

U.S. Hellfire missile and continues, to this day, to turn over that sensitive military technology are not isolated events. Both incidents underscore exactly how egregiously the administration has erred and the extraordinary lengths to which the President will go in order to hide these transgressions from Congress and from the American people.

□ 1015

You see, Mr. Speaker, after the President made his December 17, 2014, announcement, it has been revealed that not only did the administration keep Congress uninformed of the negotiations, but the negotiations had been taking place for over a year and a half.

If we follow the timeline, that means that these secret negotiations were taking place after the administration was already made aware that the Castros were in possession of a U.S. Hellfire missile and after Havana sent the illicit shipment of arms to Pyongyang.

Even after the administration offered concession after concession to the Castros—the loosening of restrictions on travel, the opening of Embassies—the list goes on and on—the President refused to make the returning of sensitive missile technology a precondition to the negotiations or to the implementation of this misguided policy.

Let's stop and think about this for a second, Mr. Speaker.

The President has given the Castro regime almost everything it could have asked for. What did we ask for in return? Did we demand free and fair elections? Of course not. Did we demand the end of the persecution of dissidents and the release of political prisoners? You have got to be kidding. Of course not. Did we demand the regime stop the long list of human rights abuses? No.

In fact, just this past Sunday, over 200 people were arrested in Cuba because they were calling for religious tolerance. But never mind that. Let's look at the cool, classic Chevys that are all through the streets of Havana. That is what we are supposed to be talking about.

The President didn't even demand that the Communist regime, with known and close military ties to Russia, China, and North Korea, turn over to the U.S. the Hellfire missile it had been in possession of since June of 2014.

I don't need to remind my colleagues of how incredibly dangerous it is for the Castros to be in possession of this sensitive military technology or how incredibly damaging it could be to our own national security interests when, not if, the regime turns that technology over to one of our adversaries.

Last year both the Russian Minister of Defense and China's top military official visited Havana to discuss ways to strengthen their military cooperation efforts with Cuba, and a senior Castro regime official traveled to North Korea for military talks.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the President's Cuban policy been a disaster for the people of Cuba, it has been a disaster for our own safety and security. There should be—there must be—a full and thorough investigation into this Hellfire missile incident. If this administration won't do what is necessary to hold the Cuban regime accountable, then we in Congress must use every available tool in order to do so.

We cannot allow the administration's endless train of concessions to the tyrannical Cuban regime to continue while it turns its back on those who are suffering under the regime's oppression. This is not what America stands for, and we should not allow President Obama's misguided foreign policy objectives to ever change that.

#### SERGEANT MATTHEW MCCLINTOCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on the wall outside my office are the faces of 149 men and women from Washington State who were killed in action over the past 14 years in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

Today it is with reverence that I will add the 150th face: Sergeant Matthew McClintock's. Matthew was killed in Helmand Province in Afghanistan on the 5th of January.

Sergeant McClintock was a Green Beret, an engineer, a National Guardsman, as well as a dedicated friend, son, husband, and father.

He joined the Army in 2006 and served in both Iraq and Afghanistan over the course of three tours. On one of his tours, his best friend was killed. So you can imagine what was in his mind when he was now leading a group in Afghanistan and one of his men was on the ground, hit. He knew the danger, but he went out to try and save his teammate.

He epitomized everything we admire about our warriors: their skill, their mettle, their commitment to their teammates, to their families, and to us as a nation. The loss of a promising, smart, steadfast young man, whose devotion to family and country was freely given, should not and will not be accepted without sorrow and respect.

I had the chance to meet Matthew's wife, Alexandra, and their 3-month-old son, Declan, on Friday, when Matthew came back to Dover Air Force Base. Everything his family said about him speaks of a man I would like to have known.

It is said that the true soldier fights not because he hates what is in front of him but because he loves what is behind him. Matthew leaves behind a proud and beautiful family.

His wife asked that she have a chance to go up to Walter Reed to see the man her husband went out to save, who is still alive. That is the kind of family this is. We, as a nation, should be for-

ever grateful that someone of his caliber—and his family—continues to choose to fight.

Mr. Speaker, we have entered the 15th year of this war, and it is easy to forget what is still going on in Iraq and Afghanistan and in other places where our soldiers are.

I became aware of this because somebody in my district was Matthew's father-in-law. He called me up and asked if I would be of help. I was glad to do it, but I realized I had not been aware of what had happened to him.

So I asked the Army press people: Was this reported in the press?

They said, yes, that it was on television for 45 seconds.

The American people are being allowed not to see and not to hear about Matthew McClintock. They are not being told what is going on.

We sent him there. We gave him the gun. We gave him the bullets. We gave him the body armor. We gave him everything and sent him over there and asked him to do this for us. He did it. He was willing to lay down his life for us.

We deserve more time with people like Matthew and like many of the soldiers who went before him. But for those who survive them—Matthew's teammates, his family—Alexandra and especially Declan—when this war finally ends, they deserve long and happy lives in peace.

#### WASP ARLINGTON INURNMENT RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the contributions the WASPs have made to our great country. These are the Women Airforce Service Pilots, and they represent an elite group of female pilots.

They flew combat missions during World War II. These women displayed courage, valor, and a willingness to serve, and they made invaluable contributions to our Nation's efforts to battle on the world stage.

There were fewer than 1,100 WASPs, and 38 of them died during their service. But because the unit was created in 1942, the WASP group was never granted full military status.

In 1977, Congress retroactively granted Active-Duty status to these brave pilots to ensure that all VA policies, laws, and services would apply to them; yet, the Army recently denied the request of WASPs who were seeking a place in Arlington National Cemetery. They say they are running out of space.

This decision flies in the face of our Nation's efforts to recognize, reward, and treat honorably the contributions of all of our veterans. These women deserve the same honor that is bestowed upon hundreds of thousands of their fellow servicemembers.

So I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring and supporting the bill.

I say this to the VA: Find the space.

## SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN SCIENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, universities are supposed to be in the business of illumination, but as we have seen in recent cases at Cal Tech and at UC Berkeley, that is not always the case.

At UC, world-renowned astronomer Geoff Marcy sexually harassed students for years with no consequences. The light of knowledge can cast some dark shadows. Brave women recently alerted my office to still more harassment in astronomy, now at the University of Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this report from the University of Arizona regarding Dr. Timothy Slater. This report was sealed for over a decade while Dr. Slater went on with his career. His example shows why so few women continue careers in science and in engineering.

### CONFIDENTIAL

#### INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

Complaint No: 04-06A-MKM  
Complainant: Administrative Review  
Respondent: Dr. Timothy Slater  
Department: Department of Astronomy,  
Steward Observatory  
Date Complaint Received: August 2004  
Report Date: March 31, 2005

#### BACKGROUND

Prior to July 2004, several individuals approached the EOAAO to discuss sexually charged conduct they were experiencing in the College of Astronomy, and Steward Observatory. They stated that the conduct was occurring across ranks; some indicated the conduct was creating a sexually hostile work environment. Some indicated retaliation might be occurring. These individuals refused to file complaints against the department because they feared work-related repercussions, including unlawful retaliation. Consequently the EOAAO met with administrators in the Department of Astronomy and Steward Observatory to discuss initiating an investigation into sexual harassment, sexually hostile work environment. The department, in turn, formalized a request for investigation, such that this Administrative Review began in August 2004.

Responsive to evidence obtained in the early stages of investigation, the EOAAO named Dr. Tim Slater as a respondent in this case, on September 24, 2004. The EOAAO notified Dr. Slater of his respondent status in accordance with EOAAO procedures, identifying sexual harassment and retaliation as the relevant issues.

Dr. Slater was hired by the University of Arizona on August 6, 2001, as an Associate Professor of Astronomy. He received tenure standing in May 2004. He has a variety of duties at the university, including his post as the Conceptual Astronomy and Physics Education Research (CAPER) team leader.

#### SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

In the course of the investigation, the investigator interviewed multiple individuals—some more than once—who were associated with the Department of Astronomy, Steward Observatory, and/or the CAPER team. Witnesses were selected either randomly, or with an effort to cross-section lev-

els of authority and closeness, professional and/or personal, with the respondent. All efforts were made to get a comprehensive point of view.

#### ISSUE

Did Dr. Slater violate the University's Sexual Harassment Policy, as well as the policy's Retaliation component?

Witness B stated that Dr. Slater and Witness J make a lot of sexual jokes and create sexual banter on a regular basis. She noted a lot of the women tend to ignore this when it is occurring around them.

On a regular basis, Dr. Slater has told Witness B she would teach better if she did not wear underwear.

On at least one occasion he grabbed her underwear through her dress, stretched it and snapped it, and said, "You'd look a whole lot better without these on," or words to that effect. That same day he invited her to attend a lunch with a visiting female graduate student from [redacted] and Witness J. Dr. Slater indicated they would be lunching at a local topless bar. At lunch both Dr. Slater and Witness J paid for and received lap dances. Dr. Slater offered to purchase a lap dance for Witness B; she declined and he did not push the issue further.

Witness B reported that during the semester the sexual conduct occurs daily.

Witness C provided the following information:

Witness C stated that she has continual but infrequent interaction with Dr. Slater during the course of her work. She stated that her concern regarding Dr. Slater reflects sexual conduct occurring on one day: [redacted] Witness C traveled with Dr. Slater to [redacted] by car, in the company of a female graduate student.

During the car trip, Witness C told Dr. Slater some work she had completed for CAPER. He responded by saying, "Awesome! I could just kiss you full on the mouth," or words very close to those. Witness C stated she found this response distasteful.

Later he asked her, "How bad can I be with you?" When she asked him what he meant, he asked her if she would be reporting his comments back to her supervisor.

Dr. Slater went on to relate that when he goes to academic conferences out of town he goes online to set up "hook-ups" (sexual dates) with women in the geographic area. He told Witness C that his personal (sexual) record was four (4) women in twenty-four (24) hours.

Dr. Slater also stated that he and his wife occasionally set up manage-a-trois.

Dr. Slater and the accompanying female graduate student discussed the upcoming visit of Dr. Slater's colleague. She asked Dr. Slater if she would have to sleep with him, to which Dr. Slater replied, "No, not this one." Witness C looked at them and exclaimed, "What?" whereupon Dr. Slater told her that occasionally he might have to ask her to take one for the team.

Talking about Witness J, Dr. Slater said, "Yeah, he likes the young ones. Witness C asked if that individual did not have a girlfriend. Dr. Slater replied that a girlfriend was one thing, but a student was another. Witness C asked if the students were minors, to which Dr. Slater responded that they were all probably over 18.

He added that he, Dr. Slater, preferred a more mature woman who knew "her way around the bedroom." Some minutes later he turned to Witness C and asked her if she knew "anything about or was any good at giving blowjobs, because (the accompanying female—name deleted) does not like to give or receive them—maybe you could give her some pointers."

Witness C then told Slater he was being completely inappropriate. She said, "You

barely know me. I only started a couple of weeks ago, and you're already talking to me like this. Doesn't the U of A give sexual harassment training, or were you absent that day?" She went on to say that she has a particularly large boyfriend (whom she described, in part, as Black) She told Dr. Slater that he would not appreciate the manner in which Dr. Slater was speaking to her. Dr. Slater then asked Witness C if it were true that once you went black, you'd never go back," or words to that effect.

Later Dr. Slater joked that he would pull off at a rest stop so they could have a threesome. Witness C responded by saying, "Like that's going to happen," or words to that effect. After that she tried changing the subject every time it turned sexual, and then she related a story of personal tragedy (non-sexual,) which she noted seemed to sober Dr. Slater and the other female right away.

Witness C stated that she reported Dr. Slater's conduct to the Principle Investigator (PI) on her project. The PI, in turn, told her she should report it to her supervisor, which she did.

[Relevant to Witness D's testimony] Witness C stated she was aware that Dr. Slater appeared to be trying to take [redacted] program [redacted] away from the department and bring it over to Steward Observatory where he also works. She stated he has been pulling funding from the program. Additionally he bad-mouths the Program Coordinator, Witness C's supervisor. He has also been giving responsibilities previously held by that supervisor to his various graduate students.

The witness recalled that other female graduate students had commented that their advisors, Dr. Slater and Witness J, were too sexual in their demeanor.

#### INFORMATION FROM RESPONDENT

On September 30, 2004 Dr. Tim Slater provided the following information:

He stated that he recalled two occasions on which individuals complained directly to him about his personal conduct.

In [redacted] talking about a bachelor party at a strip club, such that a graduate student commented, "That really creeps me out when you talk that way in front of me," or words to that affect. He recalled apologizing.

A graduate student and former CAPER team member telling him that it had made her uncomfortable when he massaged her shoulders publicly, while hosting a teacher workshop. Dr. Slater recalled that she was concerned others might misinterpret the nature of their relationship, were they to observe his gesture.

Dr. Slater characterized himself as a "touchy" person who often hugs people. He stated that he is a "flirtatious" person, and defined that as "friendly," and "flattering." He stated this is mostly with the CAPER group, since CAPER constitutes his primary professional and social interaction.

Dr. Slater stated that he hugs males as well as females, and that he brought many people on the team [CAPER] from Montana and Kansas [universities there.] Many had lived in his house with him and his wife from time to time, and some of the relationships were of 10-12 years' duration. He added they had been in each other's weddings. He stated that they all socialize together at someone's house (often his) on 2-3 occasions per month.

Dr. Slater stated that he and Witness J run the CAPER group, and that within the group they have a joke that he, Slater, is the "mom," and Witness J is the "dad." He stated that some of the CAPER team members were more like family than others; he listed the two groups.

Regarding reports that he had given out "sex toys" at social events; he recalled that