



UNDERFUNDING HOMELAND SECURITY

Since September 11th, Democrats have repeatedly pushed legislation to adequately fund homeland security – only to be met with veto threats by the President and his Budget Director Mitch Daniels. These veto threats come despite a wide array of security experts insisting that United States needs to do far more to protect the homeland. Here are just a few of the most egregious examples of Budget Director Daniels ignoring the call to action:

Priority	OMB Action
<p>First Responders</p>	<p><u>OMB Director Daniels issued a Statement of Administration Policy in January of 2003 which threatened a veto of spending bills that included Democratic legislation providing additional first responder funding</u> than the President requested. This came just after the White House sent a letter to Capitol Hill stating that additional homeland security funding was “unnecessary.” The Democratic legislation was in response to the fact that while Bush and Daniels had promised \$3.5 billion in “new” funding for first responders, their budget requests actually included only \$994 million. <u>In August of 2002, Bush vetoed \$423 million for first responders.</u></p>
<p>Tracking Down Terrorists</p>	<p>“The Immigration and Naturalization Service sought \$52 million to pay for 441 more agents to pursue foreigners who overstay their visas. But <u>the request was turned down by Mitchell E. Daniels Jr.</u>, head of the Office of Management and Budget.” [LA Times, 5/2/02]</p>
<p>Nuclear Security</p>	<p>“Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham said in a March 14 letter to Mitchell E. Daniels Jr., the director of the Office of Management and Budget, that the request, for \$379.7 million in nuclear security funding, was ‘a critical down payment to the safety and security of our nation and its people.’ The money, for guarding nuclear weapons, weapons materials and radioactive waste under the Energy Department’s supervision, was part of a \$27.1 billion emergency spending bill before Congress...‘Failure to support these urgent security requirements is a risk that would be unwise,’ the letter said. The New York Times obtained a copy from someone who favors more spending on nuclear security. <u>But White House Budget Director Mitch Daniels passed on to Congress only \$26.4 million of the request.</u>” [NY Times, 4/23/02]</p>
<p>Infrastructure Security</p>	<p><u>The Bush budget office “has asked Congress for none of the \$150 million the Army Corps of Engineers wanted to bolster security</u> at up to 200 reservoirs, dams and locks across the country...A corps list describing 14 projects “not currently funded for protection and the projected consequences should a terrorist attack occur.” [AP, 4/30/02]</p>
<p>Port Security</p>	<p><u>At the insistence of Daniels, Bush pocket vetoed a \$2.6 billion homeland security package</u> in August of 2002. This included \$39 million for the Customs Container Security Initiative, which the U.S. Customs Commissioner described as being at “the forefront of our government’s effort to secure the Nation from the potential terrorist threat using cargo containers.” Additionally, <u>none of the budget requests written by Daniels have included a single penny for port security grants</u> despite the U.S. Coast Guard reporting \$4.4 billion in port security needs over the next decade.</p>