

the administration and Congress an additional \$50 million to begin to categorize, classify, and clean up these sites.

At the center of this legislation is the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] who has time now and I will have later so we can have a dialog. I would thank the gentleman for allowing me to make this introduction and tell the gentleman that it is really a pleasure to work with him on a bipartisan basis to begin to help do this very important thing, bring businesses back into urban areas to create jobs and to pay taxes by helping to clean up these sites.

□ 1630

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I thank the gentleman for his help and cooperation, his partnership with me in bringing forward this legislation. It is deeply appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, breathing new economic life into Connecticut's communities and stimulating growth across our Nation is my top priority in the U.S. Congress. I strongly believe we can stimulate economic growth by cleaning up contaminated industrial sites and returning them to productive use. This process, known as brownfields cleanup, allows a community to turn a barren site, once unusable by business due to concerns of sky-high cleanup costs, into valuable land that can be fruitful for years to come.

What is genuinely attractive about this process is that the entire community shares in the benefits: Area businesses acquire new land for investment. Connecticut families have new jobs. Cities and towns gain tax revenue. Local homeowners enjoy increased property values. And everyone benefits from a cleaner environment.

Turning brownfields into productive properties will have a substantial positive impact on Connecticut's future prosperity and on the prosperity of every other State in the Nation as well.

Currently, due to contamination, hundreds of thousands of industrial properties across the country are idle, and some actually have negative land value because of excessive cleanup costs.

The Naugatuck Valley, located in my district in Connecticut, was known as the Brass Valley because of its tremendous level of metal fabrication industry. Today, however, it is home to 20 percent of the brownfields sites listed by the State of Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection.

While the Naugatuck Valley was once a booming industrial area, it is now the home of a shrinking job base, abandoned industrial sites, and chronic economic challenges with unemployment rate that hovers at nearly 10 percent.

The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] and I have introduced bipartisan legislation that will aggressively

address the situation and help communities like those in Naugatuck Valley thrive again. The Brownfield Economic Revitalization Act of 1997 empowers communities and residents to identify local contamination and provides them with the resources necessary to attract private investment.

By working with the EPA and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, towns and community organizations will have the ability to pay for site assessment, will have access to redevelopment grants and revolving loan funds, and will be able to leverage State, local, and private funds for redevelopment and job creation.

The act will also allow qualified taxpayers and businesses to deduct cleanup costs in the year incurred, a major new tax incentive.

I would like to share with my colleagues the success of the Waterbury Mall cleanup, which is a model of how cleaning up a brownfield is worth each and every dime.

SUCCESSFUL BROWNFIELDS CLEANUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Following its closing after years of industrial activities of a brass manufacturer, a 100-acre factory site fell into disuse in the city of Waterbury. I worked to secure funding for the environmental cleanup of the site. Once clean, the site was made available to the private sector for reuse. This fall the residents of Waterbury will see the opening of one of the largest retail shopping malls in all of New England.

This new-use, successful brownfields cleanup will add hundreds of millions of dollars to Waterbury's tax base and will create 4,000 new jobs in Connecticut. The brownfield approach can of course also be used for commercial and industrial reuse and even for public recreation.

In Derby, CT, for example, we are working to reclaim an old industrial waste site known as O'Sullivan's Island for a combination waterfront park and marina. The O'Sullivan's Island project will both reclaim a valuable environmental asset and draw thousands of people every year to downtown Derby.

Successes like the Waterbury Mall and the planning now under way for Derby, can and should be replicated across the country. The Shays/Maloney Brownfields Economic Revitalization Act will ensure that that happens. It will ensure that communities and businesses have a more streamlined process which will allow them to stimulate economic growth. It will attract needed investments and stimulate welcome

activity. Connecticut's, and America's, businesses, employees, homeowners and families need and deserve this legislation, and I and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] are committed to making it a reality for all of us.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, our legislation increasing the funding from \$37 million to \$87 million would provide a \$200,000 maximum grant to each site assessment and redevelopment plan. It enables a community to go out throughout the community and determine what are the brownfields in their community, why these buildings are not being developed.

In some cases they will find the absence of knowledge has led people to stay away. When they come and make a more thorough review of these sites, they realize they do not have the contamination problems they might think they have, and the community is able to promote the development of this land. This money also becomes a leverage to bring in private money as well as State and local money.

It also provides a capitalization revolving loan fund of \$500,000 each in addition to the \$200,000 grant. We also are providing in our legislation \$25 million to HUD for each of the next 4 years to provide for brownfield activity to leverage some of the State and local and private funding.

I think one of the most important features of this is that it provides tax incentives. A business that comes in can expense out in the year of cost the cleanup of the sites, which makes it far more attractive to a business so that they can recoup their costs much earlier and not have to amortize it over 10, 20, 30, 40, or 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen the success that has happened, that it has provided Bridgeport. We are seeing the kinds of success in cities like Waterbury with cleaning up old industrial sites. We are looking to make brownfields into greenfields. I cannot emphasize enough the need for allowing businesses to see land in urban areas as having a positive land value, not a negative land value.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY].

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I just conclude by making an observation that frequently people have suggested that economic development and environmental protection are inconsistent. What this legislation does is clearly demonstrate that we can accomplish both goals simultaneously. We can in fact take property that has been environmentally degraded, put it back to use, clean it up from an environmental perspective and then, putting that property back to use, stimulate and encourage and expand economic growth.

This is legislation that is good for the environment. It is good for the economy. It is good for the people of this country. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, we are eager to have cosponsors on this legislation. This is bipartisan. It is a Democrat and Republican bill. It has the endorsement of the President of the United States and the cooperation of the EPA. This in fact is legislation they would like to see become law, like to see these additional funds. We are looking forward to seeing it become law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PEASE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. PEASE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BRADY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SESSIONS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SESSIONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CANADY of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

DISASTER INSURANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to talk about a couple of issues. The first one is disaster insurance and the problems that most of the States that I am familiar with, Florida, California, have with the fact that today we cannot get reinsurance in terms of casualty and property insurance for those kinds of disasters and catastrophic events that occur in our States.

Many of the States along the coast particularly of this country, whether that be the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean, have tremendous exposure to hurricanes. Hurricanes can do tremendous damage. In Florida a couple of years ago we had a hurricane known as Andrew. Andrew caused \$16 billion worth of damage by going through a section south of Miami known as Cutler Ridge. If that hurricane had gone through Fort Lauderdale, we are told by experts that that

hurricane would have caused \$40 or \$50 billion worth of damage. If it had gone through Miami downtown, Lord knows how much it would have cost, but it would have been a lot.

In California within a couple of weeks of Hurricane Andrew they had a relatively mild earthquake but serious enough to cause about \$12 billion worth of damage. We are likely to see hurricanes and earthquakes, particularly big earthquakes, in California that will be staggering in total losses in terms of the entire damage done in the next few years in these cataclysmic events that occur, hopefully, only once in a lifetime or once in a century. But when they occur they do enormous damage.

There is a need because the insurance capabilities of private insurance and the States are not capable of dealing with it. There is a need to have Federal involvement. That is why I introduced legislation known as H.R. 230, which would address this problem by providing a national form of reinsurance for those who provide the kind of catastrophic coverage and property and casualty coverage in hurricanes and earthquakes and other natural disaster situations.

The way this legislation would work would be that first of all there would have to be a \$10 billion or greater total loss in the natural disaster to trigger the involvement of the Federal interest. Then, when that occurred, there would be a trust fund set up in the Treasury Department, and that trust fund would be created by the sale of reinsurance contracts to insurance companies who do this kind of business at an auction, an auction set by a commission which would be developed under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, that auction would result in premiums for the contracts being paid yearly by the insurance companies into this trust fund. Then, when we had a disaster of \$10 billion or greater all together, for the next \$25 billion in losses up to a \$35 billion disaster, the trust fund moneys would come into play and the Treasury would pay out of the trust funds on a pro rata basis to the insurance carriers the reinsurance proceeds.

This would enable a more orderly process to take place in States and in localities where these catastrophic events take place, and would eventually allow, I believe, for there to be a lowering of the insurance premiums that are now going through the roof for homeowners and business owners in these affected States. I think that it is very important that our colleagues take a look at this legislation. I would invite cosponsorship of it.

I would hope that we could move a bill of this nature or something similar to it through this Congress this session. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO], chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, has been on the floor a lot the last few days as this bill and a similar product that he has introduced and cosponsored, as he has cosponsored

mine in his committee. We are looking forward to the kind of support that will allow us to proceed to get this type of law enacted.

I might say that every State is affected by this because, if we get a pool of insurance moneys for reinsurance like this in the Treasury that is accumulated by premiums being paid by insurers, it is going to save the taxpayer money in the event of major losses.

We are talking about a supplemental appropriation now for disasters in flood prone areas and so forth. We are always going to have Federal money being spent when you have a major disaster.

If we can have an insurance pool like this that is stimulated to fill a void in the market since there is no private reinsurance to speak of for this purpose now and could lower insurance premiums for individual homeowners and businesses at the same time, we will have done two things: One, we will have helped people get insurance and afford insurance in States where catastrophic incidents and disasters occur. We will also have protected the taxpayers from losses that will occur when disasters occur and somebody comes knocking on our door for assistance.

Last but not least, in the few remaining moments I have, I would like to point out that in the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, where I serve, a hearing is going on now dealing with the subject of judicial activism. That is a somewhat controversial topic, but a few weeks ago there was a publication, an article in Human Events, which is a known periodical, on the subject of the constitutionality of impeaching judges for going too far, for not performing in good behavior, a very scholarly work.

I do not know what that line should be. I will include for the RECORD the article from Human Events that I am referring to to be incorporated:

[From Human Events, Apr. 11, 1997]

CONGRESS SHOULD THROW THE BUMS OUT
(By Robert J. D'Agostino and George S. Swan)

House Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R.-Tex.) recently gave voice to what many conservatives all across America have been thinking for years: Judges who flout the Constitution should be impeached, through the means provided in the Constitution itself, by a majority vote in the House followed by a two-thirds vote in the Senate. "As part of our conservative efforts against judicial activism," DeLay said, "we are going after judges."

But Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R.-Miss.) poured cold water on the fire DeLay had lit when he told the Washington Times that he would not consider impeaching a judge who had not committed a crime. "Not me," said Lott.

But it is DeLay, not Lott, who understands what the Framers intended to be the true constitutional role of Congress in curbing abuses of power by federal judges.

The impeachment of federal judges is a matter of congressional will. Article III, section one, of the Constitution provides that federal judges, including the Justices of the Supreme Court, "shall hold their Offices during good behavior." This is in addition to the right of Congress to remove "all civil officers" for "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors."