

new Department of Homeland Security would complement the reforms on intelligence-gathering and information-sharing already underway at the FBI and the CIA. The Department would analyze information and intelligence from the FBI, CIA, and many other Federal agencies to better understand the terrorist threat to the American homeland.

The Department would comprehensively assess the vulnerability of America's key assets and critical infrastructures, including food and water systems, agriculture, health systems and emergency services, information and telecommunications, banking and finance, energy, transportation, the chemical and defense industries, postal and shipping entities, and national monuments and icons. The Department would integrate its own and others' threat analyses with its comprehensive vulnerability assessment to identify protective priorities and support protective steps to be taken by the Department, other Federal departments and agencies, State and local agencies, and the private sector. Working closely with State and local officials, other Federal agencies, and the private sector, the Department would help ensure that proper steps are taken to protect high-risk potential targets.

OTHER COMPONENTS

In addition to these four core divisions, the submitted legislation would also transfer responsibility for the Secret Service to the Department of Homeland Security. The Secret Service, which would report directly to the Secretary of Homeland Security, would retain its primary mission to protect the President and other Government leaders. The Secret Service would, however, contribute its specialized protective expertise to the fulfillment of the Department's core mission.

Finally, under my legislation, the Department of Homeland Security would consolidate and streamline relations with the Federal Government for America's State and local governments. The new Department would contain an intergovernmental affairs office to coordinate Federal homeland security programs with State and local officials. It would give State and local officials one primary contact instead of many when it comes to matters related to training, equipment, planning, and other critical needs such as emergency response.

The consolidation of the Government's homeland security efforts as outlined in my proposed legislation can achieve great efficiencies that further enhance our security. Yet, to achieve these efficiencies, the new Secretary of Homeland Security would require considerable flexibility in procurement, integration of information technology systems, and personnel issues. My proposed legislation provides the Secretary of Homeland Security with just such flexibility and managerial authorities. I call upon the Congress to implement these measures in order to

ensure that we are maximizing our ability to secure our homeland.

CONTINUED INTERAGENCY COORDINATION AT THE
WHITE HOUSE

Even with the creation of the new Department, there will remain a strong need for a White House Office of Homeland Security. Protecting America from terrorism will remain a multi-departmental issue and will continue to require interagency coordination. Presidents will continue to require the confidential advice of a Homeland Security Advisor, and I intend for the White House Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Council to maintain a strong role in coordinating our governmentwide efforts to secure the homeland.

THE LESSONS OF HISTORY

History teaches us that new challenges require new organizational structures. History also teaches us that critical security challenges require clear lines of responsibility and the unified effort of the U.S. Government.

President Truman said, looking at the lessons of the Second World War: "It is now time to discard obsolete organizational forms, and to provide for the future the soundest, the most effective, and the most economical kind of structure for our armed forces." When skeptics told President Truman that this proposed reorganization was too ambitious to be enacted, he simply replied that it has to be. In the years to follow, the Congress acted upon President Truman's recommendation, eventually laying a sound organizational foundation that enabled the United States to win the Cold War. All Americans today enjoy the inheritance of this landmark organizational reform: a unified Department of Defense that has become the most powerful force for freedom the world has ever seen.

Today America faces a threat that is wholly different from the threat we faced during the Cold War. Our terrorist enemies hide in shadows and attack civilians with whatever means of destruction they can access. But as in the Cold War, meeting this threat requires clear lines of responsibility and the unified efforts of government at all levels—Federal, State, local, and tribal—the private sector, and all Americans. America needs a homeland security establishment that can help prevent catastrophic attacks and mobilize national resources for an enduring conflict while protecting our Nation's values and liberties.

Years from today, our world will still be fighting the threat of terrorism. It is my hope that future generations will be able to look back on the Homeland Security Act of 2002—as we now remember the National Security Act of 1947—as the solid organizational foundation for America's triumph in a long and difficult struggle against a formidable enemy.

History has given our Nation new challenges—and important new assignments. Only the United States Congress can create a new department of

Government. We face an urgent need, and I am pleased that Congress has responded to my call to act before the end of the current congressional session with the same bipartisan spirit that allowed us to act expeditiously on legislation after September 11.

These are times that demand bipartisan action and bipartisan solutions to meet the new and changing threats we face as a Nation. I urge the Congress to join me in creating a single, permanent department with an overriding and urgent mission—securing the homeland of America and protecting the American people. Together we can meet this ambitious deadline and help ensure that the American homeland is secure against the terrorist threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, June 18, 2002.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business, and under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a true prescription drug plan that would cover all the seniors in America. Under Medicare, a Democratic prescription drug benefit would be voluntary and universal. Every senior would have access, no matter where they live or what their income.

Soaring prices for prescription drugs are putting medicine out of reach for millions of seniors. Many of them are being forced to choose between paying for prescription drugs or paying for food. No older American should be faced with that decision.

The House Republican prescription drug plan is a sham proposal that provides no real guarantee at all. Let us do the math, Mr. Speaker. Republicans argue that they have a \$2,500 gap in coverage. That gap is bad enough, but the reality is even worse. Here is the math that will compare apples to apples. Under the Republican drug plan, the beneficiary pays as follows: a \$250 deductible, and then a \$150 coinsurance for the first \$1,000 of drugs, and then a \$500 coinsurance for the next \$1,000 of drugs. Add that up and that is \$900 out-of-pocket spending for the first \$2,000 worth of prescription drugs.

But that is not the end of it. You then have to calculate how much additional money a beneficiary must spend out of pocket to get to the \$4,500 out-of-pocket limit that the Republicans have. That is \$3,600. The gap for which the beneficiary is 100 percent on the hook in the Republican Medicare bill is

\$3,600. After a beneficiary obtains \$2,000 worth of drugs, they get no more coverage from the Republican Medicare drug plan until they spend another \$3,600 out of their own pocket. Therefore, before Medicare pays another cent, a beneficiary must obtain \$5,600 worth of prescription drugs for the year.

That is pretty complicated, and that is what the Republicans are counting on, that they will just use some words and you will not be able to do the math. But you have got to understand it. The Republican Medicare proposal has even greater gaping holes than they want to admit. Under their plan the benefit is so limited that it will not be worthwhile for many middle-class seniors to even enroll, it will not cover all seniors, and there is even a bigger problem. The Republican plan forces seniors to shop for and buy a private insurance plan, a plan which virtually every insurance company in America says they will not even offer because it is not worth it, and so seniors will have to go without coverage at all.

We know this model does not work. It did not work in 1965, and that is why we created Medicare to begin with. The insurance companies, as I said, say it will not work either. The Health Insurance Association of America said it will not offer drug-only policies.

The Republican prescription plan does nothing to slow prescription drug prices from continuing their upward spiral, and the Republican plan is simply guaranteed to fail. There they go again, putting words on a bill which has no meaning for the average American today.

Learn how do the math, everybody, because this is going to be a basic debate in America over the next few weeks. We need to pass a meaningful prescription drug plan that uses Medicare to make drugs affordable and provides a universal voluntary benefit for all seniors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last week the hearings began on the new Depart-

ment of Homeland Security. Yesterday my Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing titled "Homeland Security Reorganization: What Impact on Federal Law Enforcement and Drug Interdiction?" Last week in the Committee on Government Reform, our Subcommittees on Civil Service and on National Security held a joint committee hearing, the first ones on homeland security. I wanted to share a few of the things that we have already learned through these hearings as well as in the media the last few days, because we are starting these and we may be actually moving the markup through committee next week. So we are on a fast track.

Many people are reacting, "Aren't you moving awfully fast?" The answer is yes. The biggest problem we face in the government whenever you tackle one of these things is bureaucratic inertia combined with congressional committee inertia, and everybody can find many reasons not to go ahead. Unless we put this on a fast track to get it out of committee by the July break and out of the full House and Senate by the August break, the likelihood is that this government reorganization will die just like they have every other year. In fact, the class of 1994 came in committed to all sorts of reforms of government, and anything we did not achieve that first year was very difficult to achieve as the organization and the inertia kind of takes over. So I strongly support moving ahead.

But it also means that we need to understand certain basic trade-offs we are making and go into this with our eyes wide open. The witnesses yesterday at our hearing were all nongovernmental, which meant that they had the ability to speak out without any restrictions. They included the former Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Kramek; Mr. Donnie Marshall, the former Director of DEA; Mr. Peter Nunez, former Assistant Secretary for Enforcement of the Treasury Department; Mr. Doug Kruhm, former Assistant Commissioner for the U.S. Border Patrol in INS; Mr. Sam Banks, former Acting Commissioner, U.S. Customs; and Dr. Stephen Flynn from the Council on Foreign Relations, who had worked with the Rudman-Hart Commission.

Among the things that they pointed out at the hearing, and I thought Dr. Flynn made a terrific point that many in Congress and many in the media simply do not understand, which has led to much of the confusion about why is this agency not in, why is this agency not in, why is it done this way, and that is if you look at this, and this is the way the Rudman-Hart Commission looked at it and clearly was behind the President's thought, is this really deals with catastrophic security.

It is our basic function of every department to provide for security, and most of those are homeland security. We cannot have one Cabinet agency have everybody in it. So you look at

this as catastrophic. Furthermore, the agencies that have been combined in the Department of Homeland Security are basically the meet-and-greet, in Dr. Flynn's words, basically; in other words, a border agency. So if you called this the Department of Border Catastrophic Security, you would understand why INS is there, why Border Patrol is there, why Customs is there, why the Coast Guard is there, and the logic behind the system that we are about to address. Because if you view it as homeland security, you can have every policeman in, you can have every enforcement division in, you can have every sort of organization in this.

FEMA is also in this. It deals with the catastrophic results. So although it is not border, it also deals with catastrophic security. If we broaden this too much, we will not have any agency that makes any sense. But there are some things that possibly should go in it, and there are some things we need to look at.

□ 1545

Number one, by putting Customs, Coast Guard, Border Patrol and INS in, we have now multitasked a number of these agencies and changed their primary mission to homeland security away from their previous mission.

I would like to insert at this point an article from Newsday newspaper that ran today by Thomas Frank that picks up a couple of the difficulties on multitasking. I wanted to touch on a few of those, and then I have another insertion at the end of my remarks.

[From Newsday, June 18, 2002]

GETTING "LOST IN THE SHUFFLE", CONCERNS ON NONTERROR DUTIES

(By Thomas Frank)

WASHINGTON.—A group of former top federal officials warned yesterday that President George W. Bush's proposed new Department of Homeland Security could weaken other federal law-enforcement activities, such as drug interdiction.

The concerns arise because the new department would take in 22 federal agencies that do every thing from investigating counterfeiting and intercepting drugs to rescuing boaters and providing immigrant benefits.

"A major concern in a reorganization like this is that their nonterrorism duties are going to get lost in the shuffle," Peter Nunez, a former assistant treasury secretary for enforcement, told a congressional panel studying the proposed department. Adm. Robert Kramek, a former Coast Guard commandant, said the new department "will be detrimental" under the Bush administration's plan to give no additional money to the agencies.

"We're talking about moving blocks around on a playing board without increasing the number of blocks," Kramek said. He noted that the proposed homeland security budget of \$37.5 billion would be one-tenth of the \$379-billion Bush has requested for the Defense Department.

With 41,000 employees, the Coast Guard would be the largest agency in the new department, followed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the new Transportation Security Administration, which will employ about 41,000 when it hires security workers at all U.S. commercial airports. Kramek said the Coast Guard is planning