partnering with us and structuring this motion to instruct conferees. I want to express appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) for his constructive comments and for his support of the motion to instruct.

The motion to instruct promotes accountability. It assures that we remain in a strong position in our oversight function. Recent history clearly shows that in the absence of a near-term sunset we will not get answers to our questions about how controversial law enforcement powers are being used. In the absence of a near-term sunset, we cannot ensure that civil liberties are being protected.

This is not a matter about what the Department of Justice has done in the past, and I differ with the gentleman from Wisconsin on this matter. This is all about what the Department of Justice may do in the future. And having near-term sunsets will ensure that we can perform oversight over that performance.

Sunsets do not prevent law enforcement from using the broad powers the PATRIOT Act confers, but sunsets promote accountability. They ensure we get the information necessary to conduct oversight and to make decisions about whether powers that are subject to abuse should be contended.

Adopt this motion, let us adopt the Senate's 4-year sunsets and, in doing so, further the cause of protecting Americans' civil liberties. Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of the motion to instruct.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct.

The American people want us to protect them from the terrorists—but the American people also want us to protect their liberties and constitutional rights from an overreaching government.

Our system of government is made up of checks and balances and this motion to instruct only expands these checks and balances.

A review every 4 years is the right action to assure American citizens that their civil liberties are protected.

Let me close with a quote attributed to Patrick Henry:

> The Constitution is not an instrument for the government to restrain the people, it is an instrument for the people to restrain the government—lest it come to dominate our lives and interests.

I ask that we restore the Senate's Sunsets in the Conference Report.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of the House bill (except section 132) and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, COBLE, SMITH of Texas, GALLEGLY, CHABOT, JENKINS, CONYERS, BERMAN, BOUCHER, and NADLER.

Provided that Mr. SCOTT of Virginia is appointed in lieu of Mr. NADLER for consideration of sections 105, 109, 111–114, 120, 121, 124, 131, and title II of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of sections 102, 103, 106, 107, 109, and 132 of the House bill, and sections 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, and 10 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, and Ms. HARMAN.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of sections 124 and 231 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. NORWOOD, SHADEGG, and DINGELL.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 117 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. OXLEY, BACHUS, and FRANK of Massachusetts.

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of sections 127–129 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. KING of New York, WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1751.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SECURE ACCESS TO JUSTICE AND COURT PROTECTION ACT OF 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO). Pursuant to House Resolution 540 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1751.

□ 1610

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1751) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes, with Mr. SIMPSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1751, the Secure Access to Justice and Court Protection Act of 2005.

Violent attacks and intimidation against courthouse personnel and law enforcement officers present a threat to the integrity of the justice system that Congress has a duty to confront. The murder of family members of United States District Judge Joan Lefkow, the brutal slayings of Judge Rowland Barnes, his court reporter, his deputy sheriff, and a Federal officer in Atlanta, and the cold-blooded shootings outside the Tyler, Texas, courthouse all underscore the need to provide better protection for judges, courthouse personnel, witnesses, law enforcement and their family members.

This bill is an important bipartisan measure introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER). It will help address the problem of violence in and around our Nation's courthouses.

Statistics show that aggravated assaults against police officers are a serious national problem. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 52 law enforcement officers were killed in the United States in 2002 and 56 were killed in 2001. From 1994 through 2003 a total of 616 law enforcement officers were feloniously killed in the line of duty. Approximately 100 of these officers were murdered after being entrapped or ambushed by their killers. These attacks are simply unacceptable.

The lives of judicial personnel are also at great risk. According to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Federal judges receive nearly 700 threats a year and several Federal judges require security personnel to protect them and their families from terrorist associates, violent gangs, drug organizations and disgruntled litigants. The intimidation of judges directly assaults the impartial administration of justice our Constitution demands.

Court witnesses are also at risk. Threats and intimidation toward witnesses continue to grow, particularly at the State and local level. In 1996, a witness intimidation study by the Justice Department included that witness intimidation is a pervasive and insidious problem. No part of the country is spared and no witness can feel entirely free or safe.

Prosecutors interviewed in this study estimated that witness intimidation