

the smoking distinction, and included workers exposed after 1971. Especially important was the requirement to take into consideration and incorporate, to the fullest extent feasible, the compensation claims process for Navajo claimants to conform to Navajo law, tradition, and customs. For example, claims should be based on traditional ties of family.

One of the champions in this fight was a man by the name of Paul Hicks. He passed away recently and is unable to be with us and witness this victory. I also want to thank the Navajo Nation, President Kelsey A. Begaye, Vice-President Taylor McKenzie, Speaker Edward T. Begay, Mr. Phillip Harrison, Mr. Gilbert Badoni, Mrs. Sarah Benally, and Mr. Melton Martinez and all the others who have worked so hard on this effort.

The Navajos are taught to respect, honor, and take care of their elders. We can do no less. Many of these workers are now dying. They desperately need justice. They cannot afford to wait for Congress to act. We need to pass this bill. Justice delayed is justice denied.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support S. 1515, "The Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of 2000," which updates the 1990 law that currently compensates individuals exposed to radiation by either being downwind of a nuclear test blast or by being involved in the mining of uranium ore during the Cold War.

Uranium is used by our Government in the production of nuclear weapons. This legislation increases the number of radiogenic and chronic diseases compensable under the Act. The bill also increases the number of individual and states eligible for compensation based on scientific and medical information gathered over the past decade.

I would like to address the issue of attorneys' fees in the bill. The original version of the bill reduces the 10% limitation on attorneys' fees to 2%. While I generally do not support limitations on attorneys' fees, I will not oppose the compromise language in the manager's amendment that was reached between Representatives FRANK, SMITH, and HYDE. The compromise language reduces the 10% limitation on attorneys' fees in the bill to 2%, but retains the 10% limitation in existing cases and in cases where there is a resubmission of a denied claim.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today is important because it relieves suffering and pain that is brought on by illness. Illness that was contracted due to activity by the United States government. S. 1515, the "Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of 1999." On October 15, 1990, Congress passed the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990 (RECA), which provided for compassionate payments to individuals who suffered from specified diseases presumably as a result of exposure to radiation in connection with the federal government's nuclear weapons testing program. Among those eligible for compensation under the Act are individuals who were employed in underground uranium mines in Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah or Wyoming during the 1947 to 1971 time period, who were exposed to specified minimum levels of radon, and who contracted specified lung disorders. The Department of Justice administers the RECA through the Radiation Exposure Program.

The bill before us today, The Radiation Exposure Compensation Act Amendments of

1999, would reform and expand the 1990 law which was enacted to provide fair and swift compensation for those miners and downwinders who contracted certain radiation-related illnesses. Primary changes to RECA outlined in this bill include: expanding the list of compensable diseases to include new cancers, including leukemia, thyroid and brain cancer. It also includes certain non-cancer diseases, including pulmonary fibrosis. Medical science has been able to link these diseases to uranium mining in the 10 years since the enactment of the original RECA.

This bill is a positive step in the right direction. However, I do have several concerns. The first is to point out that the Congressional Budget Office has scored this at almost \$1 billion over the course of five years. The CBO has estimated that this bill will cost \$500 million in the next three years. If this bill is going to pass, then the appropriators must do their job to ensure that the RECA fund has enough money to administer these claims, and relieve the suffering of these claimants.

When RECA was initially passed in 1990, the principal authors of the legislation recognized that the federal government owed a special duty under RECA to the Navajo uranium miners due to the violation during the mining operations of the government's trust responsibilities. Thousands of men who were members of the Navajo nation who worked in these mines not only were uninformed of the extreme dangers of uranium (which is harmful if touched, inhaled, or digested), but were ordered into the mine by the American contractors immediately after blasting, when uranium dust was thick in the air. Headaches and nosebleeds resulted, and many of these Navajo miners still suffer the long term effects of their experience.

S. 1515 requires the Department of Justice to take Native American law and customs into account when deciding these claims. This legislation also directs the Justice Department to be more attuned to the culture and customs of American Indian claimants.

Since the RECA trust fund began making awards in 1992, the Justice Department has approved a total of 3,135 claims valued at nearly \$232 million. In New Mexico, there have been 371 claims approved with a value of nearly \$37 million. The Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund is designed to compensate victims and their families who were affected by radiation fall-out from open air nuclear testing and radiation mining from the 1950s through the 1970s. This legislation extends the trust fund and establishes a grant program to states for education, prevention, and early detection of radiogenic cancers and diseases.

This is a good bill and I fully support its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1515, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANY PROGRAM IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 533) providing for the concurrence by the House with an amendment in the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 2614.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 533

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 2614, with the amendment of the Senate thereto, and to have concurred in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Certified Development Company Program Improvements Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES.

Section 501(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695(d)(3)(C)) is amended by inserting before the comma "or women-owned business development".

SEC. 3. MAXIMUM DEBENTURE SIZE.

Section 502(2) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 696(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) LOAN LIMITS.—Loans made by the Administration under this section shall be limited to \$1,000,000 for each such identifiable small business concern, other than loans meeting the criteria specified in section 501(d)(3), which shall be limited to \$1,300,000 for each such identifiable small business concern."

SEC. 4. FEES.

Section 503(f) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The fees authorized by subsections (b) and (d) shall apply to any financing approved by the Administration during the period beginning on October 1, 1996 and ending on September 30, 2003."

SEC. 5. PREMIER CERTIFIED LENDERS PROGRAM.

Section 217(b) of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1994 (15 U.S.C. 697e note) is repealed.

SEC. 6. SALE OF CERTAIN DEFAULTED LOANS.

Section 508 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 697e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "On a pilot program basis, the" and inserting "The";

(2) by redesignating subsections (d) though (i) as subsections (e) though (j), respectively;

(3) in subsection (f) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking "subsection (f)" and inserting "subsection (g)";

(4) in subsection (h) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by striking "subsection (f)" and inserting "subsection (g)"; and

(5) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) SALE OF CERTAIN DEFAULTED LOANS.—

"(1) NOTICE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If, upon default in repayment, the Administration acquires a loan guaranteed under this section and identifies such loan for inclusion in a bulk asset sale of defaulted or repurchased loans or other financings, the Administration shall give prior notice thereof to any certified development company that has a contingent liability under this section.

“(B) TIMING.—The notice required by subparagraph (A) shall be given to the certified development company as soon as possible after the financing is identified, but not later than 90 days before the date on which the Administration first makes any record on such financing available for examination by prospective purchasers prior to its offering in a package of loans for bulk sale.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—The Administration may not offer any loan described in paragraph (1)(A) as part of a bulk sale, unless the Administration—

“(A) provides prospective purchasers with the opportunity to examine the records of the Administration with respect to such loan; and

“(B) provides the notice required by paragraph (1).”.

SEC. 7. LOAN LIQUIDATION.

(a) LIQUIDATION AND FORECLOSURE.—Title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 510. FORECLOSURE AND LIQUIDATION OF LOANS.

“(a) DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.—In accordance with this section, the Administration shall delegate to any qualified State or local development company (as defined in section 503(e)) that meets the eligibility requirements of subsection (b)(1) of this section the authority to foreclose and liquidate, or to otherwise treat in accordance with this section, defaulted loans in its portfolio that are funded with the proceeds of debentures guaranteed by the Administration under section 503.

“(b) ELIGIBILITY FOR DELEGATION.—

“(1) REQUIREMENTS.—A qualified State or local development company shall be eligible for a delegation of authority under subsection (a) if—

“(A) the company—

“(i) has participated in the loan liquidation pilot program established by the Small Business Programs Improvement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 695 note), as in effect on the day before the date of issuance of final regulations by the Administration implementing this section;

“(ii) is participating in the Premier Certified Lenders Program under section 508; or

“(iii) during the 3 fiscal years immediately prior to seeking such a delegation, has made an average of not fewer than 10 loans per year that are funded with the proceeds of debentures guaranteed under section 503; and

“(B) the company—

“(i) has 1 or more employees—

“(I) with not less than 2 years of substantive, decision-making experience in administering the liquidation and workout of problem loans secured in a manner substantially similar to loans funded with the proceeds of debentures guaranteed under section 503; and

“(II) who have completed a training program on loan liquidation developed by the Administration in conjunction with qualified State and local development companies that meet the requirements of this paragraph; or

“(ii) submits to the Administration documentation demonstrating that the company has contracted with a qualified third-party to perform any liquidation activities and secures the approval of the contract by the Administration with respect to the qualifications of the contractor and the terms and conditions of liquidation activities.

“(2) CONFIRMATION.—On request, the Administration shall examine the qualifications of any company described in subsection (a) to determine if such company is eligible for the delegation of authority under this section. If the Administration determines that a company is not eligible, the Adminis-

tration shall provide the company with the reasons for such ineligibility.

“(c) SCOPE OF DELEGATED AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each qualified State or local development company to which the Administration delegates authority under subsection (a) may, with respect to any loan described in subsection (a)—

“(A) perform all liquidation and foreclosure functions, including the purchase in accordance with this subsection of any other indebtedness secured by the property securing the loan, in a reasonable and sound manner, according to commercially accepted practices, pursuant to a liquidation plan approved in advance by the Administration under paragraph (2)(A);

“(B) litigate any matter relating to the performance of the functions described in subparagraph (A), except that the Administration may—

“(i) defend or bring any claim if—

“(I) the outcome of the litigation may adversely affect management by the Administration of the loan program established under section 502; or

“(II) the Administration is entitled to legal remedies not available to a qualified State or local development company, and such remedies will benefit either the Administration or the qualified State or local development company; or

“(ii) oversee the conduct of any such litigation; and

“(C) take other appropriate actions to mitigate loan losses in lieu of total liquidation or foreclosure, including the restructuring of a loan in accordance with prudent loan servicing practices and pursuant to a workout plan approved in advance by the Administration under paragraph (2)(C).

“(2) ADMINISTRATION APPROVAL.—

“(A) LIQUIDATION PLAN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Before carrying out functions described in paragraph (1)(A), a qualified State or local development company shall submit to the Administration a proposed liquidation plan.

“(ii) ADMINISTRATION ACTION ON PLAN.—

“(1) TIMING.—Not later than 15 business days after a liquidation plan is received by the Administration under clause (i), the Administration shall approve or reject the plan.

“(II) NOTICE OF NO DECISION.—With respect to any liquidation plan that cannot be approved or denied within the 15-day period required by subclause (I), the Administration shall, during such period, provide notice in accordance with subparagraph (E) to the company that submitted the plan.

“(iii) ROUTINE ACTIONS.—In carrying out functions described in paragraph (1)(A), a qualified State or local development company may undertake any routine action not addressed in a liquidation plan without obtaining additional approval from the Administration.

“(B) PURCHASE OF INDEBTEDNESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out functions described in paragraph (1)(A), a qualified State or local development company shall submit to the Administration a request for written approval before committing the Administration to the purchase of any other indebtedness secured by the property securing a defaulted loan.

“(ii) ADMINISTRATION ACTION ON REQUEST.—

“(1) TIMING.—Not later than 15 business days after receiving a request under clause (i), the Administration shall approve or deny the request.

“(II) NOTICE OF NO DECISION.—With respect to any request that cannot be approved or denied within the 15-day period required by subclause (I), the Administration shall, during such period, provide notice in accordance with subparagraph (E) to the company that submitted the request.

“(C) WORKOUT PLAN.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out functions described in paragraph (1)(C), a qualified State or local development company shall submit to the Administration a proposed workout plan.

“(ii) ADMINISTRATION ACTION ON PLAN.—

“(1) TIMING.—Not later than 15 business days after a workout plan is received by the Administration under clause (i), the Administration shall approve or reject the plan.

“(II) NOTICE OF NO DECISION.—With respect to any workout plan that cannot be approved or denied within the 15-day period required by subclause (I), the Administration shall, during such period, provide notice in accordance with subparagraph (E) to the company that submitted the plan.

“(D) COMPROMISE OF INDEBTEDNESS.—In carrying out functions described in paragraph (1)(A), a qualified State or local development company may—

“(i) consider an offer made by an obligor to compromise the debt for less than the full amount owing; and

“(ii) pursuant to such an offer, release any obligor or other party contingently liable, if the company secures the written approval of the Administration.

“(E) CONTENTS OF NOTICE OF NO DECISION.—Any notice provided by the Administration under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II), (B)(ii)(II), or (C)(ii)(II)—

“(i) shall be in writing;

“(ii) shall state the specific reason for the inability of the Administration to act on the subject plan or request;

“(iii) shall include an estimate of the additional time required by the Administration to act on the plan or request; and

“(iv) if the Administration cannot act because insufficient information or documentation was provided by the company submitting the plan or request, shall specify the nature of such additional information or documentation.

“(3) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—In carrying out functions described in paragraph (1), a qualified State or local development company shall take no action that would result in an actual or apparent conflict of interest between the company (or any employee of the company) and any third party lender (or any associate of a third party lender) or any other person participating in a liquidation, foreclosure, or loss mitigation action.

“(d) SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Administration may revoke or suspend a delegation of authority under this section to any qualified State or local development company, if the Administration determines that the company—

“(1) does not meet the requirements of subsection (b)(1);

“(2) has violated any applicable rule or regulation of the Administration or any other applicable provision of law; or

“(3) has failed to comply with any reporting requirement that may be established by the Administration relating to carrying out functions described in subsection (c)(1).

“(e) REPORT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Based on information provided by qualified State and local development companies and the Administration, the Administration shall annually submit to the Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the results of delegation of authority under this section.

“(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

“(A) with respect to each loan foreclosed or liquidated by a qualified State or local development company under this section, or for which losses were otherwise mitigated by the company pursuant to a workout plan under this section—

"(i) the total cost of the project financed with the loan;

"(ii) the total original dollar amount guaranteed by the Administration;

"(iii) the total dollar amount of the loan at the time of liquidation, foreclosure, or mitigation of loss;

"(iv) the total dollar losses resulting from the liquidation, foreclosure, or mitigation of loss; and

"(v) the total recoveries resulting from the liquidation, foreclosure, or mitigation of loss, both as a percentage of the amount guaranteed and the total cost of the project financed;

"(B) with respect to each qualified State or local development company to which authority is delegated under this section, the totals of each of the amounts described in clauses (i) through (v) of subparagraph (A);

"(C) with respect to all loans subject to foreclosure, liquidation, or mitigation under this section, the totals of each of the amounts described in clauses (i) through (v) of subparagraph (A);

"(D) a comparison between—

"(i) the information provided under subparagraph (C) with respect to the 12-month period preceding the date on which the report is submitted; and

"(ii) the same information with respect to loans foreclosed and liquidated, or otherwise treated, by the Administration during the same period; and

"(E) the number of times that the Administration has failed to approve or reject a liquidation plan in accordance with subsection (c)(2)(A) or a workout plan in accordance with subsection (c)(2)(C), or to approve or deny a request for purchase of indebtedness under subsection (c)(2)(B), including specific information regarding the reasons for the failure of the Administration and any delay that resulted."

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out section 510 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) TERMINATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—Effective on the date on which final regulations are issued under paragraph (1), section 204 of the Small Business Programs Improvement Act of 1996 (15 U.S.C. 695 note) shall cease to have legal effect.

SEC. 8. FUNDING LEVELS FOR CERTAIN FINANCINGS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958.

Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) PROGRAM LEVELS FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958 FINANCINGS.—The following program levels are authorized for financings under section 504 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958:

"(1) \$4,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

"(2) \$5,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

"(3) \$6,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2003."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us returns H.R. 2614, the Certified Development

Companies Improvement Act to the Senate. The House originally passed H.R. 2614 last August by a voice vote.

The resolution before us will accept one of the four Senate amendments added during Senate consideration of H.R. 2614 2 weeks ago. The amendment authorizes the 504 program for 3 more years, through fiscal 2003. The resolution rejects the other three Senate amendments.

The three rejected amendments includes language that the House cannot accept.

The first rejected amendment would transfer funds from the DELTA loan program and the guaranteed microloan program to the 7(a) loan program. While we understand the need for the transfer, the amendment violates the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations rules since the funds have dissimilar outlay rates.

The second rejected amendment mandates that, if certain outstanding 504 license applications are not acted upon within 21 days, those licenses shall be deemed approved.

While we agree that the delay at the SBA is unconscionable, Congress should not be in the position of, whenever executive branch inaction arises, stepping in to do their jobs for them. It sets an unhealthy precedent and opens a Pandora's box.

The third rejected amendment changes certain eligibility standards for the HUBZone contracting program. Regardless of its merits, this amendment is best discussed as part of the larger reauthorization legislation. It has no bearing on H.R. 2614 and is best discussed with similar provisions in the reauthorization currently being negotiated with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support the House version of H.R. 2614. It amends the Small Business Investment Act to make changes in the Small Business Administration's section 504 loan program without adding any unnecessary language or issues.

The 504 program guarantees small business loans for construction and renovation and provides nearly \$3 billion of financial assistance every year. It is an important program that needs our unencumbered support.

H.R. 2614 makes five basic changes to the 504 program. It increases the maximum debenture size for section 504 loans from \$750,000 to \$1 million and the size of public policy debenture-backed loans from \$1 million to \$1.3 million. It adds women-owned businesses to the current list of businesses eligible for the larger public policy loans up to \$1.3 million, continuing our efforts to increase assistance to women-owned businesses.

It will reauthorize the fees for the program which keep the 504 program at a zero subsidy rate, covering all the costs resulting in no cost to the taxpayer.

H.R. 2614 will also grant permanent status to the Preferred Certified Lend-

er Program before it sunsets at the end of fiscal year 2000. Finally, to improve recovery rates on defaulting 504 loans, H.R. 2614 makes the Loan Liquidation Pilot Program a permanent program.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to urge my colleagues to support the House amendment to H.R. 2614. It would mean a significant improvement in services to their small business constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a strong supporter of SBA 504 loan programs, I rise in support of House Resolution 533.

The 504 program is one of the most important small business loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration. It represents access to capital for countless entrepreneurs who might not otherwise have a chance to turn their dreams into reality. Since 1980, over 25,000 businesses have received more than \$20 billion in fixed-asset financing through the 504 program.

Mr. Speaker, in August of last year, the House passed a clean bipartisan bill to reauthorize the 504 loan program. That original House bill, which passed under suspension of the rules, was supported by the administration as well as by small businesses and the participating lenders.

The changes made to the legislation streamlined the program, and they also recognized the role that women-owned businesses play in the economy by making lending to women owners a public policy priority. In addition, the bill increased the loan sizes from \$750,000 to \$1 million to keep the pace with inflation and allow more businesses the access to the critical capital they need to expand their business.

These changes in the program represent reasonable improvements to update the program, making it more responsive to the needs of lenders and small businesses alike.

Ten months later, we have received a bill from the other body that includes several nonrelated provisions, some that could potentially be harmful. These changes include reallocating funding to help the 7(a) program. While this is a critical need, the language will constitute appropriating on an authorizing bill. The legislation would also expand the HUBZone program to allow those businesses that no longer reside in low-income areas to continue in the program. This change is contrary to the intention of the HUBZone program and further dilutes its mission.

Finally, the legislation will remove decision-making power regarding certain program licenses from the regulators at SBA. This represents micromanaging at its worst.

Moreover, these changes divert us from the original purpose of the 504 program which must be reauthorized quickly to ensure that it continues to

provide access to critical capital for our Nation's small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the 504 program serves as an engine of our economic development. I have seen its effect on a community. In my district, Les Fres Ford, a car dealership, is using a 504 loan to better serve its customers and to expand its business. It will also bring up to 50 new jobs to the community. These are good-paying jobs that will help families in the community I represent. This is just one example of the success that is taking place across this country, making the 504 program one of the SBA's bedrock programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, so I reserve my right to close.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), ranking member, as well as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and all of the other members of the Committee on Small Business for the outstanding bipartisan way in which this committee conducts its business. We can all see that, when people work together that way, there are results, and they are results which can be measured. So I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Over the past 20 years, the 504 program has clearly been one of the real success stories in business development. As many on the committee know, the 504 program is a completely fee-generated program and is not supported by any Federal funds. So we are not really talking about dipping into the Treasury. We are talking about making something work as part of business and economic development.

Due to the success of the program, this bill will extend the current fee system for the program until October 1, 2003. The bill will also increase the loan guarantee from \$750,000 to \$1 million.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, as we all know, it will benefit women-owned businesses, and women-owned businesses currently employ 18.5 million United States workers and contribute more than \$3.38 trillion annually to the economy. As a result, the 504 program increases the amount of loan guarantee available to women-owned businesses.

But most importantly, I think this bill is affirmation and a testament to the idea that, when people come together and work for the common interests, it does not matter which party they come from, which area of the country, which city, what their real philosophies and ideas are, other than if they come to work together, they can arrive at a common direction and a common success. Of course that direc-

tion and success means providing capital and direct services to the businesses that need it.

So, once again, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT); the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the ranking member; and all members of the Committee on Small Business for an outstanding job well done that will benefit businesses in America.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I also want to join the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) in commending the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), ranking member, for their leadership and the bipartisan way in which they guide our committee, and to also commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for her leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 2614 to reauthorize and improve upon the Small Business 504 program. This program is considered one of the premier small business loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration.

Mr. Speaker, the 504 program is a completely fee-generated program and is not supported by Federal funds. Its work is done through certified community development corporations.

I am particularly proud of the work that is done in my district by the St. Croix Foundation for Community Development, the Community Foundation for the Virgin Islands on St. Thomas, and the St. John Community Foundation, who are doing so much to stimulate economic development for my constituents.

Last year, through a strong bipartisan effort, the House passed H.R. 2614. Among the various improvements, it provided for the extension of the current fee system for the program until October 1, 2003, an increase of the government loan guarantee level from \$750,000 to \$1 million. Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2614 added women to the list of public policy goals for the 504 program. By doing so, the 504 program increased the amount of government loan guarantees available to women-owned businesses. This is very important as one out of five individuals are employed by women-owned businesses.

However, Mr. Speaker, the Senate included several unrelated and, in some cases, harmful provisions that would delay the passage of this legislation. These changes include, but are not limited to, the Senate language that would allow Congress to regulate the agency and decide who receives licenses under this program. Mr. Speaker, this is an ultimate form of micro-management.

The Senate also included language that would expand the HUBZone program to allow businesses that move

out of a low-income or underutilized area to continue to benefit, which is in clear contradiction to the original intent of that program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote to maintain the original intent of H.R. 2614, which will improve the 504 program and increase the access of this valuable loan program to more of our constituents.

□ 1200

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), who I know has been, along with Members of the Women's Caucus, very strong on the issues of small business, along with the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), for reauthorizing this legislation.

I came to the floor because I cannot think of a greater economic engine in this Nation than small businesses. The 504 loan program and the increase of loan opportunity from \$750,000 to \$1 million is going to take us leaps and bounds into the 21st century.

We have had some vigorous debates on the floor of the House over these past couple of months. A lot of them have involved the idea of trade and international business. My community is dominated by small businesses, minority-owned businesses and women-owned businesses, and one of their visions, as they have come to me, is the opportunity to reach beyond the boundaries of the United States. And as they are the economic engine of this Nation, I believe that their counterparts are in various places around the world. This opportunity of funding with a loan program that is reasonably responsive allows our small businesses to expand their vision and their opportunities to do international trade. At the same time, it continues to reaffirm their importance in our economy.

One of the things that small businesses ask for when I meet with them and dialogue with them on their issues is to be given the opportunity to be as small as they want to be, but also to be as big as they want to be. So this loan program allows small businesses to keep the familiarity of a small, a minority-owned, a women-owned business, but it also allows them to grow exponentially with respect to resources, finance, income, and revenue, and that I applaud.

Let me also say that I am very pleased to compliment the regional office, the local office of the Small Business Administration in my district, headed by Milton Wilson. That region and that locality has utilized its outreach efforts to ensure that small businesses in the one-stop office and the

general store that has been implemented in my district know how to reach out to resources. I am hoping this legislation will be well announced so that our small businesses are aware of the increase and the modifications that have been made in a positive way so that we can increase the participation of small businesses in this economy.

This is a good piece of legislation. I am looking forward to its movement and for it to be signed. I do understand that we have responded to some modifications that need to be made in order to improve the bill; so I, therefore, applaud its passage and I ask my colleagues to support the legislation.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Oftentimes in a debate the question is asked, are we giving taxpayers good value for their dollars. I would say to my colleagues that the 504 program, which is totally run on fees, with no cost to the taxpayers, is a perfect example of where the taxpayer clearly gets his money's worth. It is also a good example of how best to spur entrepreneurship, because we know that access to capital is access to opportunity.

With today's reauthorization we are ensuring that the 504 program will continue to be available to provide loans to the small businesses that are the driving force behind America's unprecedented economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for their hard work on this bill. I would also like to thank the staff, Charles Roe and Harry Katrice of the majority, and Michael Day and Eric Edwards of my staff, as well as all the members of the Committee on Small Business for their bipartisan efforts to reauthorize this loan program. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), for all his efforts; and I also want to thank very much the ranking Democratic member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), for her assistance and cooperation. It is a hallmark of our committee that we work in such a bipartisan way.

This is solid legislation that we, we the small business owners of America, need to have in place. This resolution supports a clear House position and accepts a reasonable Senate amendment, and I ask all the Members to support it.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 533. Earlier last year, we passed H.R. 2614 with overwhelming bipartisan support. The 504

Certified Development Company is considered one of the premier business loan programs administered by the Small Business Administration (SBA). Over the past 20 years, the 504 program has clearly been one of the greatest success stories in business development efforts made by the Small Business Administration. It is considered one of the "best values for the taxpayers." In that time, we have seen it mature into one of SBA's bedrock programs, by providing over \$20 billion dollars in assistance to more than 25,000 businesses. Since 1980, the 290 CDC's nationwide have provided more than \$20 billion in fixed asset financing to over 25,000 business concerns.

H.R. 2614 left the House as a good bill, however, the Senate included several unrelated, and in some way harmful provisions that will delay the passage of this legislation. The Senate language would have allowed Congress to regulate the agency and decide who receives licenses under the 504 program. This is the ultimate in micro-managing. Furthermore, the language reprogrammed critically needed money into the 7(a) program. This constitutes appropriating on an authorizing bill that will cause serious delays. I believe that the most damaging provision put forth by the Senate is the expansion of the HUBZone program to allow businesses that no longer reside in low-income areas to continue to enjoy the benefits of the program. This is a clear contrast and violation to the original intent of the program.

Colleagues, we cannot let these bad provisions spoil the good that is in H.R. 2614. The bill extends current fee system for the program until October 1, 2003. As a member of the Committee, I know that the 504 program is completely fee generated and is not currently supported by any federal funds. The "Premier Certified Lenders Program" was granted permanent status. PCLP is designed to allow established lenders to expedite the loan application process. This streamlines the process and provides immediate access to funds. I was proud to see that during Committee we raised the amount of loan guarantee available from \$750,000 to \$1,000,000.

One of the vital improvements was the addition of women to the list of public policy goals for the 504 program. By doing so, the 504 program increased the amount of government loan guarantee available to women-owned businesses. As we all know, women-owned business are the growth agents of the future. Presently they contribute more than \$2.38 trillion dollars annually in revenues to the economy. This is more than the gross domestic product of most countries. In the United States, women-owned businesses employ one out of every five U.S. workers—a total of 18.5 million employees.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 533 and continue to ensure that the 504 Certified Development Company is prepared to continue helping new small businesses, grow existing ones, and provide opportunities so that none are not left out of the changing marketplace.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 533.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 533, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

JAMES H. QUILLEN UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4608) to designate the United States courthouse located at 220 West Depot Street in Greeneville, Tennessee, as the "James H. Quillen United States Courthouse".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4608

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 220 West Depot Street in Greeneville, Tennessee, shall be known and designated as the "James H. Quillen United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James H. Quillen United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4608 designates the new courthouse in Greeneville, Tennessee, as the James H. Quillen United States Courthouse. This is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. JENKINS), so that rather than me standing here and telling my colleagues about it, the bill's primary sponsor and Mr. Quillen's successor to the Congress may do so.