

Well, what do you do about it? This didn't come overnight. We have seen the realities with regard to higher prices of gasoline. Yet we know we don't have the refining capacity. We haven't built a new refinery in 25 years in this country. We have our refineries up to maximum production. They were busy making heating oil. Now they are trying to build up inventories for gasoline. So you not only have a shortage of refined capacity but you are dependent primarily on foreign countries—OPEC, for the most part—for our crude oil. We suddenly find we have an inability to refine an adequate amount. So with inventories low, the maximum utilization out of refineries is converting over—and they have been for some time—to gasoline; and then the complications of 15 different types of reformulated gasoline in this country that require almost a boutique type of activity in the refiners, where they have to refine it to specific fuel specifications for the area—they have to separate it, batch it, transport it separately. Additives, whether ethanol or MTBE, complicate the process.

Is it necessary that we have that kind of a mandate? Clearly, the industry says they can meet the air quality requirements and the Clean Air Act if you will give them some flexibility. Well, we haven't given them the flexibility.

The public wants relief, and I think it is unfair to characterize the new administration with having the sole responsibility to come up with so-called immediate relief. Nobody is a magician around here, and it would take a magician to provide immediate relief for the crisis we have gotten into. But what we have to do is focus realistically, and I think that is the value of what we are going to see out of President Bush's and Vice President CHENEY's new energy task force—relief—which will be coming out Thursday.

We are not going to see generalities that say you can simply get there from here by conservation. Conservation is important, but conservation isn't going to do it alone. Make no mistake; Americans are used to a standard of living that has been brought about by plentiful supplies of relatively inexpensive energy. If we want to sacrifice our standard of living, that can be done. But I wonder how many people in California are ready to go out and turn in their old refrigerators, their old washers and dryers, when they are not worn out, for a new energy-saving appliance that will cut their energy bills in half. I don't know. Maybe we can mandate CAFE savings. We have a mandatory 27-mile CAFE standard currently in the automobile industry. People say, well, that doesn't include the vans, the suburban vehicles, the type that are so popular today, the SUVs and others. That is true. They are classified in the truck classification as light trucks, but the reality is that you can't get there on CAFE, either.

We have 207 million vehicles in this country. About 170 million are auto-

mobiles and the rest are trucks and cars. It is going to take you 10 years to make a significant dent in that number of vehicles because a lot of them aren't paid for. So you are not going to discard them.

If you mandate substantially increased CAFE standards, then people have to buy new cars; they have to buy new ones. CAFE standards are important, but you can't achieve the kinds of savings we need by CAFE standards. You can give tax credits for people who save energy. I think you will probably see an amendment or two on that to give them a \$250, \$300 tax credit.

The point is that we are far behind, and what the administration is going to propose is some positive steps as to how we can address the energy crisis. It is going to take the conventional sources of energy that we know and have had experience with and the addition of the clean coal technology that we have come to develop in the last decade or so. We can continue to use coal. We can use it in a manner in which we take out many of the impurities—the sulfur, and so forth. We can address the reality that we can produce more natural gas in this country, but the incentive has to be there. That is a return on investment.

Obviously, we can reduce our increased dependence on imported oil by producing more domestic oil. Of course, that involves my State of Alaska and the item that I first mentioned, the accuracy of some of the important portrayals of ANWR.

In conclusion, to those who suggest the potential development in ANWR, a reserve somewhere in the area of 5.6 billion to as high as 16 billion—and if it were an average of 10 billion it would be the largest oilfield found in the last 40 years—I suggest the prospects for developments of this area are very good. We have the technology to open it safely, there is absolutely no question about that, with the 3-D seismic and directional drilling.

The people, the residents in the area of Katovik and Nuiqsut, Barrow, the Natives who live in this area who are dependent pretty much on the realities associated with hunting and fishing for their livelihood, a subsistence lifestyle, also have aspirations of a better life, an alternative life, and this provides them with jobs, education, health care opportunities, and opportunities for their children as well to prosper. Just as people in any other community, they have visions of a better life. They support it.

Some say it is a 6-month supply. That is a totally unsuitable and inappropriate comparison because, as we all know, if you were to stop all the oil flowing into the United States for a 6-month period, that is what it would take to say that this is a 6-month supply. You would have to stop all oil imports coming in from my State of Alaska, from oil produced in the United States, whether it be from California, Kentucky, or Pennsylvania, or im-

ported into this country from overseas. That is what it would take to equal a 6 months' supply of oil.

That Prudhoe Bay has supplied the Nation with 20 to 25 percent of crude oil for the last 25 years—and the likelihood is this field is larger than Prudhoe Bay and would immediately flow in the area of somewhere in excess of 1 million barrels a day—is the reality about which we are talking.

It is important Members keep in mind the reality of separating fact from fiction, which again brings me to the fiction associated with the front page of the Washington Post in identifying three little bears as residents of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Clearly, they are not, and we will have certification from the photographer as soon as we can obtain it relative to the exact location of where the picture of the three bears was taken.

Mr. President, thank you for indulging me additional time. I yield to my good friend from Nevada, if he is seeking recognition at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as we speak, there is a meeting of the Finance Committee taking place. There are 10 Democrats on that committee and 10 Republicans. I have tried today but really literally have been able to spend no more than 3 or 4 minutes watching the proceedings. They have been going on all day. I understand they will go on into the night trying to come up with a tax bill we call reconciliation.

I have heard in the last few minutes that there is going to be an attempt tomorrow to bring that bill before the Senate. I hope the majority understands there are 40 Democrats and 40 Republicans who do not sit on the Finance Committee. It is a prestigious committee, I understand, but the members cannot speak for the rest of us, either Democrats or Republicans.

I very much want to have the opportunity to look through certain parts of that bill. It is going to be a very large piece of legislation. I doubt I will be able to read all of it, but I want to read parts of it. I have a staff that will read every word of it and bring to my attention those things I have not looked at first.

I have a staff that I think is well equipped to peruse that bill, but I just cannot imagine that we would go to that bill tomorrow without Members of the Senate having an opportunity to look at that legislation. That is how we get into trouble legislatively.

It is unfair to the American people. I have said from the very beginning we are doing well. We have a surplus. We deserve a tax cut. The American people, the people of Nevada deserve a tax cut, and they should get an immediate tax cut. But that tax cut should be given to them with deliberation. We

should make sure we understand every provision in that very important legislation. I cannot imagine a legislator voting for or against that bill not having the opportunity to read it.

I hope we slow down. We can work on this bill Thursday or next Monday or Tuesday just as well as we can tomorrow. What I prefer, when they report that bill out of committee, is we have several days to look at it.

I repeat, there is no effort on this Senator's part to unduly delay proceedings. There are all kinds of ways we can do that. There has been talk, if this proceeding goes forward as indicated, that people will file lots and lots of amendments, and we would have to vote on every one of them and the voting would take several weeks.

There are methods of slowing this down. I hope we will not have to resort to any of those. I hope we have ample time for us and for our staffs to review this legislation in some detail.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to my friend from North Dakota, whom I appreciate being here. I say prior to yielding, I served in the House with my friend from North Dakota. I looked to him when we served together. He was one of the leaders of issues dealing with money. He was on the Ways and Means Committee, which is the comparable committee to the Finance Committee in the Senate.

I will be happy to yield to my friend from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada makes a critically important point. It is important for all of us to think through this process and this strategy. We are blessed with a wonderful country that has had an economy that has produced jobs and expansion and opportunity in the last years. We want to make sure we do not create a fiscal policy that turns that around and moves us back into big Federal budget deficits and economic contraction rather than expansion.

The Congress is now, in a new day, set to provide some tax breaks because we are at this point experiencing some budget surpluses.

I support tax cuts. They need to be thoughtful and reasonable. They need to be fair to all the American people. But what I worry about is we are told that the Finance Committee is now writing a tax bill. It is now 6:30 in the evening. I understand there are over 120 amendments to that bill that have been filed. They are sitting over in, I believe, 216 of the Hart Building going through amendments. If they do finish tonight, I expect they will work until the wee hours of the morning.

We are told—I do not know if this is the case—we are told that at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the Senate will be confronted with the reconciliation bill, the tax bill that is being written this evening. If that is brought before the full Senate for consideration at 10

o'clock in the morning, I ask who in the Senate, A, has read it; B, knows what is in it; and C, has studied it enough to evaluate what kind of amendments they may or may not offer.

The answer to that question—I will answer it myself—is nobody. Not one Member of the Senate will have the foggiest notion of what is in that bill. So bringing that bill up tomorrow at 10 o'clock in the morning will be a disservice to this body and a disservice, in my judgment, to good sound fiscal policy for this country.

We are talking, after all, about a proposal that will affect Federal revenues for well over a decade. We are talking about affecting Federal revenues for over 10 years. This tax bill is put together with the prospect that we will always have budget surpluses in our future, something I hope we will have, but there is no guarantee that will be the case. There is still such a thing as a business cycle, and there is still a contraction phase in the business cycle.

I worry very much we may not experience the surpluses, and if we put in a very large tax cut that some are proposing to do, the bulk of which, by the way, will go to the largest income earners in the country, if we do that in a way that is thoughtless rather than thoughtful, we will throw this country into very significant trouble.

I implore the majority leader and those involved in scheduling not to tell us that the Finance Committee will finish at midnight tonight and, oh, by the way, we will bring that before the Senate at 10 a.m. tomorrow knowing we have not read it, knowing we have not studied it, and knowing we would not have an opportunity to figure out what amendments might be necessary. We will do it and do it under a reconciliation proposal, which is a complete fraud as we know—it was never intended for this purpose—and it will be limited to 20 hours of debate on a bill that is worth trillions of dollars that will affect this country's revenues for the next decade. Is that a thoughtful or a thoughtless way to legislate? My hope is that we can persuade those in charge to understand the best way to do this would be to go through this committee, the Finance Committee, report a bill to the floor, have it printed—God forbid, that should be a radical thought, to have a bill printed—have it on the desks of Members of the Senate, have people study the bill, evaluate what its consequences might be for the country, figure out who gets what, whether it is a fair tax cut, and then come back and debate it after having a couple of days of study and evaluation, offer amendments, and proceed to decide exactly how the Senate wants to work its will on this important issue.

I ask the Senator from Nevada, does the Senator from Nevada think if they bring this to the floor at 10 o'clock in the morning that there is anyone in the Senate, save for those who serve on

the Finance Committee, who will know what is in that piece of legislation?

Mr. REID. I answer my friend from North Dakota by saying I think there are several, of the 20 who serve on the committee, who would have a foggy idea of what is in various parts of that bill. Not even every member of the Finance Committee would have a foggy idea of what is in the bill. And certainly the 80 people who do not serve on the committee would not have the slightest idea of what is in that legislation. The Senator from North Dakota is correct.

I also say to my friend who has served in the Congress longer than I, I have known of occurrences when these bills are rushed through that mistakes are made: printing errors, people not having had the opportunity to look at them. Also, some mischievous things have happened. We know during the budget that was debated a couple of weeks ago in the House of Representatives, there were two very important pages missing that they found at 2 o'clock in the morning. Those were the pages dealing with how we would handle, in the budget, the tax measures. Whether it was done on purpose or not I do not know. The fact is those pages were found to be missing and it was necessary to put that over for a couple of days.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, I think the majority would be so much better served, our country would be better served, if we had the opportunity to have this week to study this legislation, come back Monday, we could come in at 9 o'clock in the morning—it doesn't matter to this Senator. We could have ample time next week. There are 20 hours to debate it. We could have some thoughtful amendments prepared.

I am stating to anyone within the sound of my voice that there may be some Senators who feel so strongly about this basic principle, that before you vote on something you should be able to read it, who have this radical idea that they want to have a bill that involves trillions of dollars and, as the Senator has indicated, will involve fiscal policy for this country for more than 10 years—they have this radical idea they would like to understand a little bit before they vote on it. They may feel so strongly that they may file a thousand amendments on this legislation, and the rules are that we only have 20 hours of debate, but we can have a thousand days of voting on amendments.

It would seem to me to serve everyone's best interests if we approach this in a deliberative manner, recognizing there are only 20 hours of debate on it. We could take it up Monday or Tuesday, finish it next week.

I say to my friend from North Dakota, I will be happy to yield to him to answer that question. Does it not seem to make sense with a piece of legislation that will be huge, to have some idea what is in it before we are required to vote on final passage of this

most important legislation to people of Nevada, North Dakota, and all over this country?

Mr. DORGAN. The Senator from Nevada yields, and I appreciate that. I only have this to say. The people of America don't care, I am sure, whether you or I or anyone else has the opportunity to speak as long as we might want to speak on anything. They could not care less. Nobody is going to walk around with a bad attitude because somebody here doesn't have enough time to talk on the floor of the Senate.

What is important, if we are going to cut benefits, is who gets the benefit of those tax cuts? I wondered in school whether fractions would ever come in handy. We studied them in the lower grades. Let me give a couple of simple fractions.

From a briefing, I understand, over in the Finance Committee right now the chairman's mark—which is going to pass and be brought to the floor and apparently going to be brought here at 10 o'clock in the morning—does the following: The top 1 percent of the American income earners pay about a quarter of the taxes. They are going to get about a third of the tax cuts.

Let me say that again because I think it is important. The top 1 percent of the income earners in America pay about a quarter of the taxes, one-fourth of the taxes. But the tax bill that is going to come here at 10 in the morning gives them a third of the tax cuts.

I did take fractions. I didn't go way beyond fractions in my little school, but I understand fractions enough to understand that is not fair. Why not take some of that tax cut back, which is above that which should go to the top 1 percent, and give it back to the folks in the rest of the 99 percent and say: If we are going to give taxes back, let's make sure everybody is treated fairly. Wouldn't everybody at every tax bracket like to have a little more back than they pay in? The top 1 percent do. They get it under this bill.

As we take a look at all this and ask ourselves are we going to have a chance to dig into this, offer amendments, understand it, make changes, the answer is: If the bill is not written, except that provision, of course, is already in the chairman's mark and we know he has the votes to get that out—if this bill isn't written, they have 120 or so additional amendments they are going to consider this evening. Now we are told they want to bring it to the floor at 10 o'clock in the morning?

I just ask the question, not so much on my behalf but on behalf of the American people who are not going to get the benefit of getting a bigger tax cut than the proportion of that which they paid in in taxes, would it be fair to have everybody take a look at this and see if maybe there is not a little better way to cut this pie? There are only so many pieces when you cut these pies up. It seems to me there is kind of this hog-in-the-corn-crib ap-

proach to some of these things around here. The same people always get the biggest slice. Did you ever notice that? The same interests always seem to end up with the biggest slice.

That is what I fear is going to happen here. It is not that I oppose a tax cut. I do not oppose a tax cut. In fact, I support a tax cut. We have a surplus. Some of that ought to go back to the American people in the form of a tax cut. But it ought to be fair. It ought to be a circumstance where a lot of people who do not have lobbyists walking around this building or haven't been able to afford people to represent their interests, those people, somewhere on the floor of the Senate, ought to have people to dissect this, take it apart and evaluate who is getting a fair piece. Whose slice of this tax cut is appropriate? Whose slice is too large?

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The other Senator from North Dakota, I spoke to him right down in the well of the Senate a half hour ago. He left the Finance Committee to come to vote.

I said: How are things going, Senator CONRAD?

He said: You can't believe some of the things that are going on there. He said: For example, so that they do not raid the Social Security trust fund this year, they put off one provision for 15 days so they will not raid it for 15 days so they can go around and say we did not raid the trust fund this year—but we will do it in 15 days when it cuts in.

I would like to read that. I would like Senator CONRAD or someone on my staff to point out where it is they did that.

Mr. DORGAN. If you remember a couple of years ago, they created a 13th month—sort of the same tactic, perhaps by the same people.

Mr. REID. I remember that. Thanks for reminding me.

The Senator from North Dakota, Senator CONRAD, also said to me, one of the provisions in here had a sunset provision so things would just stop and have to start all over at a certain time. That was something that they have also, as of a half hour ago, a kind of gimmick, the sunset provision. They changed it only a matter of a few hours.

There are some things going on that should be open. Sunshine should shine on this bill so everyone has a chance to look at what is in it.

Maybe my suspicions are all wrong—I hope so; I hope everything has been done aboveboard—that the Medicare trust fund is not violated, as I think it is. I hope the Social Security trust fund is held inviolate, that it is not also raided so people get these tax cuts. The people of Nevada want tax cuts, but they do not want them at the expense of taking money from the Medicare trust fund or the Social Security trust fund. So all I am saying is, let's

take a look at this bill and see whether that, in fact, is the case.

Would the Senator agree that those are a couple of examples, whether valid or not, and we should check to see if they are by reading the bill?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Nevada, he is absolutely correct. This rush here seems to me to be inappropriate if, in fact, they bring a bill to the floor tomorrow at 10 a.m. that has not yet been written—it is now 20 minutes to 7 here in Washington, DC—the bill has not yet been completed, and there are 100 and some amendments remaining. They are over in the Hart Building finishing it. It will be brought over to the Senate. I guarantee it will not be printed. They will have one copy at the desk. Someone may have made some copies, some Xerox copies, and hope they don't lose a couple pages this time. A couple weeks ago they lost a couple pages and held things up. But that is not the way to legislate.

It seems to me the thoughtful way to do this would be to move this through the Finance Committee, have it printed, bring it to the floor, lay it over at least 1 day—it should be more than that—give people an opportunity to study it, and determine what is in it and how they might wish to amend it.

There is an old saying I mentioned before in this Senate Chamber: Never buy something from somebody who is out of breath. There is a kind of breathless quality to this rush: We must rush; We must get this done immediately; We must bring this bill to the floor immediately.

That is not fair. It is not fair in terms of those who come to this Senate wanting to represent their constituents, wanting to know what is in it for various income groups, various occupations. How will it affect their constituents? How will it affect the people living in their State? In order to do that, they will need to see how the bill is written and be able to evaluate it with their legislative assistants.

Just making a final point to the Senator from Nevada, I did serve in the other body, in the House, and served for 10 years on the Ways and Means Committee. We wrote tax law. We had done this many times, where we would write a rather complicated piece of legislation. But it has generally been the case that when you write tax law, and write legislation that is complicated—and tax law by definition is always complicated—you give people an opportunity to evaluate it, to think through it, to try to understand what kind of changes they would like to make; and then have the body work its will.

There is, as I said, a kind of breathless quality around here to rushing this thing through. I am not quite sure I understand why. As I indicated, this will affect our country for a decade. This is big stakes. It will have significant impacts on our economy, on the condition of the American economy, the rates of economic growth. I am not

sure how. I am not sure anybody understands how. But we ought to all be given the opportunity to think through and evaluate what is in it, what it means to our country, what it means for the American people in general, and what it means for income groups and occupations, and so on.

The only way we can do that is to have the time. So I urge the majority leader, do not try to do that tomorrow. Do not bring a bill up tomorrow that has not yet been printed and ask the Senate, under 20 hours of time, to begin debating and trying to amend a piece of legislation that has not yet been printed. That is not fair to the Senate and that is not a thoughtful way to legislate.

Mr. REID. If the Senator would yield, I think we have to make sure that people understand this is not some stalling game we are playing. This bill is fast tracked. We have 20 hours to debate it. The majority has a right to yield back 10 of those hours. So it could be done in 1 day.

But I do not think it is a radical proposal when I say for the people I represent—the 2 million people I represent—I would sure like to read this bill first, have my staff review this bill first. I do not think that is asking too much. That is all we are asking.

I think the majority is buying themselves a lot of trouble by trying to fast track this. There is no reason to do this. Let us look at the legislation. We are going to offer amendments anyway. We might as well offer amendments that have some bearing on the bill we have read rather than one we have heard about reported in the press.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

PRAYERS FOR THE CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I was here this morning when the Senate was opened and the Chaplain gave a prayer. The prayer was dedicated to the police officers all over the country because this week we honor these brave men and women who have lost their lives in the line of duty. We recognize them. But the part of the prayer the Chaplain gave that I thought was so moving was directed to our Capitol Police force.

We take for granted these men and women who stand at the doors and patrol these large facilities. We take them for granted because we don't see them often directing traffic or arresting people, even though they do that. In fact, we know they are moments away from danger or terror at all times of the day.

That was recognized a few years ago when two of our finest were gunned down blocking an entrance to this building saving the life of the majority whip in the House of Representatives.

I appreciate the prayer of the Chaplain. These men and women do a remarkable job for the country.

All around the world today there are evil people who if they could figure a

way to do damage to these representative buildings of this great democracy or to the people who work in them, would do whatever evil they could. But what keeps them from doing that is the Capitol Police force. They are well trained. We are now, in fact, working towards developing our own academies so these men and women can be trained in this area and not have to travel hundreds of miles away in Georgia to do their training.

There is no better trained police force any place in the world than the Capitol Police. Whatever the danger, whether it is a bomb threat, the need to call in a SWAT Team, or protecting the many dignitaries who come here, they do it, and they do it very well—without any fanfare and without seeking any glory or aggrandizement of any kind.

Again, I very much appreciate the prayer of the Chaplain today. I hope we will all join in recognizing the fine work done by the men and women of our Capitol Police force. Every day I see them I recognize they are there to protect me, my family, the people of this country, and these beautiful buildings in which we have the privilege of working.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY last month. 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 detail a heinous crime that occurred October 29, 1999 in Indianapolis, Indiana. A trio of men, while allegedly committing a series of robberies, broke into the apartment of two men. Convinced that the men were gay, the perpetrators forced the men to strip, tied them together, and tortured them with a hot iron. During the attack that lasted more than 30 minutes, both victims were burned repeatedly, kicked, beaten with a small baseball bat and other household items, and taunted with homophobic remarks. One of the victims was forced to drink a mixture of bleach and urine. The robbers also tried to burn the building down on their way out but later inexplicably returned, put out the fire, and gave some water to the man they made drink the bleach mixture. The robbers walked away from the scene after having stolen \$6.

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.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I speak today in strong support of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution introduced by Chairman BOND and myself, recognizing the important role played by the Small Business Administration on behalf of the United States small business community. I am pleased to say that nearly every Senator on the Small Business Committee has cosponsored this important Resolution. I would like to thank Senators BURNS, LEVIN, BENNETT, HARKIN, SNOWE, LIEBERMAN, ENZI, WELLSTONE, CRAPO, CLELAND, ENSIGN, LANDRIEU, EDWARDS, and CANTWELL for showing their support for America's small businesses by cosponsoring this Resolution.

Mr. President, small businesses keep the U.S. economy moving. They are responsible for employing more than 52 percent of the private workforce; for generating more than 51 percent of the nation's gross domestic product; and are the principal source of new jobs. They were also responsible for helping to end the recession of the early 1990's, and with the right programs and assistance, will be a major factor in sustaining our current economy.

To help them achieve success, small businesses rely on a range of programs administered and monitored by the Small Business Administration (SBA), such as the Small Business Innovation Research Program (SBIR), the 7(a) Guaranteed Loan Program, the 8(a) Business Development Program, the Small Business Development Center and Women's Business Center Programs, and the New Markets Venture Capital Program. And these are just a few of the many initiatives that continue to receive widespread support from the Senate and House Committees on Small Business, as well as the Congress as a whole. Our resolution commends the SBA for their activities, and calls on the President to make every effort to strengthen and expand assistance to small business concerns through Federal programs.

SBA programs are relied upon to help restore economically depressed communities, spur technological innovation, provide access to capital, train entrepreneurs, monitor the procurement practices of Federal agencies, and ensure small businesses are heard when new regulations are being developed. Unfortunately, the SBA has received increasing responsibilities without the necessary increase in resources to do the job as effectively as possible.

To make the situation worse, the Bush administration's budget request for fiscal year 2002 is woefully inadequate and goes in the wrong direction. President Bush has consistently stated that the economy is in a period of economic decline, yet he has proposed limiting the resources available to our small businesses by cutting funding and charging additional fees for programs that create businesses and jobs, and help generate revenue for the American people.