

\$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