

GETTING ANSWERS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, during England's darkest hour in 1940, Winston Churchill spoke of an unwavering sense of purpose. "You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: it is victory, victory at all costs, victory in spite of all terror," he told members of Parliament.

Sixty years later, we here in the United States are fighting a different kind of terror, terrorists who hide in caves and plan the murder of thousands of innocent Americans, but our resolve to defeat it matches that of Churchill. Some have expressed concerns that the investigations of how our intelligence and law enforcement authorities handled information prior to 9-11 will weaken our efforts to defeat terrorists.

Frankly, I think the questions that are being raised will strengthen our efforts to defeat terrorism. We have a lot of good men and women working in the CIA, the FBI and other agencies. But evidence, we have learned in recent months, suggests that there is a layer of bureaucracy and resistance in the management of some of these critical agencies that stifles the efforts of good law enforcement and good intelligence when tracking terrorists.

We have to fix that. Our job is to prevent the next act of terror and if the bureaucracy is clogging the arteries of our intelligence and law enforcement agencies, then we have to get rid of it.

Consider this: six months after Mohammed Atta and MarwanAl-Shehhi flew huge jets into the World Trade Center, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service inexplicably sent notice their visa status had been changed from travel to student. In recent weeks, reports indicate a Phoenix FBI agent alerted headquarters of his suspicions about Middle Eastern men taking flight lessons. Minneapolis agent Coleen Rowley has complained bitterly that her office's efforts to obtain a search warrant about a suspected hijacker were ignored. Now the CIA says that it was tracking two of those who committed terrorist's acts on 9-11, but there is controversy over whether the FBI was actually notified. As a result the terrorists moved in and out of our country with ease. These and other reports, in recent months, raise real concerns about how these federal intelligence and law enforcement agencies are working to prevent future acts of terrorism.

When people begin to raise questions about these issues, some claim that the intent is to criticize President Bush.

President Bush, indeed any President, would have moved heaven and earth to prevent the catastrophe of 9-11 if he had received any advance warning. These inquiries are not about the President or the White House. They are about the effectiveness of our Federal agencies in the war against terrorism here at home.

The information disclosed in recent months about some of the failures of these agencies has come from people

working inside the agencies. These are employees of the FBI and other agencies who are blowing the whistle on agency managers who fail to see the gravity of this situation and refuse to take appropriate actions.

For example, Minneapolis FBI agents were admonished by their superiors for sharing information with the CIA in the case of suspected terrorist, Zacarias Moussaoui, who had links to Osama bin Laden. That is unacceptable. These agencies need to work together. Preventing the next terrorist act is a tough job, and we will succeed only if we have all of the resources working full time and cooperating fully.

In recent months and weeks, the head of Homeland Security has warned our country the terrorist attacks against the United States could happen at any time. That's why these agencies and their officials have to be fighting the battle against terrorists, not turf battles between their agencies.

Big, bureaucratic and slow doesn't get it anymore. We deserve better from these agencies. What if there is critical information right now in the possession of one agency that is not sharing it with another? Are those who dropped the ball last year in these agencies. The same ones we now rely on to prevent another terrorist nightmare?

The answer to these questions is why this is such an urgent matter. We, the President, the Congress and the American people, deserve the unvarnished facts so that we can move ahead and protect our country, so I say let's do these investigations. Let's make sure that they don't turn into a circus. As Sergeant Joe Friday used to say, "Just the facts, ma'am." Let's use those facts to make the changes these agencies so that the men and women of the FBI, the CIA and other agencies who are very capable and serve America well, are able to do their jobs successfully.

Only then, as Winston Churchill did, can we finally win the war against terrorism.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I would like to speak on the ridiculous ruling of the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Literally ridiculous; it deserves to be ridiculed. It was a 2-1 decision, so there is, at least, one judge on the Court who can rule based on the same legal and civic theory that the rest of the country has been operating under for the last 226 years.

I cannot accept removing "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. This ruling is appalling. I never thought I would see the day when saying the Pledge of Allegiance would be declared unconstitutional by a court. I certainly did not think I would see it on the day I placed my hand on a Holy Bible and made an Oath at my swearing in.

The Magna Carta of 1215, considered the initial codification of Western

democratic theory, clearly shows that power is granted from "above." Not "above" from a judge's bench, but higher—from an Almighty Power. Every major assertion of our fundamental political thought references God, and not in passing, but as a cornerstone of human life.

Sometimes it is again literally a cornerstone. The Jefferson Memorial has quotes from that great man, which contain references to God carved into the stone. The Lincoln Memorial also has a testament to that President's commitment to God cut into the very marble. Anyone reading his Second Inaugural must know his view of a daily presence of God in the affairs of man and in the political life of this nation. The Holocaust Memorial facade quotes scriptures. So does our Library of Congress, Union Station, Constitution Hall, and many others.

Even William Shakespeare's Puck is quoted referring to God over outside the Folger Shakespeare Theater—in a quote that I think rings especially true regarding certain court rulings—"Lord, What fools these mortals be." Lord, what foolish rulings these judges make. There has already been discussions on this floor regarding our coins, our money, and this very Chamber. I don't bring these up just to worry aloud as to whether they are soon to be ruled against as well, but to show that our nation was incorporated under God, and an attempt to excise God from this Republic is wrong and lacking in historical and legal insight.

Our citizens are free from an official state religion—not forced to be free from religious thought.

When President Eisenhower signed the law adding "under God" to the pledge, he was not doing so in attempt to lead this Nation down a Godly path. It was not using the bully pulpit to attempt to steer a course. He was affirming that this nation has already consistently and thoroughly incorporated belief in and submission to God.

We separated ourselves from the United Kingdom under the laws of Nature's God, claiming the unalienable rights we were endowed with by our Creator and appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for recititude of our intentions. We have continued this way ever since—no matter what the Ninth might say.

Finally, I want to make it clear that I am not merely upset about the fact that the Pledge of Allegiance was ruled against. I want to also speak against the ongoing assault on our basic religious beliefs. As my friend Senator SESSIONS voiced earlier, this is just another result of a dangerous and radical viewpoint that is held by an irresponsible few. Few as they are compared to our citizens as a whole, there are far too many in this body and elsewhere who express beliefs and support for radical judges that cannot help but lead us to these types of decisions. We do not jump from a nation that believes itself endowed by its Creator with

unalienable rights to a nation where the Pledge of Allegiance can be ruled unconstitutional without many intervening steps along the way. Those of us who oppose the many small steps taken down this path welcome those who finally stand aghast at where we end up. I hope this body and the Nation will move to correct the error.

REPORT ON TRIP TO BULGARIA, MACEDONIA, KOSOVO, SLOVAKIA, SLOVENIA AND BRUSSELS

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, over the Memorial Day recess, I joined seven members of the House of Representatives to participate in the spring meeting of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. Twice a year, legislators from NATO member countries and seventeen countries that have been given "associate" status—including NATO aspirants and members of the Partnership for Peace program—gather to discuss significant issues facing the Alliance.

At the forefront of the agenda this year were issues related to the war on terrorism, and questions that will be raised when NATO heads of state meet in Prague this November, including: the future direction of the Alliance; the growing gap in military capabilities between the United States and our European allies; and the selection of new members.

This was the third year that I have participated in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly's spring gathering. The meeting took on a new urgency as the Alliance continues to confront a changed international security environment in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September 11th. As parliamentarians discussed the military campaign in Afghanistan and the role of NATO in the war on terror, I reminded my European counterparts of the need to invest in the defense budgets of their respective countries. Without fundamental military capabilities such as strategic airlift and command and control systems, the European contribution to the global war on terrorism will continue to be limited.

It was clear throughout the meeting that the events of 9-11 have impacted discussions in many areas, including expansion of the Alliance. During consideration of a Declaration on NATO Enlargement, I introduced an amendment calling attention to the significant threats that terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction pose to NATO countries, and recognizing that as NATO considers enlargement, the Alliance remains open to tolerant, democratic societies, which embrace values that terrorism seeks to destroy.

As the meeting progressed, I also expressed my strong support for a robust round of enlargement during the Summit of the Alliance in Prague later this year. I share the President's vision of enlargement, articulated in Warsaw, Poland last June, when he said that as

we approach Prague: "We should not calculate how little we can get away with, but how much we can do to advance the cause of freedom."

Yet while the Alliance should extend invitations to a number of countries in Prague, I believe it is premature to single out countries for membership at this point. Instead, we should continue to encourage aspirants to make progress on their membership action plans and move forward with democratic, economic and judicial reforms.

As such, during consideration of the Declaration on NATO Enlargement, I joined Congressman DOUG BEREUTER, the chairman of the U.S. delegation, and other members of the United States Congress at the meeting in abstaining from a vote on an amendment that identified seven countries as ready for membership in the Alliance. Despite U.S. concerns, the amendment was adopted.

While I do not disagree that the countries listed in the amendment—Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania—have made some strides in their preparations to join NATO, there are serious discussions that must take place between now and November regarding the selection of new members.

This spring's NATO Parliamentary meeting was especially important to its host country, Bulgaria, which hopes to receive an invitation to join the Alliance in Prague. I remain very interested in discussion about NATO enlargement, and while in Sofia, I was glad to have opportunity to visit with Prime Minister Simeon Saxe-Coburg-Gothé and President Georgi Parvanov to discuss Bulgaria's work to join the Alliance. I also met with Defense Minister Nikolay Svinarov and Foreign Minister Solomon Passy, who I have met with previously in my office in Washington, DC.

My first official visit outside of the NATO session was with Bulgaria's Defense Minister, Nikolay Svinarov. Just minutes before our meeting, Mr. Svinarov spoke to the NATO PA's Committee on Defense and Security, outlining Bulgaria's plans to move forward with defense reforms. His presentation was clear, and I congratulated him on his effort to describe Bulgaria's progress on the defense portion of the membership action plan (MAP). While noting the progress that has been made, I encouraged him to follow through on the vision that he articulated to the NATO parliamentarians. I was impressed with Bulgaria's plan; however, it is evident that there is still a lot of work to be done to implement their ambitious agenda for military reform.

My impressions were reaffirmed several days later when I visited Graf Ignatievo air base, near the city of Plovdiv. The enthusiasm of the officers and pilots at the base was evident. Since 2001, the Bulgarian government has invested in modernization of base infrastructure, upgrading the runway

and the flight line and renovating buildings and training facilities. While this is certainly a positive development, I was concerned with the equipment at the base, including Soviet-era MiG-29 and MiG-21 aircraft. While the MiG-21s will be retired, the Bulgarians hope to upgrade their MiG-29s by 2004, with the goal of full NATO interoperability. There are serious questions not only about whether or not this can actually be done, but also whether this is money wisely spent. As NATO considers questions about military capabilities, it will be important to consider how NATO members and aspirant countries can best invest limited defense dollars to contribute to the overall mission of the Alliance. As Bulgaria continues with defense reforms, this will be one factor to consider.

Bulgaria must also confront challenges in other areas, including the need to move forward with judicial reforms. The government must take action to combat corruption and organized crime. I discussed this issue with Prime Minister Saxe-Coburg-Gothé and President Parvanov, as well as Foreign Minister Passy.

Perhaps one of the most eye-opening conversations I had during my trip to Bulgaria was with FBI Special Agent Victor Moore, who is working with the Bulgarian government and local NGOs to combat human trafficking. As a member of the Helsinki Commission and an active participant in the annual meetings of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, I have worked on this issue with Congressman CHRIS SMITH—who has a long record of work to combat the trafficking of men, women and children. I also follow the efforts of the Southeast European Cooperative Initiative (SECI), which aims to combat trans-border crime in the region.

SECI has spearheaded an initiative to combat human trafficking in southeast Europe, and Vic Moore's efforts are tied directly to their objectives. Of his eleven years in the FBI, he spent nine of them working on drug enforcement in New York City. In Bulgaria, he is working to give law enforcement personnel the skills they need to investigate and prosecute human trafficking cases. The Bulgarian government has formed a multi-agency task force, which has liberated more than 160 women, issued 60 arrest warrants and captured approximately 60 traffickers. This important work should continue. I believe it is important that the government take continued steps to strengthen the rule of law and reform the judicial systems. This will be important as NATO evaluates the progress of aspirant countries later this year.

In all of my conversations in Sofia, one thing was clear: the people of Bulgaria, and the members of government who represent them, want to join NATO. Over a breakfast meeting with members of the U.S. delegation at the home of our Ambassador to Bulgaria Jim Pardew, President Parvanov said that there is complete public and political consensus on NATO in Bulgaria.