

chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, to promote Federal whistleblower protection statutes and regulations, to deter unauthorized disclosures of classified information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 619

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 619, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

S. 3424

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 3424, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide further protection for puppies.

S. 3914

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3914, a bill to amend title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary of Education to complete payments under such title to local educational agencies eligible for such payments within 3 fiscal years.

S.J. RES. 37

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 37, a joint resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 35th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

S. CON. RES. 71

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 71, a concurrent resolution recognizing the United States national interest in helping to prevent and mitigate acts of genocide and other mass atrocities against civilians, and supporting and encouraging efforts to develop a whole of government approach to prevent and mitigate such acts.

S. RES. 680

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 680, a resolution supporting international tiger conservation efforts and the upcoming Global Tiger Summit in St. Petersburg, Russia.

AMENDMENT NO. 4851

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4851 intended to be proposed to Treaty Doc. 111-5, treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Prague on April 8, 2010, with Protocol.

AMENDMENT NO. 4904

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4904 proposed to Treaty Doc. 111-5, treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Prague on April 8, 2010, with Protocol.

AMENDMENT NO. 4913

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4913 intended to be proposed to Treaty Doc. 111-5, treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Prague on April 8, 2010, with Protocol.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 4051. A bill to improve, modernize, and clarify the espionage statutes contained in chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, to promote Federal whistleblower protection statutes and regulations, to deter unauthorized disclosures of classified information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the current framework concerning the espionage statutes was designed to address classic spy cases involving persons who intended to aid foreign governments and harm the United States. The current framework traces its roots to the Espionage Act of 1917, which made it a crime to disclose defense information during wartime. The basic idea behind the legislation, which was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court as constitutional in 1919, was to stop citizens from spying or interfering with military actions during World War I. The current framework was formed at a time when intelligence and national security information existed primarily in some tangible form, such as blueprints, photographs, maps, and other documents.

Our Nation, however, has witnessed dramatic changes to nearly every facet of our lives over the last 100 years, including technological advances which have revolutionized our information gathering abilities as well as the mediums utilized to communicate such information. Yet, the basic terms and structure of the espionage statutes have remained relatively unchanged since their inception. Moreover, issues have arisen in the prosecution and defense of criminal cases when the statutes have been applied to persons who may be disclosing classified information for purposes other than to aid a foreign government or to harm the United States. In addition, the statutes contain some terms which are outdated and do not reflect how information is

classified by the Executive branch today.

Legal scholars and commentators have criticized the current framework, and over the years, some federal courts have as well. In 2006, after reviewing the many developments in the law and changes in society that had taken place since the enactment of the espionage statutes, one district court judge stated that “the time is ripe for Congress” to reexamine them. *United States v. Rosen*, 445 F. Supp. 2d 602, 646 E.D. Va. 2006, Ellis, J. Nearly 20 years earlier in the *Morison* case, one federal appellate judge stated that “[i]f one thing is clear, it is that the Espionage Act statutes as now broadly drawn are unwieldy and imprecise instruments for prosecuting government ‘leakers’ to the press as opposed to government ‘moles’ in the service of other countries.” That judge also stated that “carefully drawn legislation” was a “better long-term resolution” than judicial intervention. See *United States v. Morison*, 844 F.2d 1057, 1086, 4th Cir. 1988.

As Chairman of the Senate Judiciary’s Terrorism and Homeland Security Subcommittee, I chaired a Subcommittee hearing on May 12, 2010, entitled “The Espionage Statutes: A Look Back and A Look Forward.” At that Subcommittee hearing, I questioned a number of witnesses, which included witnesses from academia as well as former officials from the intelligence and law enforcement communities, about how well the espionage statutes have been working. Since that hearing, I have been closely and carefully reviewing these statutes, particularly in the context of recent events. I am now convinced that changes in technology and society, combined with statutory and judicial changes to the law, have rendered some aspects of our espionage laws less effective than they need to be to protect the national security. I also believe that we need to enhance our ability to prosecute spies as well as those who make unauthorized disclosures of classified information if we add to the existing statutes. We don’t need an Official State Secrets Act, and we must be careful not to chill protected First Amendment activities. We do, however, need to do a better job of preventing unauthorized disclosures of classified information that can harm the United States, and at the same time we need to ensure that public debates continue to take place on important national security and foreign policy issues.

As a result, I am introducing the Espionage Statutes Modernization Act, ESMA, of 2010. This legislation makes important improvements to the espionage statutes to make them more effective and relevant in the 21st century. This legislation is narrowly-tailored and balanced, and will enable the government to use a separate criminal statute to prosecute government employees who make unauthorized disclosures of classified information in violation of the nondisclosure agreements

they have entered, irrespective of whether they intend to aid a foreign government or harm the United States.

This legislation is not designed to make it easier for the government to prosecute the press, to chill First Amendment freedoms, or to make it more difficult to expose government wrongdoing. In fact, the proposed legislation promotes the use of Federal whistleblower statutes and regulations to report unlawful and other improper conduct. Unauthorized leaks of classified information, however, are harmful to the national security and could endanger lives. Thus, in addition to proposing important refinements to the espionage statutes, this legislation will deter unauthorized leaks of classified information by government employees who knowingly and intentionally violate classified information nondisclosure agreements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4051

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “The Espionage Statutes Modernization Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) As of 2010, the statutory framework with respect to the espionage statutes is a compilation of statutes that began with Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 217, chapter 30) (commonly known as the “Espionage Act of 1917”), which targeted classic espionage cases involving persons working on behalf of foreign nations.

(2) The statutory framework was formed at a time when intelligence and national security information existed primarily in a tangible form, such as blueprints, photographs, maps, and other documents.

(3) Since 1917, the United States has witnessed dramatic changes in intelligence and national security information, including technological advances that have revolutionized information gathering abilities as well as the mediums used to communicate such information.

(4) Some of the terms used in the espionage statutes are obsolete and the statutes do not fully take into account the classification levels that apply to national security information in the 21st century.

(5) In addition, the statutory framework was originally designed to address classic espionage cases involving persons working on behalf of foreign nations. However, the national security of the United States could be harmed, and lives may be put at risk, when a Government officer, employee, contractor, or consultant with access to classified information makes an unauthorized disclosure of the classified information, irrespective of whether the Government officer, employee, contractor, or consultant intended to aid a foreign nation or harm the United States.

(6) Federal whistleblower protection statutes and regulations that enable Government officers, employees, contractors, and consultants to report unlawful and improper conduct are appropriate mechanisms for reporting such conduct.

(7) Congress can deter unauthorized disclosures of classified information and thereby protect the national security by—

(A) enacting laws that improve, modernize, and clarify the espionage statutes and make the espionage statutes more relevant and effective in the 21st century in the prosecution of persons working on behalf of foreign powers;

(B) promoting Federal whistleblower protection statutes and regulations to enable Government officers, employees, contractors, or consultants to report unlawful and improper conduct; and

(C) enacting laws that separately punish the unauthorized disclosure of classified information by Government officers, employees, contractors, or consultants who knowingly and intentionally violate a classified information nondisclosure agreement, irrespective of whether the officers, employees, contractors, or consultants intend to aid a foreign power or harm the United States.

SEC. 3. CRIMES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 793—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “**OR LOSING DEFENSE INFORMATION**” and inserting “**OR, LOSING NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION**”;

(B) by striking “the national defense” each place it appears and inserting “national security”;

(C) by striking “foreign nation” each place it appears and inserting “foreign power”;

(D) in subsection (b), by inserting “classified information, or other” before “sketch”;

(E) in subsection (c), by inserting “classified information, or other” before “document”;

(F) in subsection (d), by inserting “classified information, or other” before “document”;

(G) in subsection (e), by inserting “classified information, or other” before “document”;

(H) in subsection (f), by inserting “classified information,” before “document”; and

(I) in subsection (h)(1), by striking “foreign government” and inserting “foreign power”;

(2) in section 794—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “**GATHERING**” and all that follows and inserting “**GATHERING OR DELIVERING NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION TO AID FOREIGN POWERS**”; and

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking “foreign nation” and inserting “foreign power”;

(ii) by striking “foreign government” and inserting “foreign power”;

(iii) by inserting “classified information,” before “document”;

(iv) by striking “the national defense” and inserting “national security”; and

(v) by striking “(as defined in section 101(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978)”;

(3) in section 795(a), by striking “national defense” and inserting “national security”;

(4) in section 798—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “foreign government” each place it appears and inserting “foreign power”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking the first undesignated paragraph (relating to the term “classified information”); and

(ii) by striking the third undesignated paragraph (relating to the term “foreign government”); and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 800. Definitions

“In this chapter—

“(1) the term ‘classified information’ has the meaning given the term in section 1 of

the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.);

“(2) the term ‘foreign power’ has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801); and

“(3) the term ‘national security’ has the meaning given the term in section 1 of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of section for chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 793 and inserting the following:

“793. Gathering, transmitting, or losing national security information.”;

(2) by striking the item relating to section 794 and inserting the following:

“794. Gathering or delivering national security information to aid foreign powers.”;

and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“800. Definitions.”.

SEC. 4. VIOLATION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1925. Violation of classified information nondisclosure agreement

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘classified information’ has the meaning given the term in section 1 of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.); and

“(2) the term ‘covered individual’ means an officer, employee, contractor, or consultant of an agency of the Federal Government who, by virtue of the office, employment, position, or contract held by the individual, knowingly and intentionally agrees to be legally bound by the terms of a classified information nondisclosure agreement.

“(b) OFFENSE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, it shall be unlawful for a covered individual to intentionally disclose, deliver, communicate, or transmit classified information, without the authorization of the head of the Federal agency, or an authorized designee, knowing or having reason to know that the disclosure, delivery, communication, or transmission of the classified information is a violation of the terms of the classified information nondisclosure agreement entered by the covered individual.

“(2) PENALTY.—A covered individual who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(c) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.—The disclosure, delivery, communication, or transmission of classified information by a covered individual in accordance with a Federal whistleblower protection statute or regulation applicable to the Federal agency of which the covered individual is an officer, employee, contractor, or consultant shall not be a violation of subsection (b)(1).

“(d) REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION.—For purposes of this section, there shall be a rebuttable presumption that information has been properly classified if the information has been marked as classified information in accordance with Executive Order 12958 (60 Fed. Reg. 19825) or a successor or predecessor to the order.

“(e) DEFENSE OF IMPROPER CLASSIFICATION.—The disclosure, delivery, communication, or transmission of classified information by a covered individual shall not violate subsection (b)(1) if the covered individual proves by clear and convincing evidence that at the time the information was originally

classified, no reasonable person with original classification authority under Executive Order 13292 (68 Fed. Reg. 15315), or any successor order, could have identified or described any damage to national security that reasonably could be expected to be caused by the unauthorized disclosure of the information.

“(f) EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.—There is jurisdiction over an offense under this section if—

“(1) the offense occurs in whole or in part within the United States;

“(2) regardless of where the offense is committed, the alleged offender is—

“(A) a national of the United States (as defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)));

“(B) an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States (as defined in section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a))); or

“(C) a stateless person whose habitual residence is in the United States;

“(3) after the offense occurs, the offender is brought into or found in the United States, even if the conduct required for the offense occurs outside the United States; or

“(4) an offender aids or abets or conspires with any person over whom jurisdiction exists under this paragraph in committing an offense under subsection (b)(1).”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1925. Violation of classified information nondisclosure agreement.”.

SEC. 5. DIRECTIVE TO SENTENCING COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its authority under section 994 of title 28, United States Code, and in accordance with this section, the United States Sentencing Commission, shall review and, if appropriate, amend the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and policy statements applicable to a person convicted of an offense under section 1925 of title 18, United States Code, as added by this Act.

(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Sentencing Commission shall ensure that the sentencing guidelines account for all relevant conduct, including—

(1) multiple instances of unauthorized disclosure, delivery, communication, or transmission of the classified information;

(2) the volume of the classified information that was disclosed, delivered, communicated, or transmitted;

(3) the classification level of the classified information;

(4) the harm to the national security of the United States that reasonably could be expected to be caused by the disclosure, delivery, communication, or transmission of the classified information; and

(5) the nature and manner in which the classified information was disclosed, delivered, communicated, or transmitted.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4917. Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VOINOVICH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. INHOFE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3481, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Federal responsibility for stormwater pollution.

SA 4918. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4904 submitted by Mr. CORKER to Treaty Doc. 111-5,

Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Prague on April 8, 2010, with Protocol; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4919. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4884 submitted by Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) and intended to be proposed to Treaty Doc. 111-5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4920. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. KYL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Treaty Doc. 111-5, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4917. Mr. HARKIN (for Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VOINOVICH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. INHOFE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3481, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Federal responsibility for stormwater pollution; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TO PAY FOR STORMWATER PROGRAMS.

Section 313 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1323) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) REASONABLE SERVICE CHARGES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of this Act, reasonable service charges described in subsection (a) include any reasonable nondiscriminatory fee, charge, or assessment that is—

“(A) based on some fair approximation of the proportionate contribution of the property or facility to stormwater pollution (in terms of quantities of pollutants, or volume or rate of stormwater discharge or runoff from the property or facility); and

“(B) used to pay or reimburse the costs associated with any stormwater management program (whether associated with a separate storm sewer system or a sewer system that manages a combination of stormwater and sanitary waste), including the full range of programmatic and structural costs attributable to collecting stormwater, reducing pollutants in stormwater, and reducing the volume and rate of stormwater discharge, regardless of whether that reasonable fee, charge, or assessment is denominated a tax.

“(2) LIMITATION ON ACCOUNTS.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—The payment or reimbursement of any fee, charge, or assessment described in paragraph (1) shall not be made using funds from any permanent authorization account in the Treasury.

“(B) REIMBURSEMENT OR PAYMENT OBLIGATION OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Each department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, as described in subsection (a), shall not be obligated to pay or reimburse any fee, charge, or assessment described in paragraph (1), except to the extent and in an amount provided in advance by any appropriations Act to pay or reimburse the fee, charge, or assessment.”.

SA 4918. Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4904 submitted by Mr. CORKER to Treaty Doc. 111-5, Treaty between the United States of America

and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Prague on April 8, 2010, with Protocol; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page ___ of the amendment, between lines ___ and ___, insert the following:

(___) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION REJECTING INTERRELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE AND STRATEGIC DEFENSIVE ARMS.—The New START Treaty shall not enter into force until the President certifies to the Senate and notifies the President of the Russian Federation in writing that the President rejects the following recognition stated in the preamble to the New START Treaty: “Recognizing the existence of the interrelationship between strategic offensive arms and strategic defensive arms, that this interrelationship will become more important as strategic nuclear arms are reduced, and that current strategic defensive arms do not undermine the viability and effectiveness of the strategic offensive arms of the Parties”.

(___) PRESIDENTIAL CERTIFICATION REGARDING ADDITIONAL GROUND-BASED INTERCEPTORS.—The New START Treaty shall not enter into force until the President certifies to the Senate and notifies the President of the Russian Federation in writing that the President intends to continue to improve and modernize the United States ground-based midcourse defense system, including—

(A) two-stage interceptors that could be deployed in Europe if the Iranian ICBM threat emerges before Phases 3 and 4 of the Phased Adaptive Approach are ready; and

(B) three stage ground-based interceptors in the United States, including additional missiles for testing and emergency deployment, as necessary.

SA 4919. Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 4884 submitted by Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. ENZI) and intended to be proposed to Treaty Doc. 111-5, Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation of Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Prague on April 8, 2010, with Protocol; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2 of the amendment, beginning on line 3, strike “that—” and all that follows through line 7 and insert “that the Department of Defense will maintain not fewer than 450 deployed and non-deployed ICBM launchers silos for the duration of the treaty.”

SA 4920. Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. KYL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to Treaty Doc. 111-5, Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation of Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Prague on April 8, 2010, with Protocol; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subsection (a) of the resolution of ratification, add the following:

(11) RUSSIAN COOPERATION ON IRAN.—(A) In giving its advice and consent to ratification of the New START Treaty, the Senate has accepted and relied upon the representation