

**Prepared Statement by Senator Chuck Grassley of Iowa
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee
Executive Business Meeting
May 26, 2016**

Today we have three bills on the agenda. The first, the Expatriate Terrorist Act, will be held over. The second, S. 356, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act, is ripe for our consideration. And the third is the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act, S. 2944, which we'll also hold over.

Let me first say a few words about the PSOB bill. This has been a truly bipartisan effort based on what we learned from our hearing last month and multiple independent audits and oversight letters before then.

And several members have expressed their support for the bill and also a desire to improve it through amendments. So, the bill will be held over. I look forward to passing this out of Committee the next time we meet.

Also I'd like to mention that just in time for National Missing Children's Day, which was yesterday, the Senate on Monday passed, by a vote of 89-0, my Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act.

This bill, which this committee reported earlier this year, would extend three key programs that Congress established a decade ago under the original Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act. I want to thank those of you who cosponsored the bill, especially Senators Schumer, Hatch, Feinstein, and Leahy. Its enactment will help states continue to meet national standards for sex offender registries. It also includes, for the first time, a sexual assault survivors' bill of rights. I look forward to working with you all to ensure it's enacted before the 35th anniversary of Adam Walsh's abduction in July.

Finally, I'd like to say just a few words about ECPA reform. As I've said on many occasions, there's broad, bipartisan consensus that ECPA needs to be updated. I don't think there's anyone who disagrees with that. ECPA was passed in 1986, and it's obvious that the ways in which Americans rely on communications technology have evolved dramatically since then.

Most folks agree that given the way Americans use email today, it hardly makes sense that the privacy protections for an email should turn on whether it's more than 180 days old, or whether it's been opened. The privacy of Americans must be protected, and that privacy simply shouldn't depend on an email's age at all.

But I understand from my staff there's a request from the bill sponsors to hold the bill over again. So I'll turn to Ranking Member Leahy for his opening remarks, and to explain why that would be beneficial.