

It helps this economy. It helps bring integrity back into the system. It allows individuals to go down there to bankruptcy and represent themselves. They don't even have to have a lawyer. It has a lot of different things in it that are good. It eliminates a lot of loopholes and abuses that everybody agrees need to be fixed.

I can't understand this. It seems to me there is some sort of effort to yell, scream, and just say how horrible it is, and perhaps provide some figleaf to encourage the President to veto this bill. I hope he does not.

They say: Well, it has a protection in there for millionaires to have money in their houses in Florida and Texas and States that have an unlimited homestead exemption.

That is a problem. I have fought to eliminate that. We were not able to do that. The States that have the historic State procedures on this fought us tooth and claw. But this bill makes substantial progress toward eliminating that view. There is no doubt that the problem with homestead is far better in this legislation today than it is under current law if we don't do anything about it. A vote against this bill is a vote to keep the ineffective, bad current law, and not make the improvement this bill makes.

I believe it is good legislation. Senator GRASSLEY has worked on it tenaciously. We have been very cooperative with others who have problems. Time and again, it has been fixed to accommodate concerns that others would have. I believe it is a fair bill. I believe it is a good bill. I believe it is time for this country to improve what is going on in bankruptcy all over America today. And most bankrupts are entitled to it and need it.

But there are substantial numbers with high incomes who could pay large portions of that debt, if they wanted to. But once they talked to those lawyers who tell them they don't have to, they file under chapter 7 and wipe out much of their debts, and they go on leaving someone else to carry the burden.

I thank the Chair for the time. I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I'm glad we're getting around to the bankruptcy bill. I think we've got a good product. This conference report is basically the Senate-passed bankruptcy bill with certain minimal changes made to accommodate the House of Representatives. The means-test retains the essential flexibility that we passed in the Senate. The new consumer protections sponsored by Senator REED of Rhode Island relating to reaffirmations is in this report. The credit card disclosures sponsored by Senator TORRICELLI are also in this final conference report. We also maintained Senator LEAHY's special protections for victims of domestic violence and Senator FEINGOLD's special protections for expenses associated with caring for non-dependent family members.

So, Mr. President, on the consumer bankruptcy side, we maintained the Senate's position.

On the business side of things, we kept Senator KENNEDY's changes to the small business provisions. We have kept the international trade section intact. The financial netting provisions were updated to reflect technical changes suggested by the House. The new netting provisions, however, have universal support.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to make one point crystal clear. Because of objections from the other side of the aisle, we have been delayed in getting this conference report up. Because of this delay and these kind of underhanded tactics, Congress has allowed chapter 12 to just expire. Chapter 12 gives family farmers a real chance to reorganize their affairs. But that's gone now. This bill restores chapter 12. This conference report also expands the eligibility for chapter 12 so more farmers will have access to these special protections. Also, Mr. President, this conference report gives farmers in chapter 12 much-needed capital gains tax relief.

We hear a lot about helping farmers around here. This bill gives us a chance to do a lot of good. We should get on with passing this bill right away and stop playing political games with our farmers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

#### BROWNFIELDS REVITALIZATION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I want to raise an issue that I believe is critical for the Congress to address before we adjourn this year. It is an issue on which environmentalists, the business community, and the labor community strongly agree. It is called the Brownfields Revitalization Act. I say it is called that. I have to explain exactly what we are talking about here.

It is an issue upon which Republicans and Democrats agree. The Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2000 is a bill I introduced with Senator CHAFEE. It now has 67 cosponsors. Two-thirds of the Senate say this is a good piece of legislation and we ought to pass it. That includes, obviously, a majority of both sides of the political aisle—a rare example of overwhelming bipartisan support.

Some accuse us of being a “do-nothing Congress,” that we are stuck in partisan disagreement. That can be said. But I can tell you, it cannot be said about this brownfields bill. We ought to pass it here and now as a way to show that we can still move bipartisan legislation in the Senate.

We have strong support. Dozens of environmental organizations, business, labor, and State and local governments support the bill, including the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Real Estate Round Table, and the National Association of Realtors. It is a mix of people and interests, including the Insti-

tute of Scrap Recycling Industries and the Natural Resources Council. The list is a very long one, including various communities throughout the country as well as the organizations I mentioned.

Many don't know what we are talking about when we say brownfields. We will explain it. These are contaminated sites. They are abandoned properties that blight our communities. But also, they lie there waiting to be developed because they offer great promise for the future.

According to the Conference of Mayors, there are over 450,000 brownfield sites in the United States. They are, of course, in every State of the Union. There are brownfields in rural and urban areas and large and small communities. Citizens everywhere would benefit from this bill.

There are economic and environmental benefits from cleaning up brownfields. That is why the business community and labor so strongly support the bipartisan brownfields bill.

The Conference of Mayors has estimated that redeveloping these sites would create almost 600,000 jobs, would increase tax revenues, by their estimate, from somewhere between \$900 million to \$2.4 billion. What a benefit that would be to communities.

In a city in my State, Elizabeth, NJ, a town I lived in when I was growing up, we turned an abandoned site, that lay fallow for years, into an enormous shopping mall, with more than a million square feet of retail space and 5,000 permanent jobs. Elizabeth is one of the oldest industrial cities in the State of New Jersey. It is actively trying to build for the future. They are looking at hotels and a convention center thanks to brownfield revitalization. The successes in Elizabeth established proof that brownfields create jobs, hope, and opportunity for communities.

In Trenton, NJ, we have a very famous company that builds steel for bridges and structures all across this country, formally called Roebling & Sons. We have a picture of what happened to this site as it sat for years. I know my State so well; I remember the dump site. It was almost a lagoon of toxins. It was broken down. Anyone could see in the picture the terrible deteriorating condition.

Then we have a brownfield restoration program and this is what happened: It became a full-service supermarket, the first market in the city in many years. This is our capital city, with an office building and senior housing. It is almost a miraculous rebirth.

There is a risk in letting these brownfield sites sit there. The risks are substantial. They pose threats to human health and the environment, they create blighted downtown areas often leading to crime and loss of jobs. It forces development of farmland and open spaces. It causes sprawl. The result is increased driving time for those who have cars living in these cities,

with traffic congestion and air pollution.

The bipartisan brownfields bill will make major strides in revitalizing sites across the country. They are small sites, typically for \$200,000 and less. They can be turned into productive urban centers or rural centers where commerce can take place and jobs exist.

The bill provides critically needed funds to assess and clean up abandoned and underutilized brownfield sites. They can use them for parks and greenways. They encourage cleanup and redevelopment of the properties by providing another important element: legal protection for innocent parties such as contiguous property owners and prospective purchasers, innocent land owners. They need to know that their liabilities are limited. Otherwise they are not going to take the risk in putting money into the sites.

It helps, also, to encourage other cleanups of State and local sites creating a certainty for those who would invest there, and ensures protection for public health. When the sites are revitalized, the results are obvious: jobs, a stronger local tax base, curbing sprawl, preserving open space, and protecting the health of our citizens.

Some suggest there are other ways to solve this problem by revitalizing or reforming or reauthorizing our Superfund Program. That is a nice idea, but unfortunately, we have been working 8 years to get the parties together to get the Superfund Program reauthorized. The Superfund handles the enormous sites that dot our landscape, without success.

I, personally, since I have been so involved in the environmental committee and in environmental issues, wanted to get to work on Superfund and get it done before I left the Senate, which is effectively in the next few days. I will have lost my opportunity to talk on this floor and get some of the things done that we still have ahead. The value of this legislation is real and it is current.

While the sites, by their very definition, are not the size of Superfund sites, the overwhelming majority of brownfields are not Federal cleanup problems but are being cleaned up by States and local governments.

This bill will give incentives and protection at those hundreds of thousands of State sites. We owe this relief to our communities. They can take the money and get an investor to develop the site. We should not hold this bill hostage. There are 67 Members, two-thirds of the Senate, bipartisan, who do not want to see this bill lying around here and not getting passed. Mr. President, 67 Senators have spoken. Business groups support this, as do environmentalists, and State and local governments. The legislation ought to pass.

It is a very simple task. The time for this bill to pass is now. I hope my colleagues will act to move this legislation as quickly as possible. They have

cosponsored the bill. If we can just put it in the line of things, it need not take a long time to debate or discuss. I hope we can pass this legislation soon.

I yield the floor.

#### MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, H.J. Res. 114 is read the third time and passed.

The motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

#### COLORADO UTE SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 723, S. 2508, as under a previous order. I further ask consent that any votes ordered with respect to that legislation be stacked to occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader with the concurrence of the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2508) to amend the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act of 1988 to provide for a final settlement of the claims of the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 4303

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 4303.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL], for himself, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 4303.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. CAMPBELL. I ask unanimous consent that 30 minutes of debate on the bill be under my control, and that 30 minutes of debate on Senator FEINGOLD's amendment be divided, 20 minutes under Senator FEINGOLD's control and 10 minutes under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined in offering the proposed amendment by three of my distinguished colleagues: Senator ALLARD, who is with me on the floor tonight; Senator BINGAMAN; and Senator DOMENICI from New Mexico. This is a bipartisan effort. I thank each of them for their support. All four of us rep-

resenting the States of Colorado and New Mexico have actively supported this project since its inception. And, hopefully, S. 2508 will be the last time we need to deal with this long overdue project.

In 1956 and 1968, decades ago—in fact, before I was ever elected to any public office—the United States promised the residents of southwestern Colorado they could count on the Government to assist them in developing the region by ensuring an adequate and reliable water supply for the benefit of the tribes and the non-Indian community. In fact, in 1968, this project was authorized at the same time as the central Arizona project and the central Utah project, both of which have been completed.

Even before that, nearly 100 years before in 1868, the United States made a treaty that guaranteed the southern Ute and Ute Mountain Indian tribes of California a permanent homeland. No one could suggest this did not include the right to an adequate water supply.

In 1987, as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced legislation to settle the Ute water rights claims. This settlement act was signed by President Ronald Reagan in November of 1988. For the next two Congresses, I worked to obtain the funding needed to implement this agreement, as did my colleagues from New Mexico and Colorado. The 1988 settlement act is currently the law of the land.

Unfortunately, that law has never been complied with. When I came to the Senate, I worked to secure the funding for the massive environmental studies needed on the proposed projects. I have also worked to prevent misguided attempts to deauthorize or defund this necessary project. The Federal Government's responsibility to build this project is even more urgent because the Colorado Ute tribes have claims to much of the water that is already being used and has been used for generations by their non-Indian neighbors.

The urgency of this bill has increased too because under the 1988 Agreement the Tribes can go back to court to sue the Federal Government if the project was not completed by the year 2000. That is obviously not going to happen.

The four of us I have fought for the fulfillment of these promises because I know what will happen if the Government is allowed to forget its promise to this region and walk away from its commitment to provide a firm water supply. Most important, the United States, the State of Colorado, the two Ute Tribes, and the non-Indian residents will spend the next few decades and millions of dollars in the Federal courts fighting for the limited water supply that exists in this region. There will only be losers in this fight because the non-Indians will lose the legal right to use the water, and the Indians may never have the ability to put the water to use. The ironic part is that if