

than \$4,700,000,000, or nearly ½ of the Coast Guard's annual budget;

Whereas the Coast Guard's at-sea drug interdictions are making a difference in the lives of United States citizens, as evidenced by the reduced supply of cocaine in more than 35 major cities throughout the United States;

Whereas keeping illegal drugs from reaching our shores, where they undermine American values and threaten families, schools, and communities, continues to be an important national priority;

Whereas, through robust interagency teamwork, collaboration with international partners, and ever more effective tools and tactics, the Coast Guard has removed more than 2,000,000 pounds of cocaine during the past 10 years and will continue to tighten the web of detection and interdiction at sea; and

Whereas the men and women of the Coast Guard who, while away from family and hundreds of miles from our shores, execute this dangerous mission, as well as other vital maritime safety, security, and environmental protection missions, with quiet dedication and without need of public recognition, continue to display selfless service in protecting the Nation and the American people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the United States Coast Guard, with its proud 217-year legacy of maritime law enforcement and border protection, along with the brave men and women whose efforts clearly demonstrate the honor, respect, and devotion to duty that ensure the parents of the United States can sleep soundly knowing the Coast Guard is on patrol; and

(2) recognizes the tireless work, dedication, and commitment that have allowed the Coast Guard to confiscate over 350,000 pounds of cocaine at sea in 2007.

SENATE RESOLUTION 430—DESIGNATING JANUARY 2008 AS “NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH”

Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. SPECTER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 430

Whereas youth mentoring establishes a structured and trusting relationship that brings young people together with caring individuals who offer guidance, support, and encouragement;

Whereas a growing body of mentoring research provides strong evidence of success in reducing delinquency, substance use and abuse, and academic failure;

Whereas research also shows that formal mentoring, aimed at developing the competence and character of the young person, promotes positive outcomes such as improved academic achievement, self-esteem, social skills, and career development;

Whereas mentoring offers a supportive environment in which young people can grow, expand their vision, and achieve a future that they never thought possible;

Whereas more than 15,000,000 young people in this Nation still need mentors, falling into a “mentoring gap”;

Whereas more than 4,300 mentoring programs in communities of all sizes across the

United States focus on building strong, effective relationships between mentors and mentees;

Whereas public-private mentoring partnerships bring State and local leaders together to support mentoring programs by preventing duplication of efforts, offering training in industry best practices, and helping them make the most of limited resources to benefit the Nation's youth;

Whereas coordinated national, State, regional, and local efforts continue to need Federal support to allow more youth to be connected with the power of mentoring;

Whereas several Federal agencies have come together to coordinate approaches to mentoring within the Federal Government through the Federal Mentoring Council and National Mentoring Working Group under the Corporation for National and Community Service;

Whereas the designation of January 2008 as National Mentoring Month will help call attention to the critical role mentors play in helping young people realize their potential;

Whereas the month-long celebration of mentoring will encourage more organizations across the United States, including schools, businesses, nonprofit organizations, faith institutions, foundations, and individuals to become engaged in mentoring;

Whereas National Mentoring Month will, most significantly, build awareness of mentoring and encourage more people to become mentors and help close the Nation's mentoring gap; and

Whereas the President has issued a proclamation declaring January 2008 to be National Mentoring Month and calling on the people of the United States to recognize the importance of mentoring, to look for opportunities to serve as mentors in their communities, and to observe the month with appropriate activities and programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the month of January 2008 as “National Mentoring Month”;

(2) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring volunteers who already serve as mentors and encourages more individuals to volunteer as mentors; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote the awareness of, and volunteer involvement with, youth mentoring.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join many of my colleagues in submitting a resolution recognizing January 2008 as National Mentoring Month.

We all know the extraordinary help and support that a good mentor can give to a child. High-quality mentoring programs can make all the difference to students in need. They can reduce negative outcomes, and help keep children on track. They can reduce drug and substance abuse and delinquency. They can enable students to stay in school instead of dropping out.

By promoting such positive outcomes, mentors enable students to obtain the skills they need to succeed in school and in life. They improve academic achievement, and they also improve self-esteem and social and communications skills.

National Mentoring Month is an opportunity to recognize and commend the many mentors across the country who are doing their part. It is also an

opportunity to raise awareness about the real value of mentoring, and encourage more adults to become mentors. Experts estimate that nearly 18 million young students could benefit from being matched with a mentor, but only about 3 million of these youth are in such a relationship today. Fifteen million youth need a mentor—but they do not have one.

Mentoring a young person doesn't just pay off for the youth; it can be beneficial for the mentor as well. For the past 12 years, I have participated in the Everybody Wins Program at Brent Elementary School near the Capitol. Once a week during the school year, I spend an hour with an elementary school student. We read together, share stories, and learn from each other. This year, my first reading partner is finishing high school, and next year she will be starting college. She has stayed in touch, and it has been amazing to see her grow.

Robert Kennedy often spoke of the ripples of hope that people send forth each time they act to help others. Mentors are a proven example of the power of each citizen to create such ripples, and we should do what we can to recognize and support them. I urge the Senate to approve this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 431—CALLING FOR A PEACEFUL RESOLUTION TO THE CURRENT ELECTORAL CRISIS IN KENYA

Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Ms. SNOWE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 431

Whereas on December 27, 2007, Kenyan citizens went peacefully to the polls to elect a new parliament and a new President and signaled their commitment to democracy by turning out in large numbers, and in some instances waiting in long lines to vote;

Whereas election observers reported serious irregularities and a lack of transparency that, combined with the implausibility of the margin of victory, and the swearing in of the Party of National Unity presidential candidate Mwai Kibaki with undue haste, all serve to undermine the credibility of the presidential election results;

Whereas the Government of Kenya imposed a ban on live media broadcasts that day, and shortly after the election results were announced, in contravention of Kenyan law, the Government also announced a blanket ban on public assembly and gave police the authority to use lethal force;

Whereas subsequent to declaring Mr. Kibaki the winner, the head of the Election Commission of Kenya (ECK) stated that he did not know who won the presidential election;

Whereas in the aftermath of the election announcement, significant violence began and continues to flare;

Whereas on January 1, 2008, 4 commissioners on the ECK issued a statement which

called for a judicial review and tallying of the vote;

Whereas the head of the European Union Election Observation Mission stated that “[l]ack of transparency, as well as a number of verified irregularities... cast doubt on the accuracy of the results of the presidential election as announced by the ECK” and called for an international audit of the results;

Whereas the Attorney General of Kenya has called for an independent investigation of the tallying of votes and for the votes to be retallied;

Whereas observers from the East African Community have called for an investigation into irregularities during the tallying process and for those responsible for such irregularities to be held accountable;

Whereas some estimates indicate that at least 700 people have died and as many as 250,000 have been displaced as a result of this violence, which continues;

Whereas the economic cost to Kenya of the violence and civil unrest in the wake of the disputed polls is estimated at \$1,000,000,000;

Whereas the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs traveled to Nairobi in an attempt to mediate between the 2 leading presidential candidates and has stated that “serious flaws in the vote tallying process damaged the credibility of the process” and that the United States should not “conduct business as usual” in Kenya; and

Whereas Kenya has been a valuable strategic, political, diplomatic, and economic partner to those in the subregion, region, and to the United States and has been 1 of the major recipients of United States foreign assistance in sub-Saharan Africa for decades: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Kenyan people for their commitment to democracy and respect for the democratic process, as evidenced by the high voter turnout and peaceful voting on election day;

(2) strongly condemns the violence in Kenya;

(3) urges all politicians and political parties to immediately desist from the reactivation, support, and use of militia organizations that are ethnic-based or otherwise constituted;

(4) calls on the 2 leading presidential candidates to—

(A) engage in an internationally brokered dialogue, which results in a new political dispensation that is supported by Kenyan civil society; and

(B) respect the will of the Kenyan people; (5) simultaneously—

(A) supports a call for electoral justice in Kenya, including a thorough and credible independent audit of election results with the possibility, depending on what is discovered, of a recount or retallying of votes, or a rerun of the presidential elections within a specified time period; and

(B) encourages any political settlement to take into account these recommendations;

(6) calls on Kenyan security forces to refrain from use of excessive force and respect the human rights of Kenyan citizens;

(7) calls for those who are found guilty of committing human rights violations to be held accountable for their actions;

(8) calls for an immediate end to the restrictions on the media, and on the rights of peaceful assembly and association;

(9) condemns threats to civil society leaders and human rights activists who are working towards a peaceful, just, and equitable political solution to the current electoral crisis;

(10) holds all political actors in Kenya responsible for the safety and security of civil society leaders and human rights advocates;

(11) calls on the international community, United Nations aid organizations, and all neighboring countries to provide assistance to Kenyan refugees who have fled in search of greater security;

(12) encourages others in the international community to work together and use all diplomatic means at their disposal to persuade relevant political actors to commit to a peaceful resolution to the current crisis; and

(13) urges the President of the United States to—

(A) support diplomatic efforts to facilitate a dialogue between leaders of the Party of National Unity, the Orange Democratic Movement, and other relevant actors;

(B) consider the imposition of personal sanctions, including a travel ban and asset freeze on leaders in the Party of National Unity, the Orange Democratic Movement, and other relevant actors who refuse to engage in meaningful dialogue to end the current crisis; and

(C) conduct a review of current United States aid to Kenya for the purpose of restricting all nonessential assistance to Kenya, unless all parties are able to establish a peaceful, political resolution to the current crisis, which is credible with the Kenyan people.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3919. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. NELSON, of Florida, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2248, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3920. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3921. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3922. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3923. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3924. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3925. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3926. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3927. Mr. SPECTER (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3928. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3929. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3930. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3931. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3932. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3933. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3934. Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3935. Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3936. Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3937. Mr. FEINGOLD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3938. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3939. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3940. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3941. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3942. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3943. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3944. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3945. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3946. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for

himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3947. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3948. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3949. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3950. Mr. BOND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3919. Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. NELSON of Florida, and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2248, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 72, strike line 13 and all that follows through page 73, line 25, and insert the following:

(6) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT.—The term “Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court” means the court established under section 103(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)).

(7) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—The term “Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review” means the court of review established under section 103(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(b)).

SEC. 202. LIMITATIONS ON CIVIL ACTIONS FOR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (3), a covered civil action shall not lie or be maintained in a Federal or State court, and shall be promptly dismissed, if the Attorney General certifies to the court that—

(A) the assistance alleged to have been provided by the electronic communication service provider was—

(i) in connection with an intelligence activity involving communications that was—

(I) authorized by the President during the period beginning on September 11, 2001, and ending on January 17, 2007; and

(II) designed to detect or prevent a terrorist attack, or activities in preparation for a terrorist attack, against the United States; and

(ii) described in a written request or directive from the Attorney General or the head of an element of the intelligence community (or the deputy of such person) to the electronic communication service provider indicating that the activity was—

(I) authorized by the President; and

(II) determined to be lawful; or

(B) the electronic communication service provider did not provide the alleged assistance.

(2) SUBMISSION OF CERTIFICATION.—If the Attorney General submits a certification under paragraph (1), the court to which that certification is submitted shall—

(A) immediately transfer the matter to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court for a determination regarding the questions described in paragraph (3)(A); and

(B) stay further proceedings in the relevant litigation, pending the determination of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

(3) DETERMINATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The dismissal of a covered civil action under paragraph (1) shall proceed only if, after review, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court determines that—

(i) the written request or directive from the Attorney General or the head of an element of the intelligence community (or the deputy of such person) to the electronic communication service provider under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) complied with section 2511(2)(a)(ii) of title 18, United States Code, and the assistance alleged to have been provided was provided in accordance with the terms of that written request or directive;

(ii) subject to subparagraph (C), the assistance alleged to have been provided was undertaken based on the good faith reliance of the electronic communication service provider on the written request or directive under paragraph (1)(A)(ii), such that the electronic communication service provider had an objectively reasonable belief under the circumstances that compliance with the written request or directive was lawful; or

(iii) the electronic communication service provider did not provide the alleged assistance.

(B) PROCEDURES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In reviewing certifications and making determinations under subparagraph (A), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court shall—

(I) review and make any such determination en banc; and

(II) permit any plaintiff and any defendant in the applicable covered civil action to appear before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court pursuant to section 103 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803).

(ii) APPEAL TO FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT OF REVIEW.—A party to a proceeding described in clause (i) may appeal a determination under subparagraph (A) to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, which shall have jurisdiction to review such determination.

(iii) CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT.—A party to an appeal under clause (ii) may file a petition for a writ of certiorari for review of a decision of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review issued under that clause. The record for such review shall be transmitted under seal to the Supreme Court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction to review such decision.

(iv) STATE SECRETS.—The state secrets privilege shall not apply in any proceeding under this paragraph.

(C) SCOPE OF GOOD FAITH LIMITATION.—The limitation on covered civil actions based on good faith reliance under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall only apply in a civil action relating to alleged assistance provided on or before January 17, 2007.

SA 3920. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3911 proposed by Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself and Mr. BOND) to the bill S. 2248, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 19, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

“(7) COMPLIANCE REVIEWS.—During the period that minimization procedures approved under paragraph (5)(A) are in effect, the Court may review and assess compliance with such procedures and shall have access to the assessments and reviews required by subsections (k)(1), (k)(2), and (k)(3) with respect to compliance with such procedures. In conducting a review under this paragraph, the Court may, to the extent necessary, require the Government to provide additional information regarding the acquisition, retention, or dissemination of information concerning United States persons during the course of an acquisition authorized under subsection (a). The Court may fashion remedies it determines necessary to enforce compliance.

SA 3921. Mr. KYL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2248, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, to modernize and streamline the provisions of that Act, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CLASSIFIED INFORMATION PROCEDURES ACT.

(a) INTERLOCUTORY APPEALS UNDER THE CLASSIFIED INFORMATION PROCEDURES ACT.—Section 7(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end “The Government’s right to appeal under this section applies without regard to whether the order appealed from was entered under this Act.”.

(b) EX PARTE AUTHORIZATIONS UNDER THE CLASSIFIED INFORMATION PROCEDURES ACT.—Section 4 of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking “may” and inserting “shall”; and

(B) by striking “written statement to be inspected” and inserting “statement to be made ex parte and to be considered”; and

(2) in the third sentence—

(A) by striking “If the court enters an order granting relief following such an ex parte showing, the” and inserting “The”; and

(B) by inserting “, as well as any summary of the classified information the defendant seeks to obtain,” after “text of the statement of the United States”.

(c) APPLICATION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION PROCEDURES ACT TO NONDOCUMENTARY INFORMATION.—Section 4 of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting “, AND ACCESS TO,” after “OF”;

(2) by inserting “(a) DISCOVERY OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION FROM DOCUMENTS.—” before the first sentence; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) ACCESS TO OTHER CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—

“(1) If the defendant seeks access through deposition under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure or otherwise to non-documentary information from a potential witness or other person which he knows or reasonably believes is classified, he shall notify the attorney for the United States and the district court in writing. Such notice shall specify with particularity the classified information sought by the defendant and the legal basis for such access. At a time set by the court,