

words, first-year women—often occurred too late in the semester to be effective. In other words, the Academy didn't get around to giving them self-defense training before they were raped or sexually assaulted there.

The Fowler panel, which is a document I commend to all of my colleagues as being both incisive and insightful in its own right, and the example of what an outside panel can accomplish in a brief period of time, stated other than the reassignment of recent Academy leadership and retiring the immediate past superintendent in lower grade, the Air Force has not held any member of the Academy leadership accountable for a decade of ineffective action or, in many cases, inaction concerning sexual assaults and the culture that tolerated them.

While the record is not complete, the evidence before the panel shows the highest levels of leadership had information about serious problems at the Academy, yet failed to take effective action. It may be impossible to ever fully know what the Air Force leadership knew or suspected about sexual assault problems in the past 10 years, nonetheless the panel uncovered substantial information showing Air Force headquarters had serious and repeated indicators of a problem. If the Air Force headquarters did not act on this information or did so tepidly, it should be held accountable for avoiding its responsibility and accepting sexual misconduct as an unavoidable condition at the Air Force Academy.

By contrast, when the general counsel of the Air Force, who had led a review of a working group and a report issued by the same, stated that, in the words of the Fowler panel, despite the considerable evidence of long-term knowledge by the Air Force and the persistence of sexual misconduct problems at the Academy, the working group, headed by the Air Force general counsel, concluded that "there was no systemic acceptance of sexual assault at the Academy or institutional avoidance of responsibility." In other words, nobody was responsible for all of these atrocities occurring over the previous 10 years, probably longer but not reported or documented before that time. Nobody in positions of command at the Air Force Academy or the Air Force itself is responsible for any of this, and the Fowler report clearly documents instances time after time over that decade where the top command knew, was informed, and failed to act, failed to follow through, replace, failed to communicate, failed to even hold meetings as frequently as required, failed time after time in a myriad of ways to assume the responsibility that they had for the young lives that had been entrusted to them by their families and who were recommended for those appointments by Members of this body and the House of Representatives, who placed their faith and trust in that institution, and not just let down, they were abused, their lives were emotion-

ally devastated, their careers at the Air Force Academy were, in many instances, destroyed, and the perpetrators of these violent crimes, these rapes and sexual assaults, have gone untouched, unsanctioned, and now are pervasive throughout the Air Force itself.

It is so bad, in fact, that in one survey taken by the panel, over 20 percent, over one-fifth of those cadets the Air Force surveyed didn't believe women belonged at the Air Force Academy. The Air Force Academy has been accepting women since 1973—in other words, since before those cadets were born.

How did they conclude, based on the history, since the time they came into consciousness, that women who are an integral part of the Air Force Academy "did not belong" there? How could they not belong any more or less than male cadets?

The panel concluded, as one of them said, the culture at the Air Force Academy is infected. This is not a matter of misguided young adults. In fact, I know from my experience, as I am sure my colleagues have had approximately the same experience, the young men and women who we nominate for appointment to the Air Force Academy, or any of the service academies, are extraordinary young men and women. At least in my State of Minnesota they have to compete with other extremely well-qualified young men and women, and they are selected only after a careful review process. They have to have distinguished careers in high school with their curricula. I have not seen and I would not nominate anybody who has had problems with sexual misconduct or problems in understanding their responsibilities at such an academy to be inclusive, to be honorable, and that they report any violations cited by a commission of these kinds of actions.

According to the panel, what has happened—and I would concur from my own brief experience—is that the culture is infecting those cadets with the wrong ideas, with the wrong views, and with the notion that they can commit those acts with no consequence, that those who are the victims are the ones who are going to be punished, and the honor code notwithstanding, they should just look the other way or ignore what they see happening.

What a terrible climate to create at this institution which is paid for with taxpayer dollars and which is producing men and women who we are going to rely on to pilot Air Force planes and defend this Nation for years to come.

As I said, the very distinguished chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator WARNER, deserves such enormous credit for spiriting this inquiry on the part of our committee. He has scheduled another hearing tomorrow where the Secretary of the Air Force and the general counsel of the Air Force are scheduled to

testify. I look forward to that hearing so we can get answers to some of these unresolved questions, answers that better be found by the time this matter has been concluded, because, otherwise, I have serious questions whether the Air Force Academy is in a fit position to continue to receive the young men and women of this country and whether, despite the new leadership, it is so systemically "infected," to use the panel's word, with these cultural biases that it is simply not fit to continue to provide training, especially the training of moral conduct and leadership, that these young men and women deserve and which our Nation requires.

To be continued, I will report to my colleagues on my impressions after that hearing, after receiving that report.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 2003

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:15 a.m., Tuesday, September 30. I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and the Senate then proceed to executive session for two votes on judicial nominations as provided under the previous order; provided that following the second vote the Senate begin a period for morning business until 11:30 a.m. with the first half of that time under the control of Senator HUTCHISON or her designee and the remaining time be under the control of the minority leader or his designee; provided further that at 11:30 a.m. the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 2765, the DC appropriations bill. I further ask consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 for the weekly party lunches.

Mr. REID. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will immediately proceed to executive session to vote on two judicial nominations. The first vote will be on the nomination of Marcia Crone to be a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas. The second vote will be on the nomination of Ronald White to be

a United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Oklahoma.

Following the two judge votes, the Senate will begin a period of morning business until 11:30. Following morning business, the Senate will resume debate on H.R. 2765, the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

The majority leader has stated on a number of occasions his intent to try to finish that bill early this week. The managers will be here again tomorrow, waiting for any additional amendments that may be offered. Therefore, it is hoped we can conclude this bill during tomorrow's session.

As mentioned earlier today, the Senate will begin consideration of the Iraq emergency supplemental just as soon as that bill is available. Rollcalls will therefore occur each day this week on that bill as we press to try to complete it.

Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate—

Mr. REID. If I could say, just before the Senator gives his final statement here, I appreciate very much the majority allowing the time for us to speak. There are a number of Senators on this side who wish to speak. I appreciate very much the thoughtfulness of the Senator from Kentucky and the majority leader in allowing us to go forward on this basis. Having been in his position on a number of occasions, I know how difficult it is to keep people around, but I appreciate his doing it.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask the Senate stand in recess under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators DASCHLE, HARKIN, and REID.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

BREACH OF NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, I remember when I was a young boy, right towards the end of World War II, and there was a famous sign I saw at the American Legion club in my small town in Iowa. The sign said, "Loose Lips Sink Ships."

Later on when I went into the military and served in the military, I always remembered that, especially when it came to dealing with sensitive information, that we had to be very careful, very cautious about how we dealt with information which, if it got into the wrong hands, could be injurious to the United States of America.

I mention that because if what I have been hearing and reading about in the news media is anywhere near the truth, then we have a very serious breach of national security emanating from the administration. This is no small matter, about the disclosure of the identity

of a CIA agent, an undercover agent, the identity of whom could not only be harmful to that individual herself but to persons with whom she had contact and dealings in other countries.

This July a noted columnist, Robert D. Novak, on July 14, disclosed a covert operative's identity. That is a violation of Federal law. I am not certain Mr. Novak knew that was a violation of Federal law. He should have. He has been in this business a long time. But he printed this disclosure. Where did he get the information? Mr. Novak said he got the information from two senior administration officials. The story goes on to say that:

Yesterday, a senior administration official said that before Novak's column ran, "two top White House officials called at least six Washington journalists and disclosed the occupation of Wilson's wife [who is the undercover agent who was disclosed by Mr. Novak]. 'Clearly it was meant purely and simply for revenge,' the senior official said of the alleged leak.

What happens when a disclosure like this goes out is that if agents in the field are on pins and needles about whether they are going to be disclosed at some time, it is going to threaten our intelligence capabilities around the globe. And in fighting international terrorism, the most important thing we need is not the U.S. military, it is not bombers and missiles or a nuclear arsenal or nuclear submarines—in order to combat and beat international terrorism, what we need is good information. Intelligence—intelligence

sharing with our allies. If our agents in the field—working undercover with the contacts, the kind of sources they need—if they believe their identity is going to be disclosed in a newspaper column, what does that say to them about how they can do their business? This threatens our intelligence-gathering capabilities.

In fact, I can think of no single action that probably has done more to hurt our ability to fight international terrorism than this disclosure of this undercover agent's name. I say that because it is going to cast a cloud over those who risk their lives daily who are already out there gathering information to protect our country.

You might ask: What precipitated this? Why was this leaked? Evidently it was leaked because this person's husband had revealed the truth about President Bush's deception in his State of the Union Message about Iraq trying to get uranium from Niger.

This individual, Joseph C. Wilson, IV, former U.S. Ambassador, publicly challenged President Bush's claim that Iraq tried to buy "Yellow Cake" uranium from Africa for possible use in nuclear weapons. Because Mr. Wilson had such good credibility when he put this out, it raised questions about whether the President was being forthright in his State of the Union Message. That is why one senior official said that clearly it was meant purely and simply for revenge.

We have the leaking of an undercover individual's name because her husband

had revealed the truth about the deception in the State of the Union Message.

I don't know who these two individuals are in the administration, nor how high up they are. Mr. Novak said they were two senior administration officials. Another senior administration official said two top White House officials. Who are they? I guess I would have to ask if President Bush is really serious about cooperating and finding out who it was that violated Federal law—a criminal activity punishable by up to 10 years, a felony. If the President is really serious, and he said he was here—Mr. McClellan, the President's press secretary, said it is a serious matter and it should be looked into.

If the President is serious about cooperating and getting the truth out, ABC News "The Note" today posed these questions which I agree should be answered:

Has President Bush made clear to White House staff that only total cooperation with the investigation will be tolerated? If the President has not done this, why hasn't he?

Has the President insisted that every senior staff member sign a statement with legal authority that they are not the leaker and that they will identify to the White House legal counsel who is? If the President hasn't asked his staff to do that, why hasn't he?

Has President Bush required that all of his staff sign a letter relinquishing journalists from protecting those two sources? If he hasn't, why hasn't he?

Has President Bush said that those involved in this crime will be immediately fired? If he hasn't, why not?

Has Mr. Albert Gonzalez distributed a letter to White House employees requiring them to preserve documents, logs, and records? It is very important. Has Albert Gonzalez distributed a letter to White House employees telling them to preserve documents, logs, and records? If he hasn't, why hasn't he?

Has Mr. Andrew Card named someone on his staff to organize compliance with these? If he hasn't, why hasn't he?

These are things the President has to do if he really and truly wants to cooperate, if he truly wants to get these two individuals identified, and if he truly wants to have them prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, which they ought to be.

This is not some obscure real estate deal out in the middle of nowhere. I repeat this is not some obscure real estate deal out in the middle of some wilderness area. This has to do with our fight against international terrorism and whether or not those who are charged with the responsibility of collecting and gathering intelligence for us will be protected and their identities protected. Or will we send a signal that they are fair game, that someone in the White House can leak their name, that some columnist will print it in the paper and identify them as an undercover agent for the CIA?

This is serious business. The sooner the President of the United States gets