INSTALLATION OF W. CLOYCE ANDERS AS PRESIDENT OF THE INDEPENDENT INSURANCE AGENTS & BROKERS OF AMERICA

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 4, 2002

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a fellow North Carolinian, W. Cloyce Anders of Raleigh, who will be installed as President of the nation's largest insurance association—the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America (IIABA)—later this month in New Orleans. He is president of VFIS of North Carolina and Anders, Ireland & Marshall, Inc., both of Raleigh as well as a managing partner of Independent Agency Services, LLC, of Durham.

His career as an independent insurance agent has been marked with outstanding service and dedication to his clients, community, IIABA, the Independent Insurance Agents of North Carolina (IIANC), and his colleagues across the country.

Cloyce was elected to IIABA's Executive Committee in September 1997 and was honored by his peers when they named him President-Elect last fall in Honolulu.

His service to his peers began with his involvement at the state level with IIANC. He served as IIANC president for a year beginning in 1989 and represented the state on IIABA's National Board of State Directors from 1992–1997. In recognition of his outstanding service, he was honored by IIANC as the Agent of the Year, Young Agent of the Year, Educator of the Year and Committee Chairman of the Year.

Cloyce also is a concerned and highly active member of his community. He has served as president of several community organizations, including the Craven County Chamber of Commerce, New Bern Jaycees, Craven County Committee of 100; and as chairman of the Salvation Army Craven County Board, Craven County March of Dimes, Craven County Heart Fund, Craven County Cancer Drive, Craven County Committee of 100, and Salvation Army Building Fund Drive.

He is a member of the North Carolina Fire & Rescue Commission and is the facilitator for the Wake County Fire Commission. He also is chairman of the North Carolina Safety Workers Compensation Fund.

I am proud of Cloyce's professional and community-service accomplishments and know he will serve his fellow agents with distinction and strong leadership to further the worthy and noble cause of independent insurance agents and brokers. I bid him a successful year as president of the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America.

Mr. Speaker, Cloyce Anders was a good friend of my father, the late Congressman Walter B. Jones, Sr., who served twenty-six years in this body. Cloyce has extended that same friendship, for which I am grateful.

I wish him and his lovely wife, Carole, all the best as IIABA President and First Lady. Congratulations Cloyce and Carole.

HOMELAND SECURITY ACT OF 2002

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 26, 2002

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5005) to establish the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes:

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I do have some concerns about it, but I think it deserves to be passed.

I am united with my colleagues and with the President in a shared determination to win the war against terrorism. We must do everything we can to reduce the risks of further attacks. I believe we must reorganize our government to meet that goal.

What we have chosen to take on in the aftermath of September 11th is an enormous task, the largest reorganization of the government in half a century, a total rethinking of how we approach security. We need to plan for the protection of all domestic people, places, and things. We need to fundamentally restructure our government to be more responsive to terrorism.

This is a tall order. Homeland security has always been an important responsibility of Federal, state and local governments. But in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks, the scope of this responsibility has broadened.

The bill before us has much in common with a report that we received just last year from a commission headed by former Senators Gary Hart of Colorado and Warren Rudman of New Hampshire. The report recommended sweeping changes, including the establishment of a Department of Homeland Security.

I have reviewed the commission's report carefully and discussed it with Senator Hart, and I have been impressed with the soundness of the report's recommendations. I have also cosponsored two bills dealing with this subject.

So I am glad that the President has come to agree that a new Department of Homeland Security is necessary.

The question we face today is whether the bill before us is up to the challenge. Will this bill actually make the American people safer? I'm not entirely certain. I believe this bill generally heads in the night direction, but it still contains a number of troubling provisions.

One concern I have is that in our rush to create this new department, we may be assembling an unwieldy bureaucracy instead of a nimble department that can be quick to respond to the challenges at hand. The proposed department's size, cost and speed may well hamper its ability to fight terrorism. We need to recognize that no department can do everything. Homeland security will be the primary responsibility of the new department, but it will also continue to be the responsibility of other departments, of states and local governments, and of all Americans.

It's also true that many of the agencies that will be subsumed by this new department have multiple functions, some of them having nothing to do with security. That's why I think it's right that the bill abolishes the INS and includes its enforcement bureau in the new DHS, while leaving a bureau of immigration services in the Department of Justice. I also think it's right that the bill moves only the agricultural import and entry inspection functions of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service into the new department, while leaving the rest of the service—including the unit that investigates chronic wasting disease and other possibly contagious diseases—intact. I believe this same model should apply to the Federal Emergency Management Administration, or FEMA, which this bill would move as a whole into the new department. While it may seem that FEMA—as the central agency in charge of disaster response and emergency management—should constitute the heart of the new DHS, FEMA is primarily engaged in and especially effective at responding to natural hazards. This bill should leave FEMA outside the new department, or at a minimum transfer its Office of National Preparedness to the new department, while leaving FEMA's Disaster Response and Recovery and Mitigation Directorates intact. I voted today to leave FEMA outside the new department because I fear FEMA's current mission and focus will be lost in the new bureaucracy we are creating.

I am hopeful that the President will continue to work with the Congress to make sure the agencies moved to the new Department will be supported in their many other important duties even as they focus anew on their security roles.

I have other concerns aside from the organization of the agency.

The bill includes language that denies basic civil service protections for the federal workers who would be transferred to the new department. While I am encouraged by the passage of two amendments that slightly improve the bill's language in these areas, I remain fearful for the 170,000-plus employees of the new DHS whose jobs this bill would put at risk in an attempt to give the President ''flexibility'' to manage in a ''war-time'' situation. That's why I voted for amendments to preserve collective bargaining rights, whistleblower protections, and civil service rules that have protected career employees for over 75 years. I don't believe we should use the creation of a new department as an excuse to take away these protections—protections that Congress enacted so that we could attract the very best to government service. Taking away these protections now signals that we don't value our federal workers, their hard-won rights, or the integral role these workers will continue to play as part of the new department in the fight against terrorism.

I also supported an amendment striking the overly broad exemptions in the bill to the Freedom of Information Act, or FOIA, which was designed to preserve openness and accountability in government. The bill includes a provision excluding information voluntarily submitted to the new department from requests for disclosure; it would also preempt state disclosure laws. FOIA does not require the disclosure of national security information, sensitive law enforcement information, or confidential business information, which makes the exemptions to FOIA in this bill unnecessary in my view.

I think that these parts of the bill will need to be revised, and I will do all I can to improve them.

There is one provision we debated today that I do think should remain in the bill. Last