

to oversee and make continuing studies of the intelligence activities and programs of the United States Government, and to report to the Senate concerning those activities. Pursuant to this charge, the Committee undertook a multi-faceted review in February 2004 of issues related to intelligence produced prior to the Iraq war.

The report is in both classified and unclassified form. The classified report is available to members in the Committee's secure spaces. The classified report is also being provided to appropriately cleared officials of the Executive Branch. The unclassified report, which we are hereby transmitting, includes the Committee's conclusions and the additional views of Committee members.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IV,  
*Chairman.*

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,  
*Vice Chairman.*

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, on May 24, I voted for H.R. 2206, but I am disappointed that it took so long to complete work on this legislation, while we have troops deployed and under fire fighting against an enemy that, as few others have in history, seeks our total destruction.

For 108 days, the majority held up vital funding for our troops' equipment and training. All this time, the majority was playing politics with this funding, even sending to the President a bill that they knew would be vetoed. And this is not my analysis; we know this through the Democrats' own words. Senator HARRY REID, the Democratic leader in the Senate, said, "We are going to pick up Senate seats as a result of this war." And "well, it doesn't matter what resolution we move forward to. You know, I can count. I don't know if we'll get 60 votes. But I'll tell you one thing, there are 21 Republicans up for reelection this time."

So, with that in mind, we finally received the final version of the security supplemental at 8 p.m., the last night before the Memorial Day work period. While Democrats finally decided to listen to our generals and not MoveOn.org and yielded to Republicans' demand to exclude an arbitrary withdrawal date, this bill still has serious flaws. A policy that would potentially restrict the very economic reconstruction funds that are necessary to achieve the political and diplomatic solution General Petraeus says we need represents bad public policy, to say the least.

What's more, I am disappointed to see, yet again, that the majority would use the needs of our troops as leverage to include extraneous, and in many cases ill-conceived, spending and policy provisions. Among these are a raise in the federal minimum wage to \$7.25 an hour; \$22 million in Corps of Engineers funding specifically earmarked for Long Island and Westchester County, and certain areas of New Jersey; \$40 million in agriculture assistance specifically earmarked for certain areas of

Kansas affected by the recent tornadoes; \$10 million for radios for the Capitol Police; several new provisions to give certain labor unions and Continental and American Airlines relief from their employer pension plan contribution obligations; and a provision that mandates that the Secretary of Health and Human Services approve a state's request to extend a waiver for the Pharmacy Plus program, making Wisconsin the only state to benefit from this provision.

The delay in passage of the security supplemental caused by the majority party created significant disruptions for the Department of Defense and for our men and women deployed in the war against terrorists.

Since the emergency request was submitted by the President, the Department of Defense has realigned significant funds internally and submitted to Congress approximately six reprogramming requests driven by the delays in the supplemental.

Secretary Gates stated in an April 11 letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee, "[i]t is a simple fact of life that if the . . . [supplemental] is not enacted soon, the Army faces a real and serious funding problem that will require increasingly disruptive and costly measures to be initiated—measures that will, inevitably, negatively impact readiness and Army personnel and their families."

Then, Secretary Gates in a May 9 letter to Senator MCCAIN wrote:

[I]n submitting the FY07 supplemental request in early February, the Department planned on these funds becoming available by not later than mid-April. Accordingly, starting in mid-April, the Department began a series of actions to mitigate the impact of the delay in the supplemental on our deployed forces by slowing down spending in less critical accounts. In addition, funds budgeted for fourth quarter Army operations and personnel costs have been or are in the process of being moved forward and expended to partially make up the shortfall.

These actions have resulted in the Army having to take a series of steps including deferring repair of equipment and restraining supply purchases. In short, these steps, while necessary to account for the delay in the supplemental, have already caused disruptions within the Department.

Mr. President, here are just a few specific examples of disruptions that have occurred within the Army:

Facility maintenance and purchases for barracks, mold abatement projects, and dining facilities has been deferred. As a result, there is a risk of troops returning from combat tours to sub-standard barracks and facilities that had been scheduled for renovation or updates while soldiers were deployed.

Orders of supplies have been reduced. Deferring orders for major repair parts and unit level maintenance items creates system lag and an accumulation of backlogged orders waiting to be placed. Units can sustain operations for only a limited time by consuming existing inventory.

In his May 9 letter to Senator MCCAIN, Secretary Gates also made clear that these disruptions would have effects on the war effort:

[T]he lack of timely supplemental funds has limited the Department's ability to prop-

erly contract for the reconstitution of equipment for both the active and reserve forces. This situation increases the readiness risk of our military with each passing day should the nation require the use of these forces prior to the equipment becoming available. In other cases, the funding delay negatively impacts our forces in the field by needlessly delaying the accelerated fielding of new force protection capabilities such as the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicle and counter-IED technologies developed and acquired by the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO). Finally, the ongoing delay resulted in the depletion of funds necessary to accelerate the training of Iraqi security forces.

Multinational Force-Iraq spokesman, Army Maj. Gen. William Caldwell, on April 4 said, "At the current moment, because of this lack of funding, MNSTC-I—Multi-National Security Transition Command-Iraq—is unable to continue at the pace they were in the developmental process of the Iraqi security forces . . . It is starting to have some impact today, and will only have more of an impact over time."

While I firmly believe that the manner in which Democrats managed this legislation reveals their misplaced priorities, it is absolutely necessary that we get this funding to the men and women on the front line without further delay. That is why I voted for this supplemental. Having forced our troops to wait 108 days for this needed funding, there is no other choice but to accept this legislative blackmail.

I would also like to speak to a larger point, Mr. President. My friends on the other side of this issue in both houses talk about a failed strategy, and about a war that is lost. How do they know the Petraeus strategy has failed? It isn't even in place yet. The fifth brigade of the surge isn't there yet, and the fourth has only just arrived.

Even commentators like Joel Klein of Time magazine, no friend of this administration or this policy, have been forced to admit that progress is being made. While pointing out the many struggles that remain, Mr. Klein said:

There is good news from Iraq, believe it or not. It comes from the most unlikely place: Anbar province, home of the Sunni insurgency. The level of violence has plummeted in recent weeks. An alliance of U.S. troops and local tribes has been very effective in moving against the al-Qaeda foreign fighters. A senior U.S. military official told me—confirming reports from several other sources—that there have been "a couple of days recently during which there were zero effective attacks and less than 10 attacks overall in the province (keep in mind that an attack can be as little as one round fired). This is a result of sheiks stepping up and opposing AQI [al-Qaeda in Iraq] and volunteering their young men to serve in the police and army units there." The success in Anbar has led sheiks in at least two other Sunni-dominated provinces, Nineveh and Salahaddin, to ask for similar alliances against the foreign fighters. And, as Time's Bobby Ghosh has reported, an influential leader of the Sunni insurgency, Harith al-Dari, has turned against al-Qaeda as well. It is possible that al-Qaeda is being rejected like a mismatched liver transplant by the body of the Iraqi insurgency.

What is now happening is an attempt to reconsider the vote of four years ago

when, by large bipartisan majorities in both chambers, we authorized this war. In an effort to appease far left-wing groups, some are attempting to distance themselves from their votes to authorize this policy, and from their own statements acknowledging what the intelligence information told us: Saddam Hussein posed a grave threat to America's national security.

What they're not doing is talking about the consequences of defeat. It is clear from respected national security figures like General Anthony Zinni that "This is no Vietnam or Somalia or those places where you can walk away. If we just pull out, we will find ourselves back in short order."

Additionally, even the Brookings Institution released a study that argues:

Iraq appears to have many of the conditions most conducive to spillover because there is a high degree of foreign "interest" in Iraq. Ethnic, tribal, and religious groups within Iraq are equally prevalent in neighboring countries and they share many of the same grievances. Iraq has a history of violence with its neighbors, which has fostered desires for vengeance and fomented constant clashes. Iraq also possesses resources that its neighbors covet—oil being the most obvious, but important religious shrines also figure in the mix. There is a high degree of commerce and communication between Iraq and its neighbors, and its borders are porous. All of this suggests that spillover from an Iraqi civil war would tend toward the more dangerous end of the spillover spectrum.

We cannot forget that Iran and Syria are fostering instability in Iraq. Al-Qaida and Hezbollah are both active there as well.

As I have mentioned before, but have not heard answered from the critics, we know that chaos in Iraq could draw in others in the region. For example, Saudi Arabian officials have threatened "massive intervention to stop Iranian-backed Shiite militias from butchering Iraqi Sunnis." A Kurdish secession would likely cause Turkish intervention.

Does anyone in Congress disagree that failing in Iraq would be a dramatic setback in the war against terrorists? Iraq must not be divorced from its context—the struggle between the forces of moderation and extremism in the Muslim world. After all, al-Qaida has been in Iraq since before the U.S. invaded and has dedicated itself to fomenting sectarian violence there. Osama bin Laden referred to Iraq as "capital of the Caliphate," arguing that "[t]he most . . . serious issue today for the whole world is this Third World War . . . [that] is raging in [Iraq]."

Terrorism expert Peter Bergen has told us that a:

[U.S. withdrawal] would fit all too neatly into Osama bin Laden's master narrative about American foreign policy. His theme is that America is a paper tiger that cannot tolerate body bags coming home; to back it up, he cites President Ronald Reagan's 1984 withdrawal of United States troops from Lebanon and President Bill Clinton's decision nearly a decade later to pull troops from Somalia. A unilateral pullout from Iraq

would only confirm this analysis of American weakness among his jihadist allies.

Failure in Iraq will encourage further attacks against the United States and provide a base from which to plan and train for attacks.

I will remind my friends who pushed so hard for this legislation, and who cheered for votes on an immediate withdrawal, and the passage of the first security supplemental which the President correctly vetoed, if you are going to advocate a strategy for failure or a precipitous withdrawal, you have the responsibility to tell the American people what the consequences would be, and to tell them how you would respond. These are the burdens of leadership.

#### HONORING SENATOR TED STEVENS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, last August, TED STEVENS and DAN INOUE led a bipartisan group of Senators to China for a parliamentary visit. DAN, of course, was accorded great respect because of his winning the Congressional Medal of Honor during World War II. But it was TED STEVENS for whom the Chinese rolled out the red carpet. TED had flown with the Flying Tigers. He flew the first plane to land in Beijing after World War II ended, and the top Chinese leaders had not forgotten. They made more time for our delegation than they had for any other recent group of American visitors.

No one in our group, of course, was surprised to learn that TED STEVENS had flown risky missions and, for that bravery, earned the Distinguished Flying Cross. TED still has the cockiness, adventuresome spirit and attitude that distinguish most pilots. And he has the love of country that permeates those who fought in World War II. We see both qualities every day in the Senate.

For example, 2 years ago, when we were considering how to maneuver through five Senate committees legislation based on a National Academies report that would help America keep its brainpower advantage, TED was both unconcerned about committee prerogatives and impatient about getting the job done. "Let's form a select committee," he said many times. "You be the chairman of it." He said this even though he was then the most senior Republican in the Senate and I was nearly the most junior. The Senate never formed that select committee, but TED made sure the legislation passed because he thought it was important for our country.

I was Legislative Assistant to Senator Howard Baker in 1968 when TED was appointed to the Senate. He hasn't changed much in all that time, even though he is now the longest serving Republican Senator. In his first year, he was pushing amendments that would help Alaska Natives maintain their fishing rights. This year, he is still busy working on legislation cre-

ating additional rights for Alaska Natives. And in the 39 years between, he has snagged every dollar that comes within 50 feet for his Alaskan constituents—and some dollars that were farther away than that.

TED STEVENS is, I would say, above all, an institutionalist in the United States Senate. In other words, he sees a unique role in our democracy for the Senate, and he is one of a handful here who is determined to respect that role and make it work.

I suppose TED will have opposition when he runs for reelection in 2008. But, if he does, I wouldn't want to be that person. Last week, walking side by side with him to vote, I took the escalator when we got to the Capitol and TED literally ran up the stairs, two at a time.

It would be hard to identify a "More Valuable Player" in the U.S. Senate than TED STEVENS.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I would like to honor a colleague and a good friend, Senator TED STEVENS, for becoming the longest serving Republican Member of the Senate. I am honored to serve in the Senate with this great Republican.

TED STEVENS' career in public service began long before he became a U.S. Senator. He served in the U.S. Army Air Corps during WWII, practiced law in Alaska, worked in the Eisenhower administration, and served in the Alaska House of Representatives where he eventually became majority leader. He became U.S. Senator in 1968 and has served the State of Alaska in the Senate for over 39 years. His longstanding public service career truly demonstrates his devotion to this country.

Just like his famous Hulk tie, TED has a bullish tenacity that has made him one of the most effective Members in the Senate. He is a stalwart representative for his State of Alaska. Representing a State over 4,000 miles from the Nation's Capital, Senator STEVENS has sacrificed time with his six children and wife to serve in the Senate. Coming from a large family myself, I appreciate the strength and commitment his family has displayed over the years.

During my trips to Alaska, I always leave impressed by the spectacular landscape and TED STEVENS' hard work in his State. His work has helped many Alaskan towns receive clean running water and has enabled many children to receive a quality education. His persistence in the Senate also has provided Alaska with oil pipelines, which have brought tremendous revenue to Alaska and provided our Nation with a safe, domestic energy source.

TED STEVENS' work as a Senator has also gone beyond the borders of Alaska. During his 35-year tenure on the Appropriations Committee, he has tirelessly persevered to keep America ready and prepared. He has ensured our troops have the good equipment, training, and pay they deserve. His efforts