

1 PROF. BENGT SUNDELIUS: I have the honor to introduce  
2 the moderator of the morning discussion. Mr. Goran  
3 Lennmarker, who I've known for many years, a very  
4 seasoned member of Parliament, a leading member, ranking  
5 member of our governing party, and he's been chairman of  
6 many parliamentary committees: The constitutional  
7 committee, the European Union committee, and now  
8 chairing the foreign affairs committee. You also shared  
9 some time on the board of the Swedish Institute of  
10 National Affairs. Tomas Reiss (SP?) Was here the other  
11 day and gave a presentation, and we both were involved  
12 fortunately in hiring him on and seeing him prosper and  
13 seeing the Institute prosper, thanks to the generosity  
14 and support of one important parliamentarian in Sweden,  
15 Goran Lennmarker. Please.

16 MR. GORAN LENNMARKER: Thank you and good morning to  
17 everybody. Now we should focus on the parliamentary  
18 perspective, and that is a rather important perspective,  
19 I would say, because don't forget that Parliament  
20 decides on laws. Law making is the core of  
21 parliamentary activity. We decide on budgets, the  
22 resources and how that should also be divided. We also  
23 decide on the organizational structures, how things are  
24 organized in public life, not only in public life,  
25 sometimes also other aspects of it. Parliaments also

1 have a rather important role of scrutiny. Scrutinizing  
2 power is important in western democracies because power  
3 must be controlled, and that is up to parliaments, to  
4 scrutinize government and administrations. But also,  
5 and not least, also parliamentarians have a role as  
6 giving ideas, input to this process. So I just want to  
7 say that initially that's a very important role of us  
8 parliamentarians. That's why it's so important also to  
9 add the parliamentary perspective to this. Could I  
10 first say then that Gunnar Hokmark, member of European  
11 parliament, is not here. He had a tragedy in his  
12 family. His wife passed away very recently, so that's  
13 why he excused. He couldn't come obviously today. So  
14 we don't have the European parliament perspective, but I  
15 thought I've been rather active in European parliament  
16 affairs so perhaps I can also fill in to that without  
17 being in the European parliament. We are particularly  
18 proud and happy today to have a former speaker of the  
19 House of Representatives in the United States, Dennis  
20 Hastert here. The speaker of the House of  
21 Representatives is the third most formally important in  
22 the United States. You have a president, you have a  
23 vice president and then comes speaker of the house. And  
24 Dennis Hastert was speaker from -- I have to look here  
25 now so I say correctly -- eight -- four Congressional  
2

1 periods if I understand, eight years. And Speaker  
2 Hastert comes from Illinois, great state of the United  
3 States, including Chicago which is perhaps the best  
4 known small town there on the prairie. But his district  
5 is to the west of Chicago but including, as I just  
6 learned, some of the suburbs of Chicago. And you  
7 realize that he was speaker during these years. He also  
8 was speaker at the very moment 9/11/2001 which of course  
9 will give a particular perspective to your term as  
10 speaker. So I will start with you, Mr. Hastert. You  
11 have the floor please.

12 SPEAKER DENNIS HASTERT: Thank you very much and good  
13 morning. First of all, two things I would like to talk  
14 about. First of all, just a little bit about the  
15 Congress as opposed to most European parliaments, and  
16 then also why and the importance and what developed to  
17 create our Department of Homeland Security.  
18 The Congress is somewhat unique by our constitution. We  
19 are separate from the government. In most parliamentary  
20 units in Europe the government evolves out of the  
21 parliament, who gets the majority and becomes the ruling  
22 party and then the ruling party develops its leadership  
23 and its ministers and then follows through that process.  
24 In the United States the Congress is completely separate  
25 from the executive office. And so the Congress itself

1 has some very important functions. First of all, it has  
2 the functions of passing any law. You pass the law and  
3 put the laws together completely independent from the  
4 executive branch. The executive branch ultimately, if  
5 the laws are passed, the president has to sign a bill.  
6 He can also veto a bill. So there is some cooperation  
7 during the process, but the president makes the decision  
8 at the end whether he's going to sign this bill or not.  
9 He really has little input while that process is being  
10 put together.

11 The second part of this is not only does the Congress  
12 have separate committees -- and it has almost 20  
13 different types of committees -- it takes part in  
14 various different aspects of the government, but it also  
15 controls the appropriations process. There are 13  
16 separate appropriation committees and subcommittees and  
17 parts of the major appropriation committee, and each one  
18 of those subcommittees has an area of government. They  
19 not only fund that area, so the money that funds the  
20 Department of Defense or funds the Department of  
21 Education or the Department of Health comes from a  
22 appropriation committee. And that process of course has  
23 scrutiny and oversight in itself before they put  
24 together their budget and alot monies over several  
25 different areas, and all these governmental agencies are

1 really in a sense competing for a set number of dollars.  
2 So there's a give and take between the administration  
3 and the actual activity of the administration and the  
4 activity of the Congress. But it's in a sense kind of  
5 an adversarial. We need this, but you have to still  
6 apportion this money over a number of bodies.

7 So with that setting you find that there's a separation,  
8 a large separation, between the administration and the  
9 Congress itself. The speaker has a great deal of power  
10 because, first of all, he has the power of the purse.

11 In the House of Representatives all the appropriation  
12 bills begin in the House of Representatives, and so you  
13 control the flow of legislation. You also control who  
14 are the committee chairmen, so you have some control  
15 over how that money is spent. The second part of it,  
16 you control the flow of legislation. So any ideas that  
17 come out that end up being a bill goes through and that  
18 flow of legislation is controlled by the majority  
19 party and usually the speaker. So it's a unique  
20 situation, gives a person who is a speaker a lot of  
21 responsibility.

22 So let's go back to September 11 in the year 2001. I  
23 was speaker of the house, had been speaker for  
24 approximately three years, and I remember that morning.  
25 It was a bright September morning, not too different

1 from this morning, a little bit of chill in the air.  
2 Blue sky, beautiful puffy clouds. Came to work early,  
3 about 7:00 in the morning. Had an appointment, and then  
4 at about 8:30 I heard a knock on the door and said,  
5 Mr. Speaker, something happened in New York. We think a  
6 small plane or a helicopter went into one of the World  
7 Trade towers. And we have quite a spectacle on TV. So  
8 I said, I'll be there in just a minute. Walked in just  
9 in time to see the second plane fly into the World Trade  
10 tower. I knew at that point that it wasn't an accident,  
11 that something was amiss, that there was terrorism  
12 there. We didn't know who or why or what. But I tried  
13 to get ahold of the vice-president. The president was  
14 out of Washington. He was in Florida at that time  
15 speaking to a group of children at a school. And we had  
16 miscommunication back and forth back and forth between  
17 my office and the White House. The vice-president was  
18 in the White House with the Secretary of Transportation  
19 trying to get airplanes out of the sky and onto the  
20 ground. And all of a sudden I looked out my window and  
21 looked down this mall -- I always said I had the second  
22 best view in Washington -- and saw this smoke rolling  
23 across the mall. Now, there's no manufacturing, there's  
24 no industry in Washington and very little smoke.  
25 Sometimes. But, anyway -- that's an inside joke,

1 Americans understand that -- but anyway I ask the fellow  
2 keeping my door, I said something happened. Where is  
3 that smoke coming from? And of course the third report  
4 came in that the airplane flew into the Pentagon. So I  
5 called the temporary speaker pro tem and said, we're  
6 going to close down Congress. Because we're supposed to  
7 have the prime minister of Australia give a joint  
8 session, so I called the temporary speaker pro tem and  
9 said, we're going to close down Congress because we were  
10 supposed to have the prime minister of Australia give a  
11 joint session speech to Congress that morning. When you  
12 have a joint session of Congress you have the House, you  
13 have the Senate, you have the administration, you have  
14 all the secretaries of the various agencies of the  
15 government, you have the Supreme Court and the Joint  
16 Chiefs of Staff all in one room. So I said, probably  
17 not a good idea to do that this morning. So  
18 unilaterally I decided to close down that Congress that  
19 morning. And we did. And I went to the House floor,  
20 and I remember, to give the signal to bring down the  
21 gavel to close down the House, and instantly I had two  
22 security guys rushing me out and ended up in an Air  
23 Force base, then ended up in an undisclosed location  
24 outside of Washington. And I remember flying over  
25 Washington in a helicopter and looking down and seeing

1 Reagan National Airport just completely closed down,  
2 nothing moving on the tarmac. Looked across at the  
3 Pentagon building, and the Pentagon is just a huge  
4 building. We're flying right over the top and there's  
5 black-blue smoke and fire belching out of that building  
6 and (Check tape.) The whole suburbs of northern Virginia  
7 just covered in in blue black cloud and I'm thinking to  
8 myself -- I was a teacher of history before I got into  
9 the business of government and teaching about the  
10 British invasion of Washington in 1812 -- and thinking,  
11 here I am Speaker of the House, and this terrible thing  
12 has happened to our country. To make a long story  
13 short, I came back along with the other leadership of  
14 Congress that day, and we gave a short press statement  
15 and said that we would be back in Congress the next day.  
16 And the problems that we faced were things like we  
17 couldn't -- airplanes couldn't fly. Not only would  
18 there be the danger of not knowing what would happen if  
19 who would be on those airplanes, but we also had the  
20 danger that airplanes had no indemnity for terrorism.  
21 So until that was taken care of, those airplanes could  
22 be covered in insurance, they wouldn't fly. The markets  
23 were closed. The New York Stock Exchange was shut down.  
24 We had redundancy in communication, but still just the  
25 danger of trying to get into Manhattan and the

1 disruption closed down the markets. You can imagine,  
2 Sweden or Great Britain or Germany or the United States  
3 without any commerce happening. So that had to happen.  
4 We couldn't rebuild anything because the construction  
5 companies again had to have indemnity in case they were  
6 held harmless in case of another terrorist attack. So  
7 we had all these problems facing us and how do we  
8 address this. And for day after day, night after night  
9 in my office we literally put out legislation. We put  
10 out legislation we probably could have never passed  
11 except for a situation like 9/11. And we said to  
12 ourselves, and I think there was a common pledge among  
13 the members of Congress and with the administration,  
14 that we wouldn't let this happen in the United States  
15 again. And so we took some extraordinary measures.  
16 Some of them was the Patriot Act, which probably could  
17 never pass except with the situation of what happened on  
18 9/11, but we also then put in place indemnity  
19 legislation for airlines, for construction. But we had  
20 a very difficult time because there are so many  
21 different agencies that we had to bring together to make  
22 these things work. So we decided we needed to revamp  
23 government and what we needed to do is to bring these  
24 agencies under one type of cooperative effort, under one  
25 umbrella. And it was a very difficult thing to do

1 because in American government, I suspect other  
2 government, once you have an agency or a ministry  
3 there's kind of a protection of territory. We call it  
4 "turf wars" in the United States. And nobody really  
5 wants to share that information. Nobody wants to be  
6 encapsulated into another agency. So we had this kind  
7 of natural resistance among the different governmental  
8 agencies, and also in Congress itself. We have probably  
9 20-some different committees that have jurisdictions and  
10 they have expertise, they have traditional control and,  
11 for instance, the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard was part  
12 of the Department of Transportation. It wasn't part of  
13 the military, still is separate from the military. But  
14 it also had an issue over fishing rights, so if you were  
15 a congressman from Alaska that had a very large interest  
16 in fishing and you were on the transportation committee,  
17 you didn't want to see the jurisdiction of the Coast  
18 Guard move away from you into another entity. So  
19 there's this protectionism even in the Congress. And  
20 the second part of that is the appropriation process.  
21 The appropriation process, there was a turf and a  
22 situation where you didn't want any other committee  
23 taking the jurisdiction away from you or your expertise  
24 to go into a larger committee. So we had this huge  
25 fight. As a matter of fact when we finally did put all

1 the homeland security and created the Department of  
2 Homeland Security and put it under one umbrella, I had  
3 to take -- it was just a practical thing. I had to take  
4 probably ten different chairmen from different  
5 committees and put them on the Homeland Security  
6 committee on an ex officio basis just so that they could  
7 say that they didn't lose everything. And eventually  
8 you kind of peel them off the committee, and that was a  
9 process that took a number of years. It didn't happen  
10 overnight. And then the appropriation process, you had  
11 to find one person to take care of the appropriations  
12 and where maybe six or seven or maybe all 13  
13 appropriation committees were involved. But to do this,  
14 to make sure that you had one entity that was  
15 responsible under one umbrella to get these huge issues  
16 done -- communication, transportation, just the  
17 security. And you'll find that in the United States  
18 there's different attitudes I think maybe than you'll  
19 find in some European countries and even here in Sweden.  
20 For instance, in the United States it would be very  
21 difficult enforcing every citizen to carry an ID card  
22 with a picture and identification number. Just  
23 resistant to do that because they felt this impinges on  
24 their individual rights. So to get that type of thing  
25 so you know who is moving where, who's coming across the

1 borders and to be able to check and see if somebody is a  
2 citizen or outside -- and of course we have a very  
3 unhomogeneous population so you can't by looking at  
4 somebody -- you certainly can't tell that they're an  
5 American citizen or non-American citizen. On the other  
6 hand, we have no compunction at all and very free in  
7 putting cameras. Cameras outside -- one of the  
8 jurisdictions I had before I became speaker was to  
9 defend or to make sure that our embassies around the  
10 world were safe. We put cameras and surveillance. Our  
11 streets are surveilled in the inner cities. We have  
12 cameras to make sure that people are safe walking down  
13 sidewalks, and it's all monitored by police agencies.  
14 You probably couldn't do that very well here in Sweden  
15 or in other European nations because of the feeling of  
16 integrity of citizens. So there's different attitudes  
17 that certainly separate the United States and other,  
18 say, European communities. But overall there's a huge  
19 need. There's a huge need for cooperation so that  
20 agencies from different nations can work together, share  
21 information. It's a difficult thing to get entities to  
22 share information. For instance to get the Coast Guard  
23 to share -- that has one basis of control, and the Navy  
24 that has another basis of control. To get them to share  
25 information, it's just kind of a -- well, we don't trust  
12

1 this agency to take our information or we're not going  
2 to give that information away. One of the problems that  
3 we had prior to 9/11 and one of I think one of the  
4 causes of 9/11 is we had the CIA stovepiped away from  
5 the FBI, and they didn't share information. Those types  
6 of agencies need to share information. There's  
7 information that the CIA could have that the FBI had  
8 that would actually have changed our surveillance and  
9 how we control our borders. So these are things that  
10 you have to take into consideration. Certainly  
11 differences in parliaments, what happens in the United  
12 States and what happens in Europe, but these things all  
13 have to be taken into consideration. And I think the  
14 trend towards real security is not only cooperating on  
15 the public sectors and internationally on the public  
16 sectors, but we also have to cooperate on the private  
17 sectors as well because there's a lot of intelligence  
18 out there in the private sector that certainly can be  
19 compatible and work with complementing the intelligence  
20 that we have in the public sector. So thank you very  
21 much. I look forward to carrying on the discussion, and  
22 I hope you got some insight on what we had to do on  
23 protecting the country. And then we had issues that we  
24 talked about yesterday, things like anthrax. We had the  
25 anthrax scare. So how did you effect that? We had the

1 bird flu scare that actually came together and how did  
2 you start to put together the resources to make sure  
3 that that was not a real problem? Sometimes these types  
4 of things you have to work way in the future, but they  
5 are future problems that a government or a parliament  
6 has to look at and start to prepare for. So I look  
7 forward to our discussion. Thank you very much and  
8 thanks for having me here.

9 MR. GORAN LENNMARKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think  
10 it was very interesting to hear about your reactions in  
11 your very important position to have had this very  
12 important day. I won't tell you about where I was at  
13 that day, but we move on.

14 Lanier Avant is a staff director of the Committee on  
15 Homeland Security. He's from Mississippi, another great  
16 state of the United States. And he's actually was in  
17 that position, of course had a very important oversight  
18 role when this comes to scrutinizing the homeland  
19 security in its various aspects. You have the floor,  
20 sir.

21 MR. LANIER AVANT: Good morning. I want to just let you  
22 know, Speaker Hastert, that, you know, I never thought  
23 I'd follow you as a speaker, but I'll take my  
24 opportunity today. Speaker Hastert mentioned about 9/11  
25 and his perspective on it. If I could just reflect back

1 for just a moment to 9/11, I was a junior level staffer  
2 that day. I was working for Congressman Thompson, who  
3 was also chair of the Homeland Security Committee at the  
4 time. Well, he's chair now, but I was working for him  
5 in his personal office at the time. And one of the  
6 things that really stood out, first of all, I didn't  
7 have a 7:00 meeting that morning so I was strolling into  
8 the office about 8:30 or so. But I recall that after  
9 people realized that we needed some kind of a response,  
10 that this wasn't going to be a normal day, even though  
11 we didn't have particulars of what was going on in New  
12 York City or at the Pentagon, you know, people just  
13 started to disperse. And some members of our leadership  
14 in the Congress have certain places to go, but by and  
15 large for the thousands of staff members and for the  
16 hundreds of just rank and file members of Congress,  
17 there was no plan in place, to be quite honest. So at  
18 about 9:00 or 9:30 that morning there were people just  
19 in the streets making themselves, in my estimation, more  
20 vulnerable and being more of a target. So by about  
21 10:30 Congressman Thompson and I and a few other  
22 staffers found ourselves hanging out at the Democratic  
23 Club on the hill. But the place was full. But one of  
24 the lessons I think that we learned from that was that  
25 we really do have to have a contingency plan and we have  
15

1 to work on that plan constantly to make sure it's  
2 updated, to make sure it's effective, to make sure that  
3 it's tested so that when an event happens we're  
4 prepared. And unlike the thinking September 10 and  
5 before, it's not "if" something happens, it's just a  
6 matter of time. That's the kind of thinking that we try  
7 to take into the position. And so I'd encourage all of  
8 you to take that message back home in terms of  
9 preparation.

10 Speaker Hastert also mentioned, touched on the issue of  
11 jurisdiction in the Congress. Chairman Thompson was  
12 appointed to the Homeland Security Committee when it was  
13 initially stood up in 2003, and served on it ever since.  
14 And in the time that he's been chairman of the committee  
15 and also when he was ranking member just before he  
16 became chair, one of the big battles we fought on a  
17 daily basis and really we continue to fight is a  
18 jurisdictional battle, just a battle within Congress for  
19 power, a battle for control over who has the biggest  
20 say-so on an issue, essentially what it boils down to.  
21 And we exert a lot of staff resources, and the member  
22 exerts a lot of his own energy too, in order to  
23 consolidate that jurisdiction, to streamline it in a way  
24 that doesn't create so many problems. In the U.S. what  
25 we find is that certainly we have a very complex

1 Congress. But that complexity is sort of a double-edged  
2 sword. On the one hand it lends itself to the kind of  
3 stability that is hard to find around the world. You  
4 know, there's not a single event or a single string of  
5 events in many cases that could really disrupt the flow  
6 of Congress because it's just such a complex  
7 organization and our federal government is such a  
8 complex organization as well. But the other side of  
9 that sword is that that complexity can really lend  
10 itself to a sort of complacency. And so when Congress  
11 needs to act, many times there's just an enormous  
12 inertia, and so we spend a lot of time trying to reduce  
13 that or minimize that inertia. What we've found is that  
14 sometimes catastrophic events give us the momentum that  
15 we need. But that's just sort of learning by  
16 experience. So we would say to our friends across the  
17 Atlantic that you shouldn't have to wait on some  
18 9/11-like event in order to sort of get your internal  
19 house in order. We would encourage you to, you know, be  
20 in a constant state of readiness, be in a constant state  
21 of preparedness, examining your current systems, making  
22 sure that you're using technology, for example, in the  
23 best way possible to achieve whatever desired outcomes  
24 you have, making sure that the parliaments are working  
25 with the executive branches of your government in a way  
17

1 that is not necessarily adversarial, but certainly in a  
2 way that challenges them to be the best they can be. In  
3 the U.S. we see that as the role of the Congress. To  
4 really challenge our administration, to make sure that  
5 they're doing the best job they can. But the other side  
6 of that is that we're also challenged with making sure  
7 they have the resources to do the job. So as the  
8 Speaker mentioned, we have power of the purse so to  
9 speak, and Congress takes that role seriously. When it  
10 comes to commercializing products, the Congress can  
11 really be a leading indicator and really push the  
12 inventory on that issue. In the ways that we draft some  
13 of our laws and which issues we choose to highlight and  
14 bring attention to, we know many times that the private  
15 sector responds to what it is that we put in statute.  
16 With that being said, we always have this constant  
17 balancing act that we have to perform, and that's the  
18 balance in terms of homeland security, the balance  
19 between commerce and security. And that's an important  
20 balance to maintain. One of the best examples I can  
21 share with you is a little over two years ago when  
22 Congress passed and the President signed the 9/11 bill,  
23 one of the provisions we put in the bill required that  
24 100 percent of our cargo inbound for the U.S. be  
25 screened at a foreign port of entry. Well, that sounded  
18

1 real good. And I sat in a lot of meetings where we  
2 talked about that. We met with a lot of stakeholders on  
3 that issue. And at the end of the day we thought it  
4 would be a good policy position to take. Speaker Pelosi  
5 supported us in that so we were able to get that passed  
6 and the President signed it.

7 Well, in hindsight it would have been much better if we  
8 had talked to folks about it. Even though we had a lot  
9 of stakeholder meetings, there were some of our  
10 international partners that we probably could have  
11 engaged and should have engaged a lot more than we did.  
12 Certainly we respect the sovereignty of other nations,  
13 and so you just can't be so heavy handed with folk.

14 Now, that being said, we've still got a security  
15 interest that we're trying to maintain at home. Just  
16 like 9/11, if some WMD for example were to somehow show  
17 up at a U.S. port, you know, the public would overnight  
18 just demand that we shut every port down in the country,  
19 and that would really bring worldwide commerce to a  
20 halt. And that's the situation that we want to avoid as  
21 best we can. So how do we do that? We're trying to  
22 maintain the balance by passing laws that take into  
23 account the need for the flow of commerce but also  
24 protect our citizens. And so that's sort of a constant  
25 concern that we have. We also deal with the balancing  
19

1 act between homeland security and individual rights,  
2 privacy and civil liberties. Many times they come into  
3 conflict simply because a lot of people will put the  
4 individual interest above what's in the best interest of  
5 the greater public or the larger public. And that's not  
6 to say that it's right or wrong, but it's just to say  
7 it's a different approach and an approach that obviously  
8 we take into consideration whenever we're drafting laws  
9 that will affect the American people. And each day we  
10 try more and more not to draft those laws in the absence  
11 of thinking about how our neighbors around the world  
12 will be impacted by them. So that's a lesson I think  
13 that we're still really learning. But in terms of what  
14 motivates the Congress to pass certain laws, I would  
15 just offer than one of the lessons you all can learn  
16 from the U.S. Congress is, again, not to allow some bad  
17 experience to serve as your catalyst for creating change  
18 within your own governments. That's we think a very  
19 important lesson, and we just have to learn the hard  
20 way, but as you go forward just take our word for it  
21 that it's worth it if you do your own self-evaluation  
22 and just stay in a constant state of readiness and  
23 preparedness.

24 MR. GORAN LENNMARKER: Thank you for this. I think it's  
25 important for all of us to learn from experience. I

1 have a piece of experience that I think is important  
2 from a Swedish or European general perspective as well.  
3 There was a tsunami in the Indian Ocean Christmas 2004,  
4 and it affected Sweden very much. 543 were killed in  
5 that tsunami. Most of the outside -- from outside  
6 countries, tourists. Of course there were hundreds of  
7 thousands that were affected in Indonesia and (Check  
8 tape.) And we went through this very, very thoroughly.  
9 We were helped by another commission that looked on the  
10 broader picture because our task was to scrutinize the  
11 cabinet and the ministers' action there. I will go  
12 through that, but one reflection that I think is very  
13 important. That was to see how we organized society,  
14 particularly the public part of society. We wish to  
15 make an efficient public administration. We want to  
16 decentralize, to give specific responsibilities to even  
17 smaller units in that sense make a rather efficient  
18 day-to-day administration. We want to have  
19 responsibility not only on the top but to spread it out.  
20 And that's good. Perhaps 99 percent of the time. Then  
21 something happens, and then you need to have resources  
22 and not to take decisions between days and weeks. That  
23 is usually the democratic society. We have meetings and  
24 you have a week in advance and you have an agenda and  
25 all that. You have to take decisions within hours,  
21

1 perhaps even minutes. And how do we do that? Because  
2 when we scrutinized the cabinet and the government at  
3 large and their response to the tsunami, we found that  
4 it was too late in many respects. Critical resources  
5 were never used or used far too late. And the  
6 difficulty was how do you get access to resources within  
7 a few hours when those responsible for those resources  
8 are not there? Because what is it? Three quarters of  
9 the time is not office hours. We don't work around the  
10 clock. We have holidays. We have vacations, et cetera.  
11 And people are away also during office hours. If I take  
12 Sweden, for example, a lot of people are away. Some are  
13 in Brussels. That's the ordinary workday. And suddenly  
14 you should grab the resources belonging to someone  
15 without the knowledge of the one who is responsible for  
16 it. That is one of the things that struck me. How do  
17 we organize this? That we can go into a direct -- let  
18 us take a director general with her or his budget, and  
19 they are careful, I can tell you, jealously guarding  
20 that budget, and they know what can go into that because  
21 you plan for at least a budget year. And suddenly you  
22 need to take resources that are needed without the  
23 consent of the responsible. That is a thing that I  
24 think we have to go through. I found during the tsunami  
25 that perhaps the budget issue, money, was the real

1 problem that made it difficult to take the sound  
2 decisions that Sunday morning. It was a Sunday morning,  
3 Boxing Day, Annandag Jul in Swedish, and of course a day  
4 when everyone was away on vacation and family life as it  
5 should be. And this is one of the crucial things we  
6 have to do. This is not only between agencies. You  
7 described, Mr. Speaker, about the Coast Guard and the  
8 Navy. And there are of course many such examples. It's  
9 also about that we have different layers of government.  
10 Inside Sweden, for example, or inside Europe now we have  
11 27 members of the European Union, and how should we then  
12 divide responsibilities? And the difficult thing is  
13 that there is no standard solution because a catastrophe  
14 can be a big one involving a huge part of government; it  
15 could be rather smaller affecting just a few. So we  
16 don't have a standard recipe for this. And this is I  
17 think one of the most difficult things for us to go  
18 through. How to divide responsibilities and how to see  
19 to it that we can grab the resources that are there  
20 early on? Now we are in the process in the European  
21 Union, we have 27 countries, 5 hundred million people,  
22 and this is a very special day, the 2nd of October 2009,  
23 because there is a referendum in Ireland which will  
24 decide whether we have a new treaty, a Lisbon Treaty. I  
25 have myself the privilege of being part of writing that  
23

1 treaty in the convention of the future of Europe. And  
2 if that treaty is in place, which will probably be by  
3 the first of January next year, the Union will have some  
4 more possibilities to make decisions and take more  
5 responsibility when it comes to crisis management. That  
6 is of course particularly difficult because, unlike the  
7 United States, where you have in a way you said you have  
8 a rather -- your population is very diverse. On the  
9 other hand your legal system is rather similar. In  
10 Europe we have rather different administrative  
11 traditions. Even very different administrative  
12 traditions. And we need them to find mechanisms to  
13 harmonize these aspects without necessarily making our  
14 countries similar. We are proud that we are rather  
15 different and we have no ID and no intention to sort of  
16 streamline Europe. But in some aspects we need it  
17 because that was another of the reflections after the  
18 tsunamis, that you had Swedish activity there of course  
19 because there were a lot of Swedes there, there were  
20 Italians, there were Germans, there were other European  
21 countries, and at that moment it was a tendency that we  
22 only looked after our own instead of saying that we are  
23 in this together. Why should we, coming from the other  
24 side of the globe, from Europe, not work together? The  
25 Italians were perhaps the best at least in some aspects  
24

1 reacting to this, and I think now it's time for us to  
2 learn from each other, see how we have to do this  
3 together. Why should we confine that to Europe? We  
4 have also over the Atlantic the possibility to sometimes  
5 help and support each other and to learn from each  
6 other. One of the things that we in Europe can  
7 certainly learn from the United States is this how you  
8 work together in different layers of government. I was  
9 chair of the defense commission for (unintelligible)  
10 visiting the Los Angeles area. We had I think it was 85  
11 different municipalities and three or four counties and  
12 then the state government, State of California there,  
13 and then of course a federal level as well. And they  
14 had a lot of what I say catastrophes of various sorts.  
15 Natural things, fires for example, affecting sometimes  
16 13 municipalities and two counties, and another time it  
17 was 38 municipalities and three counties, all with  
18 different configurations. But they had developed a  
19 technique so they could use resources that were  
20 appropriate from the type of event that you had to  
21 count. And I think we must learn from that because it  
22 seemed to be a rather smart way of handling it and not  
23 least also the rules when it comes to paying for it.  
24 What is it? FEMA you call it, the federal, and I asked  
25 what could they do? They had the most important part of  
25

1 it. It was a checkbook. After a certain period -- I  
2 forgot now how many days -- but the federal agency  
3 stepped in and paid for certain things, which made it  
4 much more easy then to get the resources in when it was  
5 of a certain magnitude. Not early on, not the first  
6 days perhaps, but after a while. I think we have in  
7 Europe, and in Sweden as well inside, to find these type  
8 of mechanisms to make it easier to have these varied  
9 responses to catastrophes and events of different sorts.  
10 And we from parliamentary side have an important role to  
11 tackle this because this goes back a lot to legislation.  
12 The ability to share information, for example, to  
13 cooperate, also cooperate budgetwise, not to jealously  
14 guard your own money always, but to be able in a given  
15 situation to find a solution that must be found.  
16 Because the strange thing is -- and that was a definite  
17 experience after the tsunami -- that we had a lot of  
18 resources. They were there. They were prepared. Some  
19 were well trained. They were not used or used far too  
20 late. And that was a real problem out of that. It was  
21 not a question about resources. It was not a question  
22 about intelligent people had foresight or training for  
23 that, or realizing that something could happen, but  
24 actually to see that the mechanics were there so that we  
25 could use it in an efficient way and again in a short  
26

1 time frame take decision within I would even say minutes  
2 or at least hours, because time is often very critical  
3 if you could save lives. I don't have to say that to  
4 you because you know this as well. So that's a great  
5 challenge for us parliamentarians, not least in Europe,  
6 when we are trying to build a more common Europe on  
7 exactly those aspects where we need to support and help  
8 each other and see also that we can receive help from  
9 others or give help to others. Sometimes also that  
10 could be a problem because our national legislations  
11 have not -- are not adapted to that. We haven't  
12 understood that when we wrote the legislation or some  
13 legislation that has been made years ago when we just  
14 had a purely national perspective on everything. So I  
15 thank you, Mr. Speaker Hastert, Mr. Secretary of the  
16 Homeland Security Committee, which I think is very  
17 important. I think that we in Europe will have great  
18 experience and follow what you are doing. We look  
19 forward to a closer cooperation over the Atlantic  
20 because we can help, do a lot together, not least  
21 getting ideas which are perhaps the most important  
22 commodity when it comes to tackling different forms of  
23 challenge that we've got in our society. Thank you very  
24 much for this session.