Unfortunately, S. 1499 came to the Senate floor without debate, without committee hearings, and without an opportunity for concerns about the bill to be raised and addressed. No CBO score was released, depriving those who are fiscally-responsible of a cost estimate of this legislation. Yet the Senate leadership attempted to pass this bill without affording us any opportunity to offer amendments.

Scarcely any explanation of this bill's provisions was ever offered before it was moved to the Senate floor—and that is extremely troubling.

We do know now that the costs of this bill—as much as $815 million—would actually exceed the entire 2002 budget for the Small Business Administration, nearly doubling it, at a time of a economic slowdown.

Additionally, the agency responsible for carrying out this legislation—the Small Business Administration (SBA)—has raised a number of concerns about this bill that have not been adequately addressed.

First, some of the provisions of the Kerry bill duplicate efforts already underway by the Bush administration. After the terrorist attacks, the SBA established the September 11 Emergency Injury Disaster Loan, EIDL, assistance program to make loans available to small businesses throughout the United States, who could demonstrate economic injury as a result of the terrorist attacks.

This was an appropriate and necessary response. I emphasize, Mr. President: these loans already are being made available.

In addition to duplication of ongoing efforts, the SBA also expressed the concern that provisions of the Kerry bill would actually increase the number of small-business loan defaults, at the expense of the American taxpayer.

As the SBA wrote in a letter to the sponsors of this measure:

> By relaxing credit requirements, reducing interest rates, eliminating fees, increasing the government guarantee, deferring principal payments, forgiving interest and increasing government liability, S. 1499 could make government-guaranteed small business loans more attractive than conventional loans, potentially displacing private sector options. In addition, S. 1499 significantly reduces lender and borrower stakes in a loan, thereby increasing the likelihood of default.

Certainly the sponsors of this measure do not want to promote defaults. After all, the goal of small-business assistance is to help entrepreneurs build, sustain and grow small businesses, with sound and fiscally-responsible loan assistance programs.

The existing EIDL assistance program provides a reasonable mechanism for needed aid by offering up to $1.5 million in emergency loans to small businesses at four percent interest over 30 years. Loans are not intended purely as a means of disaster relief.

Additionally, S. 1499's language is so broad that loan assistance could be provided to any small business that have ''been, or, that (are) likely to be directly or indirectly adversely affected'' by the terrorist attacks. Obviously, such language is ripe for abuse and could lead to exorbitant costs for the American taxpayer. Surely, this is not what the bill sponsors intended from this provision.

Lastly, the Small Business Administration expresses concerns regarding S. 1499's provisions providing emergency relief for Federal contractors. The provisions would allow an increase in the price of a federal contract that is performed by a small business in order to offset losses resulting from increased security measures taken by the Federal government at Federal facilities. As the SBA points out: ''providing equitable relief through SBA acting as a central clearing house would prove inefficient, costly, and burdensome on the Federal acquisition process.''

All of us want to come to the aid of small businesses adversely affected by the September 11 attacks and their aftermath. But we can do so in a cost-effective and responsible way, instead of a rushed, haphazard process designed to thwart compromise.

I am confident that a bipartisan compromise on this issue can be found in the near-term, so that the concerns raised by the administration can be taken into account, and we can pass something the President will support.

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 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 October 7, 1998 in Traverse City, MI. A gay man was attacked by two men yelling anti-gay epithets. The assailants, Jeremy Jamrog, 21, and James Johnson, 24, were charged with aggravated assault in connection with the incident.

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.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS TASK FORCE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I stand here today to pay tribute to a group of Americans who have worked tirelessly to protect all of us. Following the tragic events of September 11, Al Lenhardt, the Senate Sergeant at Arms and Chairman of the U.S. Capitol Police Board recognized the value of bringing together a group of experts from outside the legislative branch to provide the expertise necessary to respond to this unprecedented attack on America. He brought in a team of experts and created the Legislative Branch Emergency Preparedness Task Force to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the Capitol Complex and provide recommendations that would enhance our security.

This extraordinary group of experts could quite easily have taken a simplistic approach and recommended turning the Capitol into an armed camp. Fortunately, they recognized that this building, known throughout the world as a symbol of freedom and democracy, is first and foremost the public's domain and must remain so. Instead of taking the easy route, they developed a carefully crafted series of measures which enhanced the security of everyone who walks through these doors Members of Congress, staff and visitors alike without denying the American people their right to see and meet with their elected representatives. They ensured that the Capitol remained ''the People's House.''

Mr. Gary Quay of the Department of Defense, Colonel Richard Majauskas, Lieutenant Colonel Donald Salo and Lieutenant Colonel Stanley Tunstall of the Army, Lieutenant Commander David Klain of the Navy, Deputy Chief Chris McGaffin and Captain Edward Bailor of the U.S. Capitol Police, Mr. Michael DiSilvestro of the Office of Senate Security, Mr. Michael Johnson of the Senate Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Kevin Brennan of the House Sergeant at Arms, and Mr. Bill Weidemeyer and Mr. Jim Powers of the Architect of the Capitol dedicated themselves to the task of looking at every aspect of emergency preparedness on Capitol Hill.

All of us remember the confusion that reigned on September 11. In light of what happened, that confusion was perfectly understandable. After all, never before had someone turned one commercial airliner into a weapon of mass destruction, let alone four. I am convinced that the rapid implementation of the Task Force's recommendations by Jeri Thomson, the Secretary of the Senate, Alan Hantman, the Architect of the Capitol, and Jim Varey, Chief of the U.S. Capitol Police, has significantly enhanced our ability to respond to emergencies and will prevent a repeat of that day's confusion.

In a world where cynicism and selfishness rule the day for some, I am proud to say this is not the case for these dedicated Americans. The safety of our nation's Capitol, and all who work in and visit it, is enhanced by their efforts. On behalf of Americans