is wrong, because we are not doing it right. He has asked us to fix it. It is the most solemn obligation we have under our oath of the Constitution to do it right. And to say that we are going to do it under some suspension and don't worry about what it says violates that oath.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you how disappointed I am in my friends. And I have the greatest respect for my good friend from Florida and the gentlewoman from California. We have worked so well together on so many issues that, I think, have made a difference in a positive way for national security for this country. I believe that with every fiber of my being.

I almost feel bad for you that you would be sent here on behalf of the Speaker to try to defend this today. I feel bad for you because I know you both. And I know that is not the direction you would have taken, had it been your decision.

Efforts to change this are not new. The level of concern by so many of us who sit in those classified hearings in our Intelligence Committee is not new. Last year, my colleague from New Mexico introduced a bill that would have fixed this problem last year, and it was stopped. Earlier this year, earlier this year, it was introduced again to fix this problem, and it was denied by the majority.

I have to tell you, when I was a young FBI agent, sometimes you would look up at the policies kind of flowing down at you. We were working awfully hard to develop probable cause to get wiretaps, which was the right thing to do. It was a difficult process with lots of vetting, lots of hours, lots of source development and source vetting, lots of surveillance, and putting it all together to make something like that work so that it could rise to the standard to go after a United States citizen and their communication. It is a pretty high standard. I argue, as somebody who did it for a living, it should be.

But what we have been arguing for for the last year is to say, listen, we should not give those rights to terrorists overseas who are conducting terrorist activities to target Americans or our allies, including the United States soldiers. They do not deserve the rights of a U.S. citizen.

This was an easy fix. It said, let's be technology neutral. Times have changed since the 1970s when FISA was written. Technology has changed. People communicate completely differently.

What we said last year is let us change to keep up, because today we have asked soldiers to stand in harm's way. And the thing that I know that my colleagues understand, both Democrats and Republicans, is because this House has failed to act, they have stood in harm's way without all the information that they need and deserve to be safe, successful, and come home to their families.

This gamesmanship is dangerous, and I mean dangerous. My colleagues understand those classified cases that we talk about, that we know because this has not been fixed. Lives may have been lost because of it. Lives may have been lost because of it. We can change that today.

I just got a copy of this. As I go through it, just in my brief cursory look at it, this is not what we have been negotiating. There have been no new demands. This is so easy. This is so simple. It can be about a 2-page bill, and we can begin to protect Americans in harm's way, including the homeland, but, most importantly, the soldiers who are overseas who deserve that protection. And just because we shout and we yell, no, no, no, we believe that terrorists should not have to have a warrant overseas as well doesn't make it so, and you know that. That has been the stumbling block. The Court has said it. The intelligence community has said it. The DNI has said it. We have said it.

I am going to beg all of you, please, for the lives of the soldiers who are at risk today, for the homeland, this is not the place for gamesmanship. This is not the place that we argue about a bill that we have not even seen. This is the time that we should come together. This is the time that this bill should be out and done, negotiated, and free from all of the gamesmanship we see today.

When I go home and look at those families of those folks who have loved ones overseas, I want to be able to tell them we have done everything that we can do to make them safe. When somebody kisses their young child and puts them on the bus, I want to be able to look that family in the eye and say we are doing everything to make sure we get all the information of what the terrorists are up to to protect the United States of America.

We all know in good conscience we can't say that today, and we have not been able to say that for months in good conscience.

This is our chance to come together as people I know and I respect, who know the dangers of the gamesmanship on an issue this important. Let's stop it. Let's go back. Go back and tell the Speaker, I am sorry, we are not playing this game.

People's lives are at stake. We can do this. We can do this together. I know that is why I was sent here. I know that is what you believe in your hearts. Let's do this together. Let's put this stuff aside and fix this problem so that we can begin to listen to the conversations of terrorists we know are planning attacks against our allies and the United States of America.

I strongly urge the reconsideration of this. Let's do this. We can do this. We should do this. We ought to do it. And shame on us if we can't do it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will yield to the distinguished Chair of the Intelligence Committee in just a moment.

But I would like to respond to my good friend from Michigan, and he is my good friend, and he was correct in asserting that he, Ms. HARMAN, myself, all of the members of the Intelligence Committee that are here, have worked actively for more than a year on this. What he was incorrect about was whether or not there were ongoing negotiations.

I would urge him to know that with staff, the distinguished Chair of the Intelligence Committee and many other Members, and Ms. HARMAN from her Chair on Homeland Security, and countless others in the minority as well, have worked day and night with the administration to produce a bipartisan, bicameral proposal.

Mr. ROGERS just said last night no other negotiations were going on. Last night the DNI asked us to make three changes, three, to our proposal. We made all three changes. They are in this bill. But the administration still rejected our proposal, and they gave us a moving target.

We gave the administration what it told us it needed to protect America. They still said no.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a minute to respond to my colleague from Michigan.

This is a serious issue. We have worked hard for the last 2 weeks in particular, in addition to the hearings that we have had, with the commitment that we are going to do an overall fix of FISA in the fall. But we wanted to give the administration the three things, as my colleague from Florida just mentioned, that they could work with so they could keep this country safe in this urgent hour. Those three things we gave them. Then the goalposts were moved and we were told that there would be additional issues. That has been our experience.

The difference here is very simple, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle for 6 years have been only too happy to oblige the administration on whatever they need. You got a bill? Let's rubber-stamp it. Need a supplemental? Let's rubber-stamp it.

Well, do you know what? Those days are over. Since we took control of the Congress, we are doing the oversight that was neglected. We are now being part of the process to make sure that not only do we have the tools to keep this country safe, but that we protect the American people and their civil rights. That is the basic fundamental difference.

This bill here does the three things that the DNI asked us to do and that the administration wanted us to do. It is not the all-encompassing changes that FISA needs, but we are committed to doing that in the fall.