FISA. Not only was the government’s application required to include “a certification by the applicant that the information likely to be obtained is relevant to an ongoing foreign intelligence or international terrorism investigation being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation under guidelines approved by the Attorney General,” it also had to include the following:

information which demonstrates that there is reason to believe that the telephone line to which the pen register or trap and trace device is to be attached, or the communication instrument or device to be covered by the pen register or trap and trace device, has been or is about to be used in communication with—

(A) an individual who is engaging or has engaged in international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities that involve or may involve a violation of the criminal laws of the United States; or

(B) a foreign power or agent of foreign power under circumstances giving reason to believe that the communication concerns or concerned international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities that involve or may involve a violation of the criminal laws of the United States.

Thus, the government had to make a much different showing in order obtain a pen register or trap and trace authorization to find out information about a spy or a terrorist than is required to obtain the very same information about a drug dealer or other ordinary criminal. Sensibly, section 214 of the USA PATRIOT Act simplified the standard that the government must meet in order to obtain pen/trap data in national security cases. Now, in order to obtain a national security pen/trap order, the applicant must certify “that the information likely to be obtained is foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person, or is relevant to an investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.” Importantly, the law requires that such an investigation of a United States person may not be conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

Section 214 should not be permitted to expire and return us to the days when it was more difficult to obtain pen/trap authority in important national security cases than in normal criminal cases. This is especially true when the law already includes provisions that adequately protect the civil liberties of Americans. I urge you to re-authorize section 214.

D. Access to Tangible Things

Section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act allows the FBI to obtain an order from the FISA Court requesting production of any tangible thing, such as business records, if the items are relevant to an ongoing authorized national security investigation, which, in the case of a United States person, cannot be based solely upon activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution. The Attorney General also declassified earlier this month the fact that the FISA Court has issued 35 orders requiring the production of tangible things under section 215 from the date of the effective date of the Act through March 30th of this year. None of those orders was issued to libraries and/or booksellers, and none was for medical or gun records. The provision to date has been used only to order the production of driver’s license records, public accommodation records, apartment leasing records, credit card records, and subscriber

information, such as names and addresses, for telephone numbers captured through court-authorized pen register devices.

Similar to a prosecutor in a criminal case issuing a grand jury subpoena for an item relevant to his investigation, so too may the FISA Court issue an order requiring the production of records or items that are relevant to an investigation to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities. Section 215 orders, however, are subject to judicial oversight before they are issued – unlike grand jury subpoenas. The FISA Court must explicitly authorize the use of section 215 to obtain business records before the government may serve the order on a recipient. In contrast, grand jury subpoenas are subject to judicial review only if they are challenged by the recipient. Section 215 orders are also subject to the same standard as grand jury subpoenas – a relevance standard.

Section 215 has been criticized because it does not exempt libraries and booksellers. The absence of such an exemption is consistent with criminal investigative practice. Prosecutors have always been able to obtain records from libraries and bookstores through grand jury subpoenas. Libraries and booksellers should not become safe havens for terrorists and spies. Last year, a member of a terrorist group closely affiliated with al Qaeda used Internet service provided by a public library to communicate with his confederates. Furthermore, we know that spies have used public library computers to do research to further their espionage and to communicate with their co-conspirators. For example, Brian Regan, a former TRW employee working at the National Reconnaissance Office, who was convicted of espionage, extensively used computers at five public libraries in Northern Virginia and Maryland to access addresses for the embassies of certain foreign governments.

Concerns that section 215 allows the government to target Americans because of the books they read or websites they visit are misplaced. The provision explicitly prohibits the government from conducting an investigation of a U.S. person based solely upon protected First Amendment activity. 50 U.S.C. § 1861(a)(2)(B). However, some criticisms of section 215 have apparently been based on possible ambiguity in the law. The Department has already stated in litigation that the recipient of a section 215 order may consult with his attorney and may challenge that order in court. The Department has also stated that the government may seek, and a court may require, only the production of records that are relevant to a national security investigation, a standard similar to the relevance standard that applies to grand jury subpoenas in criminal cases. The text of section 215, however, is not as clear as it could be in these respects. The Department, therefore, is willing to support amendments to Section 215 to clarify these points. Section 215 also is scheduled to sunset at the end of this year.

E. The “Wall”

Before the USA PATRIOT Act, applications for orders authorizing electronic surveillance or physical searches under FISA had to include a certification from a high-ranking Executive Branch official that “*the purpose*” of the surveillance or search was to gather foreign

intelligence information. As interpreted by the courts and the Justice Department, this requirement meant that the “primary purpose” of the collection had to be to obtain foreign intelligence information rather than evidence of a crime. Over the years, the prevailing interpretation and implementation of the “primary purpose” standard had the effect of sharply limiting coordination and information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement personnel. Because the courts evaluated the government’s purpose for using FISA at least in part by examining the nature and extent of such coordination, the more coordination that occurred, the more likely courts would find that law enforcement, rather than foreign intelligence collection, had become the primary purpose of the surveillance or search.

During the 1980s, the Department operated under a set of largely unwritten rules that limited to some degree information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement officials. In 1995, however, the Department established formal procedures that more clearly separated law enforcement and intelligence investigations and limited the sharing of information between intelligence and law enforcement personnel even more than the law required. The promulgation of these procedures was motivated in part by the concern that the use of FISA authorities would not be allowed to continue in particular investigations if criminal prosecution began to overcome intelligence gathering as an investigation’s primary purpose. The procedures were intended to permit a degree of interaction and information sharing between prosecutors and intelligence officers while at the same time ensuring that the FBI would be able to obtain or continue FISA coverage and later use the fruits of that coverage in a criminal prosecution. Over time, however, coordination and information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement personnel became more limited in practice than was allowed in reality. A perception arose that improper information sharing could end a career, and a culture developed within the Department sharply limiting the exchange of information between intelligence and law enforcement officials.

Sections 218 and 504 of the USA PATRIOT Act helped to bring down this “wall” separating intelligence and law enforcement officials. They erased the perceived statutory impediment to more robust information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement personnel. They also provided the necessary impetus for the removal of the formal administrative restrictions as well as the informal cultural restrictions on information sharing.

Section 218 of the USA PATRIOT Act eliminated the “primary purpose” requirement. Under section 218, the government may conduct FISA surveillance or searches if foreign intelligence gathering is a “significant” purpose of the surveillance or search. This eliminated the need for courts to compare the relative weight of the “foreign intelligence” and “law enforcement” purposes of the surveillance or search, and allows increased coordination and sharing of information between intelligence and law enforcement personnel. Section 218 was upheld as constitutional in 2002 by the FISA court of Review. This change, significantly, did not affect the government’s obligation to demonstrate that there is probable cause to believe that the target is a foreign power or an agent of a foreign power. Section 504 – which is not subject to sunset – buttressed section 218 by specifically amending FISA to allow intelligence officials conducting FISA surveillances or searches to “consult” with federal law enforcement officials to

“coordinate” efforts to investigate or protect against international terrorism, espionage, and other foreign threats to national security, and to clarify that such coordination “shall not” preclude the certification of a “significant” foreign intelligence purpose or the issuance of an authorization order by the FISA court.

The Department moved aggressively to implement sections 218 and 504. Following passage of the Act, the Attorney General adopted new procedures designed to increase information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement officials, which were affirmed by the FISA court of Review on November 18, 2002. The Attorney General has also issued other directives to further enhance information sharing and coordination between intelligence and law enforcement officials. In practical terms, a prosecutor may now consult freely with the FBI about what, if any, investigative tools should be used to best prevent terrorist attacks and protect the national security. Unlike section 504, section 218 is scheduled to sunset at the end of this year.

The increased information sharing facilitated by the USA PATRIOT Act has led to tangible results in the war against terrorism: plots have been disrupted; terrorists have been apprehended; and convictions have been obtained in terrorism cases. Information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement personnel, for example, was critical in successfully dismantling a terror cell in Portland, Oregon, popularly known as the “Portland Seven,” as well as a terror cell in Lackawanna, New York. Such information sharing has also been used in the prosecution of: several persons involved in al Qaeda drugs-for-weapons plot in San Diego, two of whom have pleaded guilty; nine associates in Northern Virginia of a violent extremist group known as Lashkar-e-Taiba that has ties to al Qaeda, who were convicted and sentenced to prison terms ranging from four years to life imprisonment; two Yemeni citizens, Mohammed Ali Hasan Al-Moayad and Mohshen Yahya Zayed, who were charged and convicted for conspiring to provide material support to al Qaeda and HAMAS; Khaled Abdel Latif Dumeisi, who was convicted by a jury in January 2004 of illegally acting as an agent of the former government of Iraq as well as two counts of perjury; and Enaam Arnaout, the Executive Director of the Illinois-based Benevolence International Foundation, who had a long-standing relationship with Osama Bin Laden and pleaded guilty to a racketeering charge, admitting that he diverted thousands of dollars from his charity organization to support Islamic militant groups in Bosnia and Chechnya. Information sharing between intelligence and law enforcement personnel has also been extremely valuable in a number of other ongoing or otherwise sensitive investigations that we are not at liberty to discuss today.

While the “wall” primarily hindered the flow of information from intelligence investigators to law enforcement investigators, another set of barriers, before the passage of the USA PATRIOT Act, often hampered law enforcement officials from sharing information with intelligence personnel and others in the government responsible for protecting the national security. Federal law, for example, was interpreted generally to prohibit federal prosecutors from disclosing information from grand jury testimony and criminal investigative wiretaps to intelligence and national defense officials even if that information indicated that terrorists were planning a future attack, unless such officials were actually assisting with the criminal investigation. Sections 203(a) and (b) of the USA PATRIOT Act, however, eliminated these

obstacles to information sharing by allowing for the dissemination of that information to assist Federal law enforcement, intelligence, protective, immigration, national defense, and national security officials in the performance of their official duties, even if their duties are unrelated to the criminal investigation. (Section 203(a) covers grand jury information, and section 203(b) covers wiretap information.) Section 203(d), likewise, ensures that important information that is obtained by law enforcement means may be shared with intelligence and other national security officials. This provision does so by creating a generic exception to any other law purporting to bar Federal law enforcement, intelligence, immigration, national defense, or national security officials from receiving, for official use, information regarding foreign intelligence or counterintelligence obtained as part of a criminal investigation. Indeed, section 905 of the USA PATRIOT Act requires the Attorney General to expeditiously disclose to the Director of Central Intelligence foreign intelligence acquired by the Department of Justice in the course of a criminal investigation unless disclosure of such information would jeopardize an ongoing investigation or impair other significant law enforcement interests.

The Department has relied on section 203 in disclosing vital information to the intelligence community and other federal officials on many occasions. Such disclosures, for instance, have been used to assist in the dismantling of terror cells in Portland, Oregon and Lackawanna, New York and to support the revocation of suspected terrorists' visas.

Because two provisions in section 203: sections 203(b) and 203(d) are scheduled to sunset at the end of the year, we provide below specific examples of the utility of those provisions. Examples of cases where intelligence information from a criminal investigation was appropriately shared with the Intelligence Community under Section 203(d) include:

- Information about the organization of a violent jihad training camp including training in basic military skills, explosives, weapons and plane hijackings, as well as a plot to bomb soft targets abroad, resulted from the investigation and criminal prosecution of a naturalized United States citizen who was associated with an al-Qaeda related group;
- Travel information and the manner that monies were channeled to members of a seditious conspiracy who traveled from the United States to fight alongside the Taliban against U.S. and allied forces;
- Information about an assassination plot, including the use of false travel documents and transporting monies to a designated state sponsor of terrorism resulted from the investigation and prosecution of a naturalized United States citizen who had been the founder of a well-known United States organization;
- Information about the use of fraudulent travel documents by a high-ranking member of a designated foreign terrorist organization emanating from his criminal investigation and prosecution revealed intelligence information about the manner and means of the terrorist

group's logistical support network which was shared in order to assist in protecting the lives of U.S. citizens;

- The criminal prosecution of individuals who traveled to, and participated in, a military-style training camp abroad yielded intelligence information in a number of areas including details regarding the application forms which permitted attendance at the training camp; after being convicted, one defendant has testified in a recent separate federal criminal trial about this application practice, which assisted in the admissibility of the form and conviction of the defendants; and
- The criminal prosecution of a naturalized U.S. citizen who had traveled to an Al-Qaeda training camp in Afghanistan revealed information about the group's practices, logistical support and targeting information.

Title III information has similarly been shared with the Intelligence Community through section 203(b). The potential utility of such information to the intelligence and national security communities is obvious: suspects whose conversations are being monitored without their knowledge may reveal all sorts of information about terrorists, terrorist plots, or other activities with national security implications. Furthermore, the utility of this provision is not theoretical: the Department has made disclosures of vital information to the intelligence community and other federal officials under section 203(b) on many occasions, such as:

- Wiretap interceptions involving a scheme to defraud donors and the Internal Revenue Service and illegally transfer monies to Iraq generated not only criminal charges but information concerning the manner and means by which monies were funneled to Iraq; and
- Intercepted communications, in conjunction with a sting operation, led to criminal charges and intelligence information relating to money laundering, receiving and attempting to transport night-vision goggles, infrared army lights and other sensitive military equipment relating to a foreign terrorist organization.

Section 203 is also critical to the operation of the National Counterterrorism Center. The FBI relies upon section 203(d) to provide information obtained in criminal investigations to analysts in the new National Counterterrorism Center, thus assisting the Center in carrying out its vital counterterrorism missions. The National Counterterrorism Center represents a strong example of section 203 information sharing, as the Center uses information provided by law enforcement agencies to produce comprehensive terrorism analysis; to add to the list of suspected terrorists on the TIPOFF watchlist; and to distribute terrorism-related information across the federal government.

In addition, last year, during a series of high-profile events – the G-8 Summit in Georgia, the Democratic Convention in Boston and the Republican Convention in New York, the

November 2004 presidential election, and other events – a task force used the information sharing provisions under Section 203(d) as part and parcel of performing its critical duties. The 2004 Threat Task Force was a successful inter-agency effort where there was a robust sharing of information at all levels of government.

F. Protecting Those Complying with FISA Orders

Often, to conduct electronic surveillance and physical searches, the United States requires the assistance of private communications providers to carry out such court orders. In the criminal context, those who assist the government in carrying out wiretaps are provided with immunity from civil liability. Section 225, which is set to sunset, provides immunity from civil liability to communication service providers and others who assist the United States in the execution of FISA orders. Prior to the passage of the USA PATRIOT Act, those assisting in the carrying out of FISA orders enjoyed no such immunity. Section 225 simply extends the same immunity that has long existed in the criminal context to those who assist the United States in carrying out orders issued by the FISA court. Providing this protection to communication service providers for fulfilling their legal obligations helps to ensure prompt compliance with FISA orders.

CONCLUSION

It is critical that the elements of the USA PATRIOT Act subject to sunset in a matter of months be renewed. Failure to do so would take the Intelligence Community and law enforcement back to a time when a full exchange of information was not possible and the tools available to defend against terrorists were inadequate. This is unacceptable. The need for constant vigilance against terrorists wishing to attack our nation is real, and allowing USA PATRIOT Act provisions to sunset would damage our ability to prevent such attacks.

We thank the Committee for the opportunity to discuss the importance of the USA PATRIOT Act to this nation's ongoing war against terrorism. This Act has a proven record of success in protecting the American people. Provisions subject to sunset must be renewed. We look forward to working with the Committee in the weeks ahead. We appreciate the Committee's close attention to this important issue. We would be pleased to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.