

\$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

next year to scale back functions not related to domestic security, such as drug and migrant interdiction, maritime safety and fisheries enforcement.

"We're going to have to put some money where our intention is to make sure this is done right," Kramek said, echoing members of Congress who have called for additional funding for the agencies that would be moved into the new department. White House officials have said more money could be added after Congress adopts an initial 2003 budget for the new department.

The hearing yesterday marked the beginning of an intense period of deliberations as Congress tries to create the new department either by the year-end goal set by Bush, or by Sept. 11, as proposed by House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.).

The hearing's topic—how the new department would affect federal law enforcement—is one of many questions Congress will debate as it decides what agencies should be included and under what conditions.

"There will be a profound impact on federal law-enforcement agencies unrelated to terrorism," said Rep. Mark Souder (R-Ind.), chairman of the House criminal justice subcommittee. Congress must "determine how best to ensure the continuation and preservation of these missions in the new department," he added.

Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-Md.) pressed witnesses on whether a heightened government focus on fighting terrorism would signal a lessened emphasis on anti-drug efforts that might embolden local drug dealers who intimidate neighborhoods. "We're fighting terror every day," Cummings said of his inner-city Baltimore neighborhood.

Donnie Marshall, a former Drug Enforcement Administration chief, said authorities need to continue fighting dealers and recognize that terrorists will increasingly look to illegal activities such as drug dealing to finance their operations.

One clear example is the Coast Guard. How does the Coast Guard make a trade-off when their primary mission before had been search and rescue? A sailboat tips over. They are now down watching, say, a midlevel warning, we do not have a hard warning, whether we are going to get attacked on a chemical plant on the water, and for practical purposes these warnings could be any water anywhere in the United States.

But let us say we have a boat that is watching along the Ontario side north of Detroit. A sailboat tips over in Huron, there is only one boat there, where do they go? Do they go for the possibility that somebody may be drowning, versus protecting from a catastrophic terrorism question? If we do not put adequate resources in this Department, this will be the daily trade-off, because we are going from a mission of 2 percent on catastrophic terrorism of the Coast Guard to it now being their primary concern.

What does this mean for drug interdiction, because the primary intercepts in the Caribbean and the Eastern Pacific, the western side of Mexico have been the Coast Guard, but the boats cannot simultaneously be off California and down off Mexico.

Furthermore, what does it mean for fisheries in Alaska? When the salmon circulate through, if you see these 3-mile-long nets and things coming out

of Japan or Russians and other groups that are trying to pirate the salmon in the oceans, if we do not have Coast Guard there to protect that, they could capture the salmon, and there will not be any spawning the next year.

Clearly if you have a boat out in the middle of the Pacific Ocean protecting the salmon runs and the salmon's circular patterns, that boat is not off of Washington State.

So there are many trade-offs, and over the next couple days I would like to talk about those. I include my opening statement from June 17 for the RECORD.

Today's hearing is the first we have held since President Bush announced his proposal to create a new cabinet Department of Homeland Security. In that respect, we will be breaking new ground as we begin to consider how best to implement such an ambitious and important reform proposal prior to considering it in the full Government Reform Committee in the coming weeks.

This is not, however, the first time we have considered the important issues of federal law enforcement organization, drug interdiction, border security, or their interrelationship with the increased demands of homeland security. We have held six field hearings on border enforcement along the northern and southern borders of the United States, I have personally visited several other ports of entry, and we have had two Washington hearings on the implications of homeland security requirements on other federal law enforcement activities. This is in addition to our ongoing oversight of America's drug interdiction efforts.

Our work as a Subcommittee has made very clear that the U.S. Customs Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the U.S. Coast Guard, which are among the most prominent agencies in the proposed reorganization, have critical missions unrelated to terrorism which cannot be allowed to wane and must be fully maintained. The House has to carefully consider the interrelationship of these law enforcement missions with the demands of homeland security.

The Administration has defined the mission of the proposed new Department solely as one of preventing and responding to acts of terrorism. The concept of "homeland security" has to be defined more broadly to include the many other diverse threats to our nation which are handled on a daily basis by these agencies, as well as other law enforcement activities. It is clear that there is simply too much else at stake for our nation to define the issues solely as ones of terrorism.

Let me illustrate my point with a brief but very clear example of the risks which could be posed when resources are allocated single-mindedly. This map illustrates the deployment of Coast Guard assets prior to the September 11th attacks. They are balanced and allocated to a number of important missions, such as drug interdiction, illegal migrant interdiction, and fisheries enforcement. I believe it is apparent here that a vigorous forward American presence had been maintained in the Caribbean and Eastern Pacific for counterdrug missions and law enforcement.

A second map shows how the resources were temporarily (and correctly I should emphasize) deployed after the attacks to respond to the terrorist attacks. It is evident here that the enhancement of immediate homeland security had to come at the price of the customary missions of the Coast Guard. The chart also shows the redeployment of our assets from the front lines to a

"goal-line" defense centered on the east and west coasts of the United States itself. In the critical transit zone of the Eastern Pacific, for example, the deployment went from four cutters and two aircraft to a lone cutter.

This is not a criticism of the tremendous response by the Coast Guard or, by extension, any other agency. Most would agree that the approach taken was wholly appropriate over all the short term, and redeployments have subsequently moved the picture much closer to an equilibrium today. However, I believe that these charts are a clear illustration that an intensive focus on homeland security cannot be maintained over the long run without coming at the expense of other tasks. This lesson is equally applicable to every other mission of every other agency that will potentially be affected by the reorganization plan.

However this reform emerges, it is inevitable that there will be a profound impact on federal law enforcement activities unrelated to terrorism, on our nation's drug interdiction and border control efforts, and on operations at several federal departments within the Subcommittee's jurisdiction. Our challenge as we move through this process will be to determine how best to ensure the continuation and preservation of these missions within the new Department. We also must optimize the organization of other agencies, such as the DEA, the FBI, and law enforcement in the Treasury Department, which share tasks with agencies destined for the new department. And finally, we must consider the many incidental benefits and synergies which will arise from the President's proposal. These include increased operational coordination of narcotics and migrant interdiction efforts among agencies that will now be united, as well as a significantly improved focus on the links between the drug trade and international terrorism.

REFORMING THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, my goal in Congress is to assure that the Federal Government is a better partner to State and local communities, especially in developing infrastructure.

Through its construction of water projects, the Army Corps of Engineers has been a major player in this career throughout our Nation's history. Recently some have questioned the Corps' planning and construction process and its ability to economically and environmentally justify its projects.

I have joined with other Members of Congress in calling for reform and modernization of the Corps of Engineers, including updating the principles and guidelines by which it operates, addressing and prioritizing the Corps' enormous project backlog, and developing a system of independent review.

Perhaps most important, I think we need to examine the role that Congress itself plays in pushing through poorly conceived water resources projects.

Last week, the General Accounting Office issued a document which illustrates why Corps reform is urgently needed, especially a new process for independent review of Corps projects.