his hand. Then I say: How many of you know that David Kay said, based on what he discovered, that Saddam Hussein was more dangerous than we thought? Well, we didn't know that. But that is a fact that we must recognize and have the wisdom to go forward in the face of that fact.

Now, if indeed we are engaged in a worldwide war on terror, that means that our being in Iraq is not only for the sake of the Iraqis, it is for the sake of Americans. Some say we have no business being there, it is not our country, we don't care. Well, one of the realities we have to face is we are involved in the world whether we like it or not. Those on the campaign trail who are saying bring the troops home are the same people who are saying stop buying at any retailer who purchases goods abroad. Those who are saying don't have anything to do with any company that has any employees abroad do not realize the fundamental truth that America is involved in the world whether we like it or not, and we cannot withdraw. We cannot become isolationists. We cannot hide behind our two oceans militarily or economically.

The world has fundamentally changed. It fundamentally changed when the Berlin Wall came down and the ''evil empire'' ceased to exist. We are engaged around the world whether we like it or not. We must have the wisdom to recognize that fundamental truth and act accordingly; we must have the courage to act according to the truth.

I went to Iraq with the leader and my colleague Senator ENSIGN from Nevada and spent a day with the commanders there. You can say that in one day in Iraq, what do you learn? Obviously, you don't learn everything you need to in one day to know the whole situation, but you learn a whole lot more in one day in Iraq than you do sitting in America reading the newspapers.

I learned the forces that are opposed to us in Iraq have as their goal civil war and a failed state. Ultimately, what they want to have happen is for the Iraqi government that is being created now to fail. They want the Iraqis in anarchy. They want the economy destroyed. Why would they want such terrible things? They think out of that chaos they can seize power and come back into control.

Most who are involved in this insurgency are former supporters and officers of Saddam Hussein. They are hoping that through chaos they can recapture that which they could not hold in the face of the American military incursion into that country.

Grant us the wisdom to know the difference between a difficult situation and an impossible one. There are those who are saying Iraq is Bush's Vietnam. I do not think Iraq is Bush's Vietnam because Bush did not go into Iraq with the same motives that President Kennedy went into Vietnam, with the same naivete that President Kennedy and President Johnson pursued Vietnam.

We should have the courage to change the situation in Iraq by persistence, by holding the course steadily, and by recognizing that there are people in the Middle East who do want freedom.

There are pessimists who say: No, come on, BENNETT, you say to accept the things you cannot change, and one of the things you cannot change is that the Muslim people do not want freedom.

I refuse to accept that. Maybe I do not have the wisdom to recognize the difference, but I refuse to accept that.

Having visited with some of the Iraqis, I have found some who said they clearly do, most particularly the new Prime Minister Allawi. We visited with him. He struck me as a very clear-headed, careful guy who fully understood the situation.

As we were finishing our conversation, I said to him: Accept our thanks for your willingness to put your life on the line for this effort.

His life is in jeopardy. Two ministers of his government have already been assassinated, and he is clearly the chief target of those who would plunge Iraq into civil war.

I was interested in his answer. When I thanked him for his willingness to risk his life to make this government work, he looked at me and responded: It is my country.

There is an Iraqi leader willing to risk his life for his country. We have the responsibility, I believe, to do everything we can to help him.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 7 minutes.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today because, frankly, I am alarmed. I am alarmed by bottlenecks and barriers blocking the ability of our law enforcement and intelligence agents to fight terrorism. These bottlenecks and barriers are hampering our law enforcement's ability to use the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, known as the FISA statute. In setting up surveillance against foreign powers working inside the United States, all Americans should be concerned. All Americans should be concerned, frankly, as the FISA statute is one of the most important weapons we have to fight terrorism.

Bottlenecks in the Justice Department's process of FISA applications could mean if there were a terrorist attack being planned against Americans today, we might not know about it. We would not know about it because a FISA request simply did not get processed.

We would not know it because the bureaucracy in Washington, DC, simply did not get to the application in time, did not have the time or the people or the resources to process an agent's request allowing him or her to gather that pivotal piece of intelligence, that vital piece of information that very well could be the key to preventing a terrorist attack at home. That scares me, and that should scare every Member of this Senate, and that should scare every American.

Although the FBI has been more aggressive in submitting FISA requests since the September 11 terrorist attacks, the Department of Justice has been unable to keep pace with the resulting surge in applications. Here is what the staff of the independent 9/11 Commission tells us:

> The application process . . . continues to be long and slow.

That process is still subject to ''bottlenecks.''

I was very concerned about that. So on May 20, the last FBI oversight hearing held by the Judiciary Committee, I asked Director Mueller how well he thought the FISA statute was being utilized, and this is what Director Mueller said:

> We still have concerns. There is still frustration out there in the field in certain areas where, because we have had to prioritize, we cannot get to certain requests for FISA as fast as perhaps we might have in the past.

What does this mean? Does that mean it is now taking longer post-9/11 to process certain FISA requests? If that is the case—and it is—that is a shocking statement and one that is certainly disconcerting and also downright frightening.

Later in a Judiciary Committee hearing just last week, Attorney General Ashcroft made equally troubling statements. I told him I felt it was dangerous to have to prioritize FISA requests because we can never know what kind of information we will get from these warrants. Even our best guess is still just a guess, and this is what the Attorney General said:

> . . . we are prioritizing among FISA applications . . . so that at least the most promising of those applications are the ones that would be first attended to, but frankly, it is not easy always to know where you are going to get the best intelligence, and it is not a situation where I am confident in saying, ''Oh, well, we do not have to worry about that one.''

The Attorney General was very candid. He was very honest, and he said it very well. You never can be sure where a promising lead will take you or which lead will be the one lead that uncovers the information that will save many lives. They have to prioritize. To have to prioritize, to have to pick and choose among these leads, is very risky and dangerous business. It is almost this kind of Russian roulette. We should not be in that business. We should not have to do it.

The Justice Department should be able to look at each FISA request individually and do whatever is necessary to process that request, not prioritize it, not just put it higher up in the pile, but actually process it immediately so

that the court can issue a warrant and agents can go about the business of catching terrorists.

This is a very real problem we have. So I say to the Justice Department, you have to put more resources into this. You have to do a better job. Of all that you do in the Justice Department, what could be more important? Do you need more FISA lawyers at Justice? Do you need more people in this unit? If you do, then put them there. Do you need more FISA training for agents?

Do you need more resources? How far behind are you in the FISA process? These are all questions that the Justice Department needs to answer right now. No excuses. Our national security is at stake.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 8 minutes.

IRAQ AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, last week the G8 summit was held in my State of Georgia, and I had the honor of serving as one of the hosts, along with our Governor, the senior Senator from Georgia, Congressman KINGSTON, and Congressman BURNS in greeting the other seven members of the G8. Together with President George W. Bush, we received the heads of state and government from Britain, Canada, Germany, France, Italy, Japan, and Russia, along with a number of other leaders of countries from the Middle East who were specially invited to the G8 summit, including the new President of Iraq, Ghazi al-Yawer.

I liked what I saw in the new President of Iraq. When I shook his hand, I shook the hand of a true Iraqi patriot who is determined to see his country become secure, stable, prosperous, and free. He insists on full sovereignty for the Iraqi people, and he is already an eloquent and tough defender of their interests.

This is why he has publicly stated, not once or twice but at almost every opportunity he gets, that the Iraqi people are grateful for America's sacrifice in freeing them from the tyranny of Saddam Hussein.

He also made it absolutely clear that his new government will continue to need the help of America and other coalition forces as it regains its strength and fends off efforts by terrorists, thugs, and foreign enemies to strangle Iraq's democracy in its cradle.

President al-Yawer has a vision for Iraq, a nation with a history stretching back beyond the storied walls of Babylon to the mists of prehistory. He sees his nation gaining a position of leadership in the Middle East and forming an example of democracy, peace, progress, and prosperity for the entire region.

He made it clear to me that Iraq very much sees the United States, the United Kingdom, and the other nations in the coalition as partners and friends that took risks to free his nation from the tyranny of Saddam Hussein and are now working together to help rebuild Iraq.

President al-Yawer is a strong pragmatic leader who wants to put his government on a sound fiscal footing. When it was proposed to destroy the Abu Ghraib prison—and I was one, frankly, who advocated that following the prisoner scandal—and to replace it, he made a poignant observation about the symbols of Saddam's barbaric treatment of his own people.

He told ABC's ''This Week'' that Saddam tortured people not just in prisons but in the basements of each and every government building, and it would not be prudent to destroy all government entities because of what happened in them. President al-Yawer said:

> We are people that need every single dollar we have in order to rebuild our country, instead of demolishing and rebuilding.

This shows a practical approach to governance which is a very welcome change to the grandiosity and extravagance which, along with cruelty and aggression, marked the reign of Saddam Hussein.

I know there is not one Senator in this Chamber who would begrudge Iraq, its people, and President al-Yawer the assistance needed to continue the transition of Iraq to full sovereignty and democracy.

In my State, we know a real friend stays with you the whole way through difficult times and does not abandon you when the going gets tough. You do not lead someone halfway home and then abandon him to the wolves. And we know those wolves are baying at the door. Al-Qaida, the Baathists, and all the enemies of democracy are already stepping up their attacks to drive us from Iraq so they can rip apart this young democracy.

Only the cowardly, only those without a vision for a newer, better Middle East would urge us to leave Iraq to its fate. History has left its inscriptions in Iraq from time immemorial, from cuneiform inscriptions on clay tablets to the stone pillar of Hammurabai. These judgments have been read and pondered by men in the centuries following their inscriptions.

In the distant future, let no traveler see inscribed in weathered stone the withering judgment of history that the United States had an opportunity to help democracy take root in the Middle East but failed to see it through. Let him read instead: They defeated the forces of darkness so the people of Iraq could live in the light.

The Senate will surely debate what our national policies and priorities should be as we seek to provide assistance for Iraq. We will debate the relative merits of the different ways we can help our friends in Iraq. In fact, this is our job, and it is our duty. But I, for one, will not entertain any policy option that would allow the people of Iraq, so recently freed from the horror of despotism, to be submerged again into the darkness by a different set of tyrants.

Let me now touch on some international aspects of the Iraqi situation. In addition to the forces from the United States, there are 14 other NATO allies with us in Iraq. Military forces from Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, and the United Kingdom are all there with us. And we have great support from another 17 countries, such as Australia, Japan, New Zealand, South Korea, and the Ukraine. Now the international support helping to secure the future of Iraq is growing even more.

At the G8 summit, President Bush gained the unanimous support of the member states to help Iraq. They agreed to form a ''Partnership for Progress and a Common Future with the Region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa'' to support political, social, and economic reform in this region. This builds on President Bush's ''forward strategy of freedom'' that he announced last November.

President Bush also secured a U.N. Security Council resolution supporting the plan for handing sovereignty back to the Iraqi people. On June 8, the Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1546 which supports free elections and authorizes a multinational security force to help stabilize the security situation in Iraq.

The U.N. has done exactly the right thing in passing Resolution 1546, and I applaud them for taking this important step. However, I would be remiss if I did not mention a subject which hinders the effectiveness of the United Nations, not only in Iraq but in its dealings around the world, and by this I mean the Oil-for-Food scandal.

The Oil-for-Food Program, established in 1995, was designed to alleviate the impact of the economic embargo on the people of Iraq, while continuing restrictions on military and technology sales. It was a humanitarian program that was supported by the United States as a way to help average Iraqi citizens get basic food and medical supplies while Saddam Hussein was still in power.

The Oil-for-Food Program was administered by the United Nations Assistant Secretary General Benon V. Sevan who oversaw sales of $111 billion worth of Iraqi oil. While under U.N. auspices, the U.S. Government Accounting Office estimates that over $10 billion of that $111 billion was stolen from the Iraqi people by Saddam's regime. While children were dying for lack of medicine or food, Saddam was importing Mercedes limousines, weapons, and building his grand palaces. Skimming off this vast amount of money involved kickbacks and bribes to a wide variety of foreign officials and businessmen.

When the new Iraqi oil ministry recently published a list of foreign officials receiving bribes, kickbacks, and