



Homeland Insecurity: Do We Feel Safe With George W. Bush?



"The American people can be certain that the mission of homeland security will be carried out with focus and resolve, with the resources the task requires."

—President George W. Bush
Swearing in ceremony of Secretary of the
Department of Homeland Security, Tom Ridge,
January 24, 2003.
[White House Website](#)

That's what Bush said. It's NOT what Bush does.

◆ "Twenty one times. . . Bush and congressional Republicans restricted or rejected the resources necessary to make us safer." — Democratic political strategist James Carville, *Had Enough? A Handbook for Fighting Back*

Some examples

- November 2001: "Senate Democrats pressed ahead . . . with . . . a fiscal 2002 spending bill for the Defense Department that includes \$15 billion in extra funding for homeland security and recovery efforts following the attacks of September 11—\$15 billion the White House refuse[d] to endorse." ["Senate gets to slow start on contentious defense bill" [CNN's Inside Politics](#), 12/7/01]
- December 2001: A day after the Senate Appropriations Committee votes 29-0 for a bill that includes \$13.2 billion for homeland security programs, Bush threatens to veto it. ["Had Enough?" by James Carville]
- "Senate Republicans reduce homeland security funding in the Defense Appropriations bill by \$4.6 billion. Under further pressure from the White House, conferees reduce funds by an additional \$200 million. This reduction comes from the areas of airport security, port security, nuclear facility security, and postal security." [*Had Enough?* James Carville]
- June 2002: "The Senate, by a bipartisan vote of 71-22, passé[d] a spending bill that include[d] \$8.3 billion for homeland security. The next day, the president's senior advisers recommend a veto of this '*excessive homeland security spending.*'" [*Had Enough?* by James Carville]
- August 2002: "Bush decides not to spend the \$2.5 billion in emergency funding for homeland security. He casts his decision as one of "fiscal responsibility."" [*Had Enough?* by James Carville]
- April 2003: Senate Republicans defeated South Carolina Democratic Senator Fritz Hollings's \$1 billion proposal to improve port security. [Port security's needed funding, [The Post and Courier](#) 4/7/03]
- Senate Republicans rejected five Democratic proposals worth \$4.8 billion in additional homeland security funding to offset the costs to local and state governments for additional costs for first responders, safeguard nuclear weapons and nuclear material in the U.S. and throughout the world and nuclear detectors at seaports around the world. Republicans rejected the funding. FOX News reported "Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, R-Tenn., said he only supported assistance to the airline industry. . ." ["House, Senate Panels Pass Amended War Budget" [Fox News](#) 4/1/03; "Democrats Want More Homeland Security Spending" [Cybercast News Service](#) 4/2/03]

Congressional Republicans rejected a Democratic proposal to add \$2.5 billion for tightened security at dams, more aid to state and local emergency agencies, and other domestic safety efforts. On a straight party line vote in committee, the 35 Republicans voted against the homeland security funding while the 28 Democrats voted for the additional funding. ["House, Senate Panels Pass Amended War Budget" [Fox News](#) 4/1/03]

June 2003: "[T]he House Appropriations Committee and later on the House floor, Republicans rejected a Democratic amendment to add \$1 billion for homeland defense, paid for by trimming a piece of the recently enacted tax break for 200,000 millionaires from \$88,000 each to \$83,000." ["Unprepared For Terrorists" [Washington Post](#) 7/6/03]

◆ Bush Failing to Fund Homeland Security Leaves Americans Vulnerable.

- "The Council on Foreign Relations (2003) ...estimates that the U.S. will fall approximately \$98.4 billion short of meeting critical emergency responder needs under current Federal, State, and local funding levels. Consequently, it is imperative that the Federal government stretches every dollar for local responders to the greatest extent possible."
—[Forging America's New Normalcy](#)
[The Fifth Annual Report to the President and the Congress By The Advisory Panel to Assess Domestic Response Capabilities for Terrorism Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction 12/15/03]
- "America will fall approximately \$98.4 billion short of meeting critical emergency responder needs over the next five years if current funding levels are maintained. . .Estimated combined federal, state, and local expenditures therefore would need to be as much as tripled over the next five years to address this unmet need. Covering this funding shortfall using federal funds alone would require a fivefold increase from the current level of \$5.4 billion per year to an annual federal expenditure of \$25.1 billion."
[Emergency Responders: Drastically Underfunded, Dangerously Unprepared](#)
[Report of an Independent Task Force Sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations 12/15/03]
- "If you talk to mayors, to governors, to police chiefs, they are just not ready, and we had better get ready."
—former New Hampshire Republican Senator Warren Rudman
["Report: Homeland security grossly underfunded" by [CNN.com](#) 6/30/03]
- "The administration wasn't matching its deeds to its words in the war on terrorism. They're making us less secure, not more secure," said (Rand) Beers, who until now has remained largely silent about leaving his National Security Council job as special assistant to the president for combating terrorism. "As an insider, I saw the things that weren't being done. And the longer I sat and watched, the more concerned I became, until I got up and walked out." [Former Aide Takes Aim at War on Terror [Washington Post](#) 6/13/03]

George W. Bush . . . he's not keeping Americans safe.



The Democratic Party:



Because National Security Matters



Democratic State of the Union Response Center

<http://democrats.senate.gov> - <http://democrats.gov> - <http://HouseDemocrats.gov/>

DEMOCRATS FIGHT FOR SAFER COMMUNITIES

While Republicans hand over billions in no-bid contracts to corporate interests, Democrats are fighting for a strong national security policy that protects the interests and safety of Americans. As Republicans continue to protect the wealthy corporate interests that put them in power, Democrats are putting the safety of American families first with strong steps to protect our homeland security.

Reinforce the front lines of our domestic defense. Currently, state and local budget crises are forcing cities to fire police, firefighters, and emergency medical personnel even as more of them are needed to meet the increased demands of homeland security. Democrats want to strengthen the front lines of domestic defense by helping state and local governments hire more police, firefighters, and EMS professionals, and provide them with the tools and training they need. And Democrats want federal agencies to get information to state and local law enforcement and other officials who are the eyes and ears of our communities.

Train and equip our first responders. The vast majority of the nation's first responders don't have the protective gear, equipment, and training they need to respond to another large-scale terrorist attack, especially if it involves biological or chemical agents. Democrats want to make sure that our police, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians have the tools they need.

Making our Coast Guard stronger. The Coast Guard has been traditionally underfunded and short on personnel. Democrats want to upgrade the Coast Guard's fleet of ships and patrol aircraft in half the time of current plans.

Implementing security plans for ports. Ports are developing plans to provide the security necessary in the post-September 11th world, such as installing cameras, building fences, and posting guards. Due to lack of funding and commitment, many ports are struggling to get these changes in place, leaving them extremely vulnerable. We must fully secure our ports.

Inspecting cargo. Millions of cargo containers enter the U.S. every year. But currently, less than three percent of these containers are ever checked to determine their contents. Democrats want Customs inspectors permanently stationed at high-risk ports abroad and the installation of systems to track every container and ship entering U.S. ports.

Increase border enforcement. Hundreds of miles of our borders are inadequately monitored. Democrats are fighting for a terrorist "watch list," more Border Patrol agents, and State Department officials to stop terrorists from entering America in the first place.

Protect against a bioterrorist attack. Democrats want to ensure that hospitals can accommodate potentially large increases in patients and that they have the tools needed to respond to the effects of a potential attack, as well as to produce the medicines we need to counter potential threats.

Improve domestic nuclear security. Democrats want to conduct a top-to-bottom review of nuclear security concerns. We need to upgrade security at nuclear power plants to assure the highest levels of security and provide new protections against theft of materials that could be used in "dirty bombs."

Improve chemical security. Today there are over 3,000 chemical facilities where a toxic release could threaten more than 10,000 people. An incident at any of over 120 of those facilities could put more than one million people at risk. Democrats want to require chemical facilities to implement security improvement plans.