

Security has to be comprehensive. Under El Al, they check thoroughly and rotate the screeners from the boarding gates, to the tarmac and to cleaning out the aisles.

I flew out of Dulles last week. And what do you do? You get seat 9A. So I can call out to my friend who has been working on the tarmac for the last 2 years who is in cahoots with me as a terrorist. I say: Paste a pistol underneath seat 9A, loaded. I get on. I got through all the screeners and everything else. And afterwards, they wonder why, because you have to have the same kind of security on the tarmac. You have to have the same security for the people who cater. You have to have the same security with the people who clean. This is a safety/security responsibility and not a game of playing around on whether they are going to join a union or not.

A third of airline security workers join unions now and have the right to strike. Yes, they can join our union, but they can't strike and they can be fired.

On contracting out, 669,000 civilian personnel work in our defense forces and at the Pentagon. Some of them were lost on September 11. Give us a Senate bill or something very similar to it because that is the overwhelming sentiment. The captain of the airline pilots appeared with us again yesterday and said: Please pass the Senate version so we can get on and move with it and get the cockpit doors secured, get thorough background checks, and then be ready, willing, and able to give the watch list to the screeners so they will know what to look for.

At the present time, you wouldn't give the watch list to these foreign companies, agents at minimum wage. You wouldn't give it to them. You would try to keep that security knowledge to yourself and send somebody out. If I had a watch list and was trying, I would have an FBI agent at the likely airports where they may board, but I wouldn't give it to the present screeners. We have to clean that out entirely and come down to the reality that this is totally bipartisan. It is not in the sense of trying to be pro-labor or anti-union, pro-Democrat or pro-Republican, or anything else like that.

We have finally learned at least one lesson from 9-11—that we can't play

around any longer with airline security. We have to get on with it and not fiddle here some 7 weeks as "Rome" burns, and we wonder what to do and put all this political pressure on to change the folks around and not bring it up and not allow them to vote common sense.

I yield the floor.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred July 6, 2001, in Monmouth County, NJ. Seven people were sentenced on multiple counts, including aggravated assault and harassment by bias intimidation under the state law, for assaulting a 23-year-old learning-disabled man with hearing and speech impediments. The victim was lured to a party, bound, and physically and verbally assaulted for three hours. Later, he was taken to a wooded area where the torture continued until he was able to escape.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

CBO COST ESTIMATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, on October 11, 2001, I filed Report No. 107-83 to accompany S. 1533, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and strengthen the health centers program and the National Health Service Corps, and to establish the Healthy Communities Access Program, which will help coordinate services for the uninsured and underinsured, and for other purposes. At the time the report was filed, the estimate by the Congressional Budget Office was not available. I ask unani-

mous consent that a copy of the CBO estimate be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE

S. 1533.—HEALTH CARE SAFETY NET AMENDMENTS OF 2001

Summary: S. 1533 would extend expiring provisions and authorizations for appropriations in title III of the Public Health Service Act (PHSA). The bill would reauthorize and expand the Health Centers and National Health Service Corps programs, and establish the Community Access Program in statute. It also would create several new grant programs and demonstrations. The provisions in this bill would be administered by the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA).

Assuming the appropriation of the necessary amounts, CBO estimates that implementing S. 1533 would cost about \$1 billion in 2002 and between \$8 billion and \$9 billion over the 2002-2006 period.

The bill would increase spending by the Medicare program for rural health clinic services, and reduce Medicaid spending for certain beneficiaries who use those clinics. In total, direct spending would increase by \$146 million over the 2002-2011 period. Because enacting S. 1533 would affect direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply.

S. 1533 contains an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), but CBO estimates that the mandate would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments. Those governments may also benefit either directly or indirectly from some of the grant programs authorized in the bill, but their participation in those programs would be voluntary. S. 1533 contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimated cost to the Federal Government: The estimated budgetary impact of S. 1533 is shown in the following table. For the purposes of this estimate, CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted this fall and that the necessary appropriations will be provided for each fiscal year. The table summarizes the budgetary impact on discretionary spending of the legislation under two different sets of assumptions. In cases where the bill would authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, the first set of figures provides the estimated levels of authorizations assuming annual adjustments for anticipated inflation after fiscal year 2002. The second set of assumptions does not include any such inflation adjustments. The costs of this legislation would fall within budget functions 550 (health) and 570 (Medicare).

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars					
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION With Adjustments for Inflation						
Spending Under Current Law:						
Budget Authority*	1,513	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	1,368	662	60	7	0	0
Proposed Changes:						
Estimated Authorization Level	0	1,887	1,878	1,914	1,953	1,989
Estimated Outlays	0	1,004	1,776	1,886	1,923	1,961
Spending Under S. 1533:						
Estimated Authorization Level	1,513	1,887	1,878	1,914	1,953	1,989
Estimated Outlays	1,368	1,665	1,835	1,893	1,923	1,961
Without Adjustments for Inflation						
Spending Under Current Law:						
Budget Authority*	1,513	0	0	0	0	0
Estimated Outlays	1,368	662	60	7	0	0
Proposed Changes:						
Estimated Authorization Level	0	1,887	1,836	1,834	1,833	1,833
Estimated Outlays	0	1,003	1,753	1,826	1,824	1,825