

Overland Park neighborhood, but on each and everyone of us who look for the EPA to be the guardian of our nation's environmental health and safety.

For those who have not followed the Shattuck case, these are the facts that have been uncovered thus far. In 1991, the local Region 8 EPA office and the Colorado Department of Health began to look at possible remedies for the cleanup of the old S.W. Shattuck Chemical Company located on South Bannock Street in Denver. Initially, it was determined that the safest and most effective cleanup was removal of the radioactive waste to a registered storage facility in Utah. But following a secret meeting between Shattuck's attorneys, EPA and the Colorado Department of Health the decision was made to store the waste on-site. Residents in the area were never told that the remedy chosen by the EPA had never been used before anywhere in the United States, and more importantly documents calling into question the reliability of the remedy were kept from the public. In 1993, the EPA signed the Record of Decision (ROD) and the radioactive waste at the Shattuck Superfund site was entombed on-site.

Over the next five years the citizens of Overland Park fought to get their neighborhood back. They petitioned the EPA for a review of the decision and were denied. They attempted to submit new information about the safety of the remedy selected and were told by the EPA the remedy was safe. Finally, last summer the residents concerns were brought to my attention. After meeting with area residents and business owners, I determined their questions deserved answers and together we began a journey to find the truth about Shattuck.

Last October, I asked the EPA to meet with the community to answer their questions and was informed they would not conduct such a public meeting. Outraged by their answer, I exercised my right as a U.S. Senator to hold up Senate confirmation of a key EPA official. The move resulted in the EPA agreeing to my request for an independent investigation of Shattuck by the National Ombudsman. Earlier this year he began his investigation and quickly determined the claims made by residents were not only meritorious, but that EPA officials had engaged in an effort to keep documents hidden from the public.

In fact, the Ombudsman was so successful at uncovering the facts surrounding Shattuck, his investigation has resulted in EPA officials now looking at eliminating his office. A meeting was recently held among all ten EPA regional administrators and staff from EPA Administrator Carol Browner's office to discuss eliminating the Ombudsman position. This can not be allowed to happen! Nor will I allow it to happen. Without the Ombudsman's inves-

tigation on Shattuck the residents of Overland Park would have never learned the truth. The Ombudsman's investigation brought integrity back into the process.

The EPA's efforts to curtail the Ombudsman's independence is an attempt to seek revenge for the on-going Shattuck investigation and to intimidate citizens who dare question the answers they are given by the EPA. I have recently introduced Senate Bill 1763, the "Ombudsman Reauthorization Act of 1999," which will preserve the office of the National Ombudsman. The battle to enact this legislation could be tougher than getting the EPA to admit they made a mistake at Shattuck.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, November 3, 1999, the Federal debt stood at \$5,654,990,773,682.18 (Five trillion, six hundred fifty-four billion, nine hundred ninety million, seven hundred seventy-three thousand, six hundred eighty-two dollars and eighteen cents).

One year ago, November 3, 1998, the Federal debt stood at \$5,553,893,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred fifty-three billion, eight hundred ninety-three million).

Five years ago, November 3, 1994, the Federal debt stood at \$4,723,729,000,000 (Four trillion, seven hundred twenty-three billion, seven hundred twenty-nine million).

Ten years ago, November 3, 1989, the Federal debt stood at \$2,864,340,000,000 (Two trillion, eight hundred sixty-four billion, three hundred forty million) which reflects a doubling of the debt—an increase of almost \$3 trillion—\$2,790,650,773,682.18 (Two trillion, seven hundred ninety billion, six hundred fifty million, seven hundred seventy-three thousand, six hundred eighty-two dollars and eighteen cents) during the past 10 years.

#### JOHN H. CHAFEE

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, on the day that his son, Lincoln, succeeds him in the Senate I would ask to have printed in the RECORD what I believe to be John H. Chafee's last formal address. It was given at the National Cathedral on the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary Celebration of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. They reflect the great beauty of the man, who loved his country so, and gave so much to it.

I ask unanimous consent the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN H. CHAFEE FOR FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF THE NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION, OCTOBER 21, 1999

Thank you, Dick, for your generous introduction. Secretary Babbitt, Mayor Williams,

Commissioner Peck and friends, it is an honor to join you today.

Every so often there occurs an event so cataclysmic, so egregious, that it sparks a demand for national action. For example, in the 60's and early 70's, many in our nation were disturbed about the foul condition of our natural waters—our lakes, streams, and rivers—where fish could no longer survive and filth was obvious to all who would look.

There were those who said a national response was required, but other demands on the federal treasury took precedence. Until one day the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland, polluted with oil and grease, caught fire. That's right—a river burst into flames in 1969.

That was the final indignity—that was what brought about the Clean Water Act of 1972. This led to an eventual expenditure of \$70 billion by the federal government for waste water treatment plants and an even greater outlay by private industry and local communities to comply with new discharge standards.

A desperate call for national action to preserve the historically and architecturally important buildings across our land was heard in 1963. Out of a single event—the destruction of magnificent Penn Station in New York City—arose a national outcry.

Modeled in part after the Baths of Caracalla, Penn Station was an awe inspiring building the likes of which will never again be built.

A line from an editorial in the New York Times, published soon after the commencement of the station's demolition, expressed the sentiment of the day. It read:

"We will probably be judged not by the monuments we build but by those we have destroyed."

Fortunately, there was in existence an organization—The National Trust for Historic Preservation—that was trying to sound the alarm to our nation that we must save the Penn Stations and other grand buildings. And that organization is doing a superb job and we are fortunate it exists on this, its 50th birthday.

There are three points I'd like to leave with you today. They are:

First, as supporters of the National Trust, you are engaged in extremely important work for our country.

Second, you are on the cutting edge of the environmental movement.

Third, some suggestions I have that could make your efforts even more effective.

Let me exemplify point one. You are engaged—as supporters of the National Trust for Historic Preservation—in work that is extremely important to our country. You are preserving what British novelist D.H. Lawrence once referred to as the "spirit of place." Expressing his anxiety about the quiet exchange of quaint English hamlets for the faceless infrastructure of the industrial age, he wrote:

"Different places on the face of the earth have different vital effluence, different vibration, different chemical exhalation, different polarity with different stars: call it what you like. But the spirit of place is a great reality."

All across our land, your actions are preserving that spirit of place.

You are doing far more than trying to save the Penn Stations of our land. You are fostering an urban revitalization of whole sections of some of our older cities. By encouraging tax credits for rehabilitation of older buildings, by promoting smart-growth initiatives, and the conservation of open space,