

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 of the problems that have resulted from September 11 to have to deal with this.

This is not an appropriate response to the events of September 11 for us to

force this on our State and local communities.

In my own State of Arizona, for example, our law provides that public safety employees can present their proposals to their employers but does not require as an obligation that collective bargaining be the result. This, of course, would require the State agencies and local governments to bargain with labor unions on behalf of the public safety employees. This is why the sheriffs as well as some police chiefs have contacted me and said it interferes with their ability. The Arizona sheriffs and police chiefs, the league of cities and towns, all of them have expressed their opposition to this legislation.

I think the problem is in opposing it, there is somehow a notion we are therefore against police and firemen. That is what bothers me the most. There is a big difference between the Federal Government mandating labor policies on our towns and counties on the one hand and expressing our support for police and firefighters on the other. We have done that in the Senate in resolutions we have passed.

I hope in many other ways to show support for the police and firemen in my State with whom, again, I have had such a great relationship. They have helped me, and I hope I have been able to help them. In fact, I know I have through several appropriations that we have received to help them in fighting drugs, for example. It has been a great relationship, and I hope I do not have to prove my loyalty to these folks by supporting an amendment which has no place in this bill, which is a very political amendment, which creates huge problems with respect to federalism and forcing for the first time this new Federal mandate on these local communities, at a huge cost.

By the way, the cost is estimated at \$44 million by CBO over the next 4 years. CBO says it will cost \$3 million just to set up the FLRA to develop the regulations to determine State compliance and enforce those compliances.

This is simply not the right response to the events of September 11. I regret this issue has been infused into the Labor-HHS bill.

So I say to my friends in the volunteer fire departments in the small towns throughout Arizona and even in the larger communities, which of course do have these collective bargaining arrangements, for the most part, the best way we can respond to the incident of September 11 is to keep focused on the job ahead of us, and that is to train up and be ready to respond as first responders to any emergency within our local communities; to support our local firefighters and police so that in the myriad false alarms they are now responding to we provide them the resources necessary for them to do their job; to support them in any issues

they have with respect to the Federal Government in terms of getting funding for programs and the like; but not to respond by creating a new Federal mandate on every community in our States that now they are going to have to be required to engage in collective bargaining when that has been a matter of local option in the past.

It seems to me this is the wrong approach, and I hope we can find other ways of supporting our local fire and police than by this particular amendment.

I intend to vote no if the question of cloture comes up. To explain that very briefly, the point is: Should we be taking up this amendment on this unrelated bill? Sixty Senators will have to say yes before we will be permitted to do that next Tuesday. I hope at least 40 Senators will say, no, this is not the place to do it, this is not the way for us to express our support for fire and police. There are more practical ways we could do that given the events of September 11.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. KYL. I ask unanimous consent that we stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:28 a.m., recessed until 11:48 a.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. REID).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from New Jersey.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. CORZINE. Madam President, today I rise to discuss a critical need for our Nation to unite in what I think is an immediate effort to strengthen our economy. This morning you probably saw that our Nation's unemployment rate jumped a full half of 1 percent to 5.4 percent—one of the largest increases in any given month in history. We lost 415,000 jobs over the last month. Within that context, there are many more layoffs in the offing, that have been announced by companies, yet to be executed.

GDP has declined. Consumer prices, actually, within the GDP numbers, declined for one of the first times since the 1950s. Manufacturing indices and other statistics indicate that we are in a recession.

Over 40 years ago, the brother of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, President John Kennedy, issued a dramatic and now immortalized challenge to all Americans. He said: "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

We are now having a debate about an economic stimulus program, about the state of our economy, and what we

should do next. Four decades later, it is again time to ask Americans to come to the support of our country in a practical sense. This is particularly true for those of us in the Congress.

Today, we have not one but two great challenges. First, of course, we need to win the war against terrorism at home and abroad. To this end, we are remarkably united. Most Americans are on the same page in responding to the Nation's needs.

But at the same time, we need to reinvigorate our slumping economy, an economy profoundly impacted by the cowardly acts of September 11, and the subsequent uncertainty surrounding bioterrorism events. Here America's response is not quite so clear. To this challenge, we still appear focused on something more than the Nation's real needs.

Let me be clear: My views of stimulus are premised on the near certainty that we are in the midst of a serious national recession and I think also, importantly, a global one. Increasingly, we see our neighbors across the globe suffering from much of the same kind of weakness we see in America. This view is shared by most economic analysts and political leaders. Today's report only reinforces that view.

For all of us, the primary risks from this point forward are how deep, how much further will this economic erosion go? The signs, statistically and anecdotally, are everywhere that this will be a long and deep slowdown.

Therefore, we need an immediate and substantial fiscal response. We need an insurance policy, and we need to put it in place now.

I agree with what the President says: It is time for us to go to work. The question is, How should we organize that work?

This economic challenge will require the same type of bipartisan cooperation, the same sense of resolve, the same sense of national unity that we have enjoyed in the war effort. In truth, that should not be all that hard. After all, when it comes to designing an economic stimulus package there is broad consensus among economists about the principles we should follow. Chairman Greenspan agrees. Bob Rubin agrees. And the chairs and ranking members of the Senate and House Budget Committees—Democrat and Republican alike—agree. We should follow those straightforward principles and get on with working out the details. This should not be a political argument but an objective pursuit of the most certain actions to reinvigorate our economy.

In the short term, we need actions that quickly generate real economic activity, real economic growth. For the long term, we need actions that promote fiscal discipline. It is a simple formula, very simple: Short-term stimulus, long-term discipline.