This has no limited objective. This is unconditional.

Those people will not stand. We don't want to talk to them. We don't want to negotiate with them. We don't want to work out a misunderstanding with them. They will not stand.

The judgment about whether to fight during Ramadan and pay them the respect that they are actually of the Islamic faith should be debated in that context because they are not Islamic. They are not exercising their faith. They are blasphemists of their own alleged religion.

Civilian casualties need to be debated in this context because, though regrettable, they are inevitable and a part of unconditional war in a threshold that was already crossed, and then finally all of us coming to recognition of what it is we fight—terrorism, bin Laden. We fight against people whose weapons are not the principal concern. Their methodology is not our principal concern. Our concern is the profound judgment that they reached: that our presence and our lives are somehow a central threat.

Before the Senate left for this week, I wanted to share these thoughts knowing that we will revisit these issues again and again in what promises to be, unfortunately, a long and difficult engagement in Afghanistan, knowing that among the many strengths of our people, patience is not the greatest of American virtues. But we did not seek this war. We did not want it. We would have done anything to avoid it, but it was not our choice. It was thrust upon us. The decision to take lives was made by others. We only have one thing to do—no decisions, no choices, no judgments—just to win. That takes time. It takes sacrifice. Sacrifices we have made before. Now we will make them again.

I hope our country simply can steady its nerves and muster the patience to see this to the end. That will involve a great price, but there is no choice.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, it is only on a Friday that we can make sense. That is my attempt here this morning with respect to the upcoming stimulus bill. We have more than enough deficit stimulus already in the pipeline, almost, without a stimulus bill.

The point is that, yes, we are going to have to spend, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, for home security. The Senator has outlined our spending on homeland defense to the tune of some $20 billion, including airport security; Amtrak security; Federal, State, and local antiterrorism enforcement; infrastructure security; highway security; clean and safe drinking water; bioterrorism response; border security. Actually, we have to add, necessarily, unemployment compensation and health care.

So let's say definitely all of us will be supporting—and should—deficit stimulus; otherwise, it makes no difference to the economy. It must be spent for home security with respect to the initiative of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

For starters, we are beginning this fiscal year with a horrendous deficit. I think of Mark Twain who once said that the truth is such a precious thing, it should be used very sparingly. That is the credo when we come to Government finance here in Washington. Specifically, we count Social Security revenues—I want to be specific in my limited time—twice. Sure, the government receives the well over $500 billion that payroll tax payers pay in to the Social Security Trust Fund. The American people paid that amount in fiscal year 2001 for a surplus of—other than paying out the regular benefits, $163 billion. But the Social Security law, section 201, says, wait a minute, we don't want that money to languish and sit there, we want to gain interest on it.

So we issue T-bills, you and I buy the T-bills—the money comes into the Government, and what do they do? They count that again as revenues. So you count the money first as it comes in from the payroll tax payers, and you count it a second time from the purchase of the Treasury bills, in compliance with section 201.

Now, let's understand it. We ended the fiscal year with a $133 billion deficit. I encourage my fellow Senators and the American public to view the public debt to the penny as issued by the Secretary of the Treasury on September 28, 2001 at: http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov/opd/opdpenny.htm.

Madam President, you can see that the national debt went up from the end of fiscal year 2000—the end of September in the year 2000—from 5 trillion 674 billion some odd dollars to 5 trillion 806 billion some odd dollars. It will show on the chart a $133 billion deficit. That is verified in the final monthly Treasury statement made for fiscal year 2001. You can access this report at: http://www.treasury.gov.

Madam President, immediately it highlights a half truth because they show a surplus, and that is how they talk about the surplus and how it is diminishing. But don't bother with that. Go down to page 20, the particular culmination of all their moneys, and you find out how much revenue the Government took in and how much was spent. Every year since Lyndon Johnson's day, we have ended up with a deficit. Not just the $133 billion deficit as of the last fiscal year, only a month ago. I will ask unanimous consent to have this particular document printed in the RECORD, the budget realities.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

Presidents and fiscal year	U.S. budget (outlays in billions)	Borrowed trust funds (billions)	Unified deficit with trust funds (billions)	Actual deficit without trust funds (billions)	National debt (billions)	Annual increases in spending for interest (billions)
Truman:						
1946	55.2	−5.0	−15.9	−10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	−9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	−0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	−3.1	−4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	−1.5	−3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	−6.5	−6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower:						
1954	70.9	3.6	−1.2	−4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	−3.0	−3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	−2.8	−7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	−5.0	−12.8	−7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	−3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	−1.2	−3.3	−2.1	292.6	
Kennedy:						
1962	106.8	3.2	−7.1	−10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	−4.8	−7.4	310.3	9.9
1964	118.5	−0.1	−5.9	−5.8	316.1	10.7
Johnson:						
1965	118.2	4.8	−1.4	−6.2	322.3	11.3

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES—Continued

Presidents and fiscal year	U.S. budget (outlays in billions)	Borrowed trust funds (billions)	Unified deficit with trust funds (billions)	Actual deficit without trust funds (billions)	National debt (billions)	Annual increases in spending for interest (billions)
1966	134.5	2.5	−3.7	−6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	−8.6	−11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	−25.2	−28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
Nixon:						
1970	195.6	12.3	−2.8	−15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	−23.0	−27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	−23.4	−27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	−14.9	−30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	−6.1	−17.6	483.9	29.3
1975	332.3	4.8	−53.2	−58.0	541.9	32.7
Ford:						
1976	371.8	13.4	−73.7	−87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	−53.7	−77.4	706.4	41.9
Carter:						
1978	458.7	11.0	−59.2	−70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	−40.7	−52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	−73.8	−79.6	909.1	74.8
1981	678.2	6.7	−79.0	−85.7	994.8	95.5
Reagan:						
1982	745.8	14.5	−128.0	−142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	−207.8	−234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.9	7.6	−185.4	−193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	−212.3	−252.8	1,871.5	178.9
1986	990.5	81.9	−221.2	−303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,004.1	75.7	−149.8	−225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.5	100.0	−155.2	−255.2	2,601.3	214.1
1989	1,143.7	114.2	−152.5	−266.7	2,863.3	240.9
Bush:						
1990	1,253.2	117.4	−221.2	−338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,324.4	122.5	−269.4	−391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,381.7	113.2	−290.4	−403.6	4,002.1	292.3
1993	1,409.5	94.2	−255.1	−349.3	4,351.4	292.5
Clinton:						
1994	1,461.9	89.0	−203.3	−292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,515.8	113.3	−164.0	−277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.6	153.4	−107.5	−260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.3	165.8	−22.0	−187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,652.6	178.2	69.2	−109.0	5,478.7	363.8
1999	1,703.0	251.8	124.4	−127.4	5,606.1	353.5
2000	1,789.0	258.9	236.2	−22.7	5,628.8	362.0
2001	1,853.0	254.8	281.0	+26.2	5,602.6	369.0

* Historical Tables, Budget of the U.S. Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO's 2001 Economic and Budget Outlook. March 14, 2001.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The document takes us from President Harry Truman right on up to the Johnson Administration. You can see that, in 1968–69, when I had the privilege of serving here and worked on that with George Mahon over on the House side, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee at that time. We cut it back again another $5 billion. We called over to Marvin Watson in December of 1968 because President Johnson was very sensitive about guns and butter—paying for the war in Vietnam and the Great Society. So we cut it back another $5 billion, and we ended up with a true surplus that particular year, a $2.9 billion surplus. But you can see the minus marks coming through.

This particular chart shows that the Congressional Budget Office projected by March 14 of this year that we would have a $26.2 billion surplus. Truth: We ended up with a $133 billion deficit.

Where do you find that truth out? Turn to page 20 of 'Final Monthly Treasury Statement,' and you will see that at the beginning of fiscal year, 2001, we had a debt of $5,674,178,000,000.

By the close of the fiscal year last month, the debt had already gone up to $5,807,463. So it has gone up some $133 billion. We ended up with a deficit of $133 billion.

I ask unanimous consent that page 20 of the ''Final Monthly Treasury Statement'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 6.—MEANS OF FINANCING THE DEFICIT OR DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, SEPTEMBER 2001 AND OTHER PERIODS

[$ millions]

Assets and liabilities directly related to budget off-budget activity	Net transactions (−) denotes net reduction of either liability or asset accounts			Account balances current fiscal year		
	This month	Fiscal year to date		Beginning of		Close of this month
		This year	Prior year	This year	This month	
LIABILITY ACCOUNTS						
Borrowing from the public:						
Treasury securities, issued under general Financing authorities:						
Debt held by the public	−1,508	−110,688	−218,382	3,449,998	3,340,818	3,339,310
Intragovernmental holdings	39,096	243,973	236,289	2,224,180	2,429,058	2,468,153
Total Treasury securities outstanding	37,588	133,285	17,907	5,674,178	5,769,876	5,807,463
Plus premium on Treasury securities	−32	62	697	2,699	2,793	2,761
Less discount on Treasury securities	−4,176	−8,555	−5,157	75,541	71,162	66,986
Total Treasury securities net of Premium and discount	41,731	141,902	23,761	5,601,336	5,701,507	5,743,238
Agency securities, issued under special financing authorities (see Schedule B, for other Agency borrowing, see Schedule C)	394	−661	−832	27,672	26,617	27,011
Total federal securities	42,125	141,240	22,929	5,629,009	5,728,124	5,770,249
Deduct:						
Federal securities held as investments of government accounts (see Schedule D)	39,122	232,995	246,455	2,235,763	2,429,635	2,468,757
Less discount on federal securities held as investments of government accounts	−1,007	1,633	719	16,867	19,508	18,500
Net federal securities held as investments of government accounts	40,130	231,361	245,736	2,218,896	2,410,128	2,450,257
Total borrowing from the public	1,996	−90,121	−222,807	3,410,113	3,317,996	3,319,992
Accrued interest payable to the public	11,677	−4,728	1,608	44,211	27,806	39,483
Allocations of special drawing rights	4	−44	−440	6,359	6,312	6,316
Deposit funds [1]	−127	4,160	−1,248	2,625	6,912	6,785

TABLE 6.—MEANS OF FINANCING THE DEFICIT OR DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, SEPTEMBER 2001 AND OTHER PERIODS—Continued

[$ millions]

Assets and liabilities directly related to budget off-budget activity	Net transactions (−) denotes net reduction of either liability or asset accounts			Account balances current fiscal year		
	This month	Fiscal year to date		Beginning of		Close of this month
		This year	Prior year	This year	This month	
Miscellaneous liability accounts (includes checks outstanding etc.)	−3,966	4,160	−404	4,140	12,266	8,301
Total liability accounts	9,584	−86,571	−223,291	3,467,448	3,371,293	3,380,877
ASSET ACCOUNTS (DEDUCT)						
Cash and monetary assets:						
U.S. Treasury operating cash: [2]						
Federal Reserve account	4,263	1,337	1,818	8,459	5,533	9,796
Tax and loan note accounts	33,627	−9,776	−5,618	44,199	795	34,423
Balance	37,890	−8,440	−3,799	52,659	6,329	44,219
Special drawing rights:						
Total holdings	7	603	33	10,316	10,913	10,919
SDR certificates issued to Federal Reserve Banks	.....	1,000	4,000	−3,200	−2,200	−2,200
Balance	7	1,603	4,033	7,116	8,713	8,719
Reserve position on the U.S. quota in the IMF:						
U.S. subscription to International Monetary Fund:						
Direct quota payments	.....	.....	.....	46,525	46,525	46,525
Maintenance of value adjustments	29	−330	−3,336	1,691	1,332	1,361
Letter of credit issued to IMF	3,089	7,017	−5,194	−35,827	−31,899	−28,810
Dollar deposits with the IMF	−18	−4	4	−117	−103	−121
Receivable/Payable (−) for interim maintenance of value adjustments	6	−1,966	2,234	1,418	−554	−548
Balance	3,106	4,717	−6,292	13,690	15,301	18,407
Other cash and monetary assets	656	8,309	954	24,937	32,590	33,246
Total cash and monetary assets	41,659	6,190	−5,105	98,401	62,932	104,591
Net Activity, Guaranteed Loan Financing	2,145	4,319	−4,438	[3] −22,013	−19,839	−17,694
Net Activity, Direct Loan Financing	−2,852	19,090	21,566	105,459	127,402	123,549
Miscellaneous asset accounts	4,582	1,564	−1,603	[4] −119	−3,137	1,445
Total asset accounts	45,534	31,163	10,419	181,729	167,357	212,891
Excess of liabilities (+) or assets (−)	−35,950	−117,734	−233,710	+3,285,720	+3,203,935	+3,167,986
Transactions not applied to current year's surplus or deficit (see Schedule A for Details)	560	−9,430	−3,207	.....	−9,990	−9,430
Total budget and off-budget federal entities (financing of deficit (+) or disposition of surplus (−))	−35,390	−127,165	−236,917	+3,285,720	+3,193,945	+3,158,555

[1] Includes the cash balances only and does not include any investments held by funds.
[2] Major sources of information used to determine Treasury's operating cash income include Federal Reserve Banks, the Treasury Regional Finance Centers, the Internal Revenue Service Centers, the Bureau of the Public Debt and various electronic systems. Deposits are reflected as received and withdrawals are reflected as processed.
[3] Includes an adjustment of $943 million in September 1999 to reflect additional reporting by the Department of Education.
[4] Includes an adjustment of $11 million in September 1997 to reflect additional reporting by the Department of Treasury.

. . . . . No Transactions.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that ''The Debt to the Penny'' be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEBT TO THE PENNY

Current month and amount:
11/01/2001; $5,817,190,945,192.56.
10/31/2001; $5,815,983,290,402.24.
10/30/2001; $5,821,971,462,166.69.
10/29/2001; $5,822,039,361,288.25.
10/26/2001; $5,824,411,453,143.54.
10/25/2001; $5,823,620,074,112.16.
10/24/2001; $5,820,311,931,563.74.
10/23/2001; $5,821,675,171,748.09.
10/22/2001; $5,819,200,893,343.94.
10/19/2001; $5,819,139,910,042.71.
10/18/2001; $5,819,279,815,278.59.
10/17/2001; $5,820,599,313,961.29.
10/16/2001; $5,820,976,918,375.44.
10/15/2001; $5,818,887,492,619.52.
10/12/2001; $5,813,332,736,265.82.
10/11/2001; $5,811,762,115,860.32.
10/10/2001; $5,805,746,196,414.92.
10/09/2001; $5,808,819,610,348.90.
10/05/2001; $5,810,495,191,205.19.
10/04/2001; $5,803,751,789,864.65.
10/03/2001; $5,797,694,485,722.59.
10/02/2001; $5,815,899,927,829.86.
10/01/2001; $5,806,151,389,190.21.
Prior months and amount:
09/28/2001; $5,807,463,412,200.06.
08/31/2001; $5,769,875,781,034.48.
07/31/2001; $5,718,303,095,621.12.
06/29/2001; $5,726,814,835,287.17.
05/31/2001; $5,656,181,958,605.26.
04/30/2001; $5,661,347,798,002.65.
03/30/2001; $5,773,739,939,951.53.
02/28/2001; $5,735,859,380,573.98.
01/31/2001; $5,716,070,587,057.36.
12/29/2000; $5,662,216,013,697.37.
11/30/2000; $5,709,699,281,427.00.
10/31/2000; $5,657,327,531,667.14.
Prior fiscal years and amount:
09/29/2000; $5,674,178,209,886.86.
09/30/1999; $5,656,270,901,615.43.
09/30/1998; $5,526,193,008,897.62.
09/30/1997; $5,413,146,011,397.34.
09/30/1996; $5,224,810,939,135.73.
09/29/1995; $4,973,982,900,709.39.
09/30/1994; $4,692,749,910,013.32.
09/30/1993; $4,411,488,883,139.38.
09/30/1992; $4,064,620,655,521.66.
09/30/1991; $3,665,303,351,697.03.
09/28/1990; $3,233,313,451,777.25.
09/29/1989; $2,857,430,960,187.32.
09/30/1988; $2,602,337,712,041.16.
09/30/1987; $2,350,276,890,953.00.
Source: Bureau of The Public Debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, you can see we are already in the red $8.5 billion. The debt is on the way up.

What had happened in August was the Congressional Budget Office came over to the Budget Committee and Mr. Crippin projected a $104 billion deficit for fiscal year 2002. In the last couple of weeks, he has come back and amended that to some $140 billion more. He said the downturn has been far more extreme than he ever expected. So he adds another $140 billion to the $104 billion, which is $244 billion. We start off with $244 billion, without the stimulus, without the moneys for defense that we are bound to pass before we leave in the next few weeks, without the moneys for education that we are bound to spend, without the moneys for agriculture for the farm bill that we are prepared to provide. I am looking at all of that, and I made this comment at the Cabinet table just last week to the Vice President—the President had to excuse himself to receive a head of state—but I said: Mr. Vice President, we are starting off now knowing at the very beginning of fiscal year 2002 that we have over some $300 billion in the pipeline of stimulus that people are not looking at.

I will bet anybody any amount of money anytime—give me whatever odds you want—that the deficit for fiscal year 2002 will exceed $300 billion. I want to see my colleagues in the Senate take me up on that bet. We are still talking surpluses, is my point, and we know the truth is that we are going to have at least a $300 billion deficit.

Yes, let us take care of home security, if it is $20 billion, $25 billion, $30 billion—whatever it is. But none of these fast forward tax cuts and calling it stimulus, because it is a political opportunity: We will give you what spending we want, and we will take what tax cuts we want. That game has to stop.

The cold sobriety of the moment is, this country is at war. We have to sacrifice, and we will sacrifice in the context of the economy, trying to hold the line as much as we can; specifically, let's not take anymore loss of revenues and call it stimulus. Let us go forward with strengthening home security and appreciate the reality that we are in trouble. The ox is in the ditch. We have fooled ourselves all year long. I pointed it out time and again.

I have such a high regard for our distinguished chairman in the Senate, KENT CONRAD of North Dakota, who is doing an outstanding job as our chairman, that I hate to appear as the dog in the manger constantly bringing up the record, the record, the record, showing the deficit, the deficit, the deficit. But we have had a deficit. We ended up with one, as I said we would, as of last year of $133 billion. We are already going into the red, and we have not even started the level of spending that will be required. Let us hold tight to home security, unemployment compensation, and health care, and stop right there to hold down the long-term interest rates. That is what is stultifying any kind of economic comeback from the recession we are in.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 2044

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I rise this morning to speak to an amendment which I believe is the pending business before the Senate, and that is the Daschle amendment No. 2044 relating to collective bargaining of public safety employees. This is an amendment that has been offered to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill which is the pending business of the Senate. I understand a cloture vote will be scheduled for next Tuesday on this particular amendment.

I want to speak to this issue for a moment because I think this is an unfortunate time to be bringing this amendment forward, especially since it has nothing whatsoever to do with the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. I regret an effort has been made to inject this rather emotionally charged issue into the appropriations bill we are going to be asked to vote on early next week.

I also think the timing is unfortunate. I understand why, at a time when all of America is willing to and desirous of expressing its appreciation to our firefighters and other rescue workers, especially as they have worked day and night, literally, at the site of the World Trade Center in New York City, to find ways of recognizing their contribution to our country and to the people of New York. I do not think this particular amendment is the way to do that because the amendment seeks to, for the first time, force the U.S. Government's heavy hand into State and local government labor relations with police, fire, and a whole host of other workers—first responders, ambulance, paramedics, EMTs, and a whole group of other people who, for the first time, would be required to comply with Federal procedures regarding collective bargaining rather than the traditional approach, which has been for the State and local governments to make their own determinations as to how to deal with their various employees, including fire, police, and other first responders to emergencies.

The timing is unfortunate, as I say. I think there are many better ways for the United States to express its appreciation to these employees than to have a very partisan and contentious issue of labor relations inserted into the appropriations bill under the guise of finding a way to support our police and firefighters. This is not the way to support our police and firefighters.

This is an item that has been on the agenda of some people for a long time. To try to insert it into the debate on an appropriations bill at this time I think is most unfortunate.

Let me say parenthetically, there are some wonderful police and fire folks in Arizona with whom I have worked over the years. They have been tremendously helpful to me. Arizonans went back to New York City to help in that effort. There is not anybody who appreciates more the work that our police, firefighters, and other first responders do than I.

As I say, in particular, the folks in the various organizations that provide police services in Arizona have helped me in more ways than I can tell, but I really do not think this collective bargaining bill, as an amendment to the appropriations process, is the way to recognize their efforts. Here is why.

This amendment would require the State and local governments to implement collective bargaining for this group of employees, and it is not limited to paid employees. Volunteer firemen, for example, would be just as subject to this collective bargaining requirement as would the employees of the towns' or counties' police or fire department, for example, because it applies to either paid or unpaid law enforcement officers, firefighters, rescue squads, ambulance crews, as well as paramedics, EMTs, rescue workers, ambulance personnel, hazardous materials workers, first responders, and individuals providing out-of-hospital emergency medical care, both on a paid or voluntary basis.

It mandates many categories of individuals that would now be subject to collective bargaining for the first time under Federal rules because under this amendment, within 180 days of enactment, the Federal Labor Relations Authority must determine whether a State provides the following rights—and there is a whole long list: The right to form and join a labor organization; to recognize employees' labor organizations; commit agreements to writing; bargaining over hours, wages, terms of employment, arbitration, enforcement through State courts, and so on.

This is obviously an arbitrary list of rights that would be imposed under the authority of the Federal Government. If the FLRA determines that a State does not substantially provide for these rights—and over half of the States do not, by the way, they are right-to-work States that do not mandate collective bargaining—then the FLRA, under this legislation, shall establish collective bargaining procedures for these covered individuals. That has to be done within 1 year of the date of enactment.

So the bottom line is it imposes on States, even those which do not currently have collective bargaining laws, a new set of Federal requirements for collective bargaining for these people, including, as I said, even voluntary firemen. It would force this Federal system on those States.

It is not just an unfunded mandate, although there is obviously a cost associated with this as well, but it would override all of the local and State laws that currently apply. Twenty-one States do not currently require this kind of collective bargaining. It would literally force upon those governments collective bargaining over these public safety officers, who are nonunion members, to accept the union as their official bargaining agent.

This is such a total break from all of the tradition in this country. Some States are right-to-work States. Some States are not right-to-work States. Some States have options for collective bargaining for local jurisdictions, for example, such as my State of Arizona. We have never felt it was appropriate to mandate from the Federal Government how each of these municipalities and States would conduct their labor relations.

The bill has a provision that says if you have less than 25 full-time employees, then your police department or fire department would not be covered. Stop and think about all of the towns and the counties throughout our country that may have 26 or 27 or 28 employees. They would be covered. For the first time, the heavy hand of the Federal Government would come down and tell them what to do.

It is no wonder that county sheriffs in Arizona and some mayors in some relatively small towns have contacted my office and said: Do not impose this on us. We are getting along fine. We have great relations with our employees, and for the Federal Government to step in is not only going to increase our costs but, frankly, create some bad relationships. We do not need that. We have enough trouble responding to all