

meddling in this area at all. However, unlike the Specter bill, these two amendments were offered to replace the broad grant of retroactive immunity in the FISA bill, and they were offered after the Senate had voted not to adopt the Dodd-Feingold amendment. Each of them was an improvement, however slight, to the underlying immunity provision, in that they would have left open the possibility that the lawsuits could continue, thus permitting the courts to rule on the legality of the warrantless wiretapping program. Therefore, I voted in favor of both of these amendments, even though I would have much preferred to see retroactive immunity stricken entirely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 2248, an original bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that act, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close.

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Alexander	Dole	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Mikulski
Barrasso	Ensign	Murkowski
Baucus	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Grassley	Pryor
Bond	Gregg	Roberts
Brownback	Hagel	Rockefeller
Bunning	Hatch	Salazar
Burr	Hutchison	Sessions
Carper	Inhofe	Shelby
Casey	Inouye	Smith
Chambliss	Isakson	Snowe
Coburn	Johnson	Specter
Cochran	Kohl	Stevens
Coleman	Kyl	Sununu
Collins	Landrieu	Thune
Conrad	Lieberman	Vitter
Corker	Lincoln	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner
Craig	Martinez	Webb
Crapo	McCain	Whitehouse
DeMint	McCaskill	Wicker

NAYS—29

Akaka	Durbin	Murray
Biden	Feingold	Obama
Bingaman	Harkin	Reed
Boxer	Kennedy	Reid
Brown	Kerry	Sanders
Byrd	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cardin	Leahy	Tester
Dodd	Levin	Wyden
Dorgan	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—2

Clinton Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 29. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:34 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

FISA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2007

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following Senator FEINGOLD's 15 minutes on FISA, I be recognized for 10 minutes and that the time be taken from Senator DODD's 4 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I strongly oppose S. 2248. This bill is deeply flawed in ways that will have a direct impact on the privacy of Americans. Along with several other Members of this body, I have offered modest amendments that would have permitted the government to obtain the intelligence it needs, while providing the checks and balances required to safeguard our constitutional rights. Unfortunately, under intense administration pressure marked by inaccurate and misleading scare tactics, the Senate has buckled. And we are left with a very dangerous piece of legislation.

The railroading of Congress began last summer, when the administration rammed through the so-called Protect America Act, vastly expanding the government's ability to eavesdrop without a court-approved warrant. That legislation was rushed through this Chamber in a climate of fear—fear of terrorist attacks, and fear of not appearing sufficiently strong on national security. There was very little understanding of what the legislation actually did.

But there was one silver lining: The bill had a 6-month sunset to force Congress to do its homework and reconsider the approach it took. Unfortunately, with far too few exceptions, the damage has not been undone.

This new bill was intended to ensure that the government can collect communications between persons overseas without a warrant, and to ensure that the government can collect the communications of terrorists, including their communications with people in the United States. No one disagrees that the government should have this authority. But this bill goes much fur-

ther, authorizing widespread surveillance involving innocent Americans—at home and abroad.

Proponents of the bill and the administration don't want to talk about what this bill actually authorizes. Instead, they repeatedly and inaccurately assert that efforts to provide checks and balances will impede the government's surveillance of terrorists. They launched these attacks against the more balanced bill that came out of the Judiciary Committee. And they have attacked and mischaracterized amendments offered on the floor of this body. This is fear-mongering, it is wrong, and it has obscured what is really going on.

What does this bill actually authorize? First, it permits the government to come up with its own procedures for determining who is a target of surveillance. It doesn't need advance approval from the FISA Court to ensure that the government's targets are actually foreigners, and not Americans here in the United States. And, if the Court subsequently determines that the government's procedures are not even reasonably designed to wiretap foreigners, rather than Americans, there are no meaningful consequences. All that illegally obtained information on Americans can be retained and used.

Second, even if the government is targeting foreigners outside the U.S., those foreigners need not be terrorists. They need not be suspected of any wrongdoing. They need not even be a member or agent of some foreign power. In fact, the government can just collect international communications indiscriminately, so long as there is a general foreign intelligence purpose, a meaningless qualification that the DNI has testified permits the collection of all communications between the United States and overseas. Under this bill, the government can legally collect all communications—every last one—between Americans here at home and the rest of the world. Even the sponsor of this bill, the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, acknowledges that this kind of bulk collection is probably unconstitutional, but the DNI has said it would be not only authorized but "desirable" if technically possible. Technology changes fast in this area. We have been forewarned, yet the Senate failed to act.

One of the few bright spots in this bill is the inclusion of an amendment, offered by Senators WYDEN, WHITEHOUSE and myself in the Intelligence Committee, to prohibit the intentional targeting of an American overseas without a warrant. That is an important new protection. But that amendment does not rule out the indiscriminate vacuuming up of all international communications, which would allow the government to collect the communications of Americans overseas, including with friends and family back home, without a warrant. And those communications can be retained and used. Even the administration's illegal warrantless wiretapping program,