The same applies here, it would seem to me, I say to my friend from Nevada, that this is a case where not only someone in the CIA but anyone in a position who has access to this classified information would be subject to this. Again, I say to my friend from Nevada, since he is on the floor, I really think many of the people who are inquiring about this are stopping short because they are only focusing on who gave the information to Mr. Novak. There is a deeper and I think even more profound question to be asked: How did those individuals in the administration get that classified information? How did they come by that information to know this Valerie Plame was an undercover agent? That raises very serious questions.

Mr. REID. If I can answer and ask a question. First of all, Webster's compact dictionary I have in my desk says a traitor is one who betrays trust. So certainly if a CIA agent leaked to the press the name of one of his colleagues who is an undercover agent, he would be a traitor.

Mr. HARKIN. I accept that definition. I say to my friend, my feelings and my senses are that someone with this kind of information who leaked it I think has violated the law and betrayed the government and the citizens of the United States.

Mr. REID. The next question I ask my friend: So if a CIA operative would be subject to criminal penalties and would be considered a traitor for doing this activity, certainly someone working within the administration, within the White House, would be considered the same; is that not true?

Mr. HARKIN. I think the Senator from Nevada has it exactly right. That is true, they would be considered the same. I thank the Senator for asking the question because it does clarify a point.

If I can take off from what the Senator from Nevada just asked me—and it is a good point, it should be made—what would happen in the administration if someone in the CIA had leaked this kind of information about an undercover agent. What would happen? I will tell you what would happen. They would have that person locked up in jail before nightfall, and they would be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. My friend from Nevada raises a good question: What is the difference between that and someone in the White House or administration doing the same thing?

Again, it is time for a special counsel. As the New York Times said this morning on the front page, both Mr. Rove and Mr. Oliver have close connections with Mr. Ashcroft. I don't know whether they are involved in this or not, but they are both very high in the administration. There are too many close ties between Attorney General Ashcroft and people high in this administration for the people of this country to be assured that we are going to have a fair, independent, full, and thorough investigation. Let the chips fall where they may and prosecute—yes, prosecute—the people responsible for leaking this information.

Mr. President, I intend to take the floor of the Senate every day to talk about this issue. We cannot allow this to be swept under the rug. We cannot allow a coverup to go on day after day. This is a President elected by the people, a servant of the people. And I don't think it is enough for any President to say: We will let the Attorney General investigate. The buck stops on the President's desk. I can only say if an allegation had been made about someone on my staff doing something like that, I would call them in, and I would have them sign a notarized legal document right there: I, so and so, had nothing to do with any leak and know no information about it whatsoever. Sign it.

That is what the President can do, and we can have this information out about who called Mr. Novak, who called these other reporters. We would know it before the sun went down today. That is why this coverup cannot continue to go on. The American people deserve better than this, and they are going to get it. We are going to find out who put our country at risk, who committed these treasonous activities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN SECURITY AND RECONSTRUCTION, 2004

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1689, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1689) making emergency supplemental appropriations for Iraq and Afghanistan security and reconstruction for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell modified amendment No. 1795, to commend the Armed Forces of the United States in the War on Terrorism.

Biden amendment No. 1796, to provide funds for the security and stabilization of Iraq by suspending a portion of the reductions in the highest income tax rate for individual taxpayers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 40 minutes divided in the usual form on the McConnell amendment No. 1795.

The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 1795

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, before proceeding to my remarks about the pending amendment, I point out to Members of the Senate that we are all familiar with the National Endowment for Democracy and the fact that it provides funds to the International Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute, which operate overseas to help promote democracy, human rights, and all of the things that Americans believe are important.

The National Democratic Institute recently issued a report on Iraq that I think is noteworthy, and I am going to point out some excerpts from that.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this report be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright currently chairs the National Democratic Institute and she points out:

> The past half-century provides ample proof that democracy is more than just another form of government; it is also a powerful generator of international security, prosperity and peace.

According to the NDI, inside Iraq there is an explosion of democratic politics.

> . . . NDI will find fertile ground for democracy promotion initiatives on a scale not seen since the heady days of the fall of the Berlin wall.

That bears repeating, that the National Democratic Institute finds within Iraq today an explosion of democracy, and fertile ground for democracy promotion initiatives on a scale not seen since the fall of the Berlin wall.

Another finding of the NDI that I think is noteworthy is that the Iraqis are grateful for their liberation. There has been some notion promoted, I think by many in the press, that somehow the Iraqis are sorry that Saddam is gone. The NDI, headed by Madeleine Albright, finds that the Iraqis are grateful for their liberation.

In addition, the NDI finds significant evidence of support for the United States. For example, they say:

> In Kirkuk, there was a large painted sign reading ''Thank you USA'' in English and in Kurdish.

Additionally, the NDI found overwhelming support for liberation, but lack of stability or economic opportunity obviously does erode, to some extent, support for the U.S.

They found that security and jobs are a precondition to democracy. We know that, and that is what this supplemental is all about. They found Iraqi frustrations are due to fear and uncertainty, not hostility toward the United