

Cini, a man who will long be remembered for his service to his family, to Connecticut, and to his beloved town of East Lyme. Mr. Cini passed away yesterday after a long illness.

The incredible courage he showed these last years has truly been inspiring. Despite physical challenges that would daunt most people, Mr. Cini never stopped working. Just last month I joined him on the town's waterfront to announce that a long-held goal of securing funding for a boardwalk had finally been achieved. For years he has worked to bring sensible development to the waterfront area of East Lyme. When we finally open the boardwalk, it will be with great sorrow that he will not be there to open it with us. I hope that the town will see fit to build that boardwalk in his honor.

Mr. Cini was not well, but he never stopped. He conducted the town's business and worked to ensure that everyone he came into contact with agreed with him that East Lyme was the best place to live. He passed away while still first selectman, which is, I think, how he preferred it.

His legacy in the town will be one of sound management, low taxes, and sensible improvements. He has been a tireless fighter for his community, representing it since 1980 as a board of education member, a selectman, and for the last eight years, first selectman. During part of that time, he was active with the Council of Governments, a regional coordinating group on Connecticut's south shore, even serving as chair at one point. He brought good honor to the town of East Lyme every day he came to work.

Certainly we will all miss David, but those who will miss him most—and in whom his legacy will endure—will be his wife Sally and his children: Heather, Holly, and Matt. Matt is following in his father's footsteps by serving eastern Connecticut's community as a valued member of my staff. When I see Matt at work, I see a bit of David; he is certainly his father's son.

Mr. Speaker, on Saturday David L. Cini will be laid to rest in his beloved town. Requiescat in pace.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. BILL BARRETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 16, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2158) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to share with my colleagues a small town's recent experience with the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] which serves up yet another reason why the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation,

and Liability Act [CERCLA], commonly called Superfund, must be reformed and reformed soon.

Recently, EPA advised a community in the south-central part of my congressional district, Hastings, NE, that it intends to present the city and three or four potentially responsible parties [PRP's] with a bill for the costs EPA incurred at the Hastings Groundwater Contamination Site. EPA's Region 7 Administrator has confirmed that in the next 2 to 3 months EPA intends to demand payment for costs incurred between 1983 and 1994. EPA incurred these costs in its investigation, analysis, and study of contamination in Hastings. The bill apparently even will include EPA's indirect expenses, such as employee benefits, office costs, expenses, travel, and lodging—Believe it or not!

As you can imagine, this situation greatly alarms Hastings and me, since past costs for the site amount to more than \$20 million. EPA estimates the city would be responsible for \$1 to \$1.5 million, and the PRP's would be responsible for the balance. Unfortunately, EPA is not expected to allocate responsibility for these past costs among the various PRP's. Thus, the PRP's and the city will need to voluntarily allocate or litigate. As you know, litigation has been much more common under Superfund. Given the large amounts of money at stake, this could become a fight for survival.

You're probably thinking, so what's the big deal? I'll tell you—Hastings is a small town with a population of 23,000! The city collects approximately \$5 million in sales and property taxes annually. The city can't afford a \$1 to \$1.5 million bill. It can't raise taxes because the Nebraska legislature has placed a zero-spending lid on all Nebraska cities in an effort to curb taxes, and it can't afford to engage in costly litigation with the other PRP's. The city can ill-afford to lose its business base because it was forced to sue to reduce its liability.

The PRP's can't afford to pay the balance of the bill. It could bankrupt them. I don't know exactly what dollar amount would force the PRP's out of business, but any large bill—even if it does not amount to \$20 million—could severely hamper future business expansion and new job creation in the community.

This is a perfect example of why Superfund, and especially retroactive liability, needs to be reformed. Many communities are familiar with similar situations—a large portion of the pollution at Hastings occurred early in the century, and any pollution that did occur happened after hazardous waste laws were enacted. The disposal of the responsible materials was done according to the law of the day. Since then, companies have been bought and sold, the city's management has come and gone, and as a result, there are no real polluters now in Hastings—despite EPA's efforts to identify them.

This should be a warning to all of us. This is not an isolated case. This could happen in any district.

But what makes me so frustrated, Mr. Chairman, is that it's our fault. Congress passed Superfund. Congress has not been able to reform it, even though many of my colleagues have been working with each other and the administration to reform it for many years. It's a complex issue, but it shouldn't take this long or be this hard to do.

Often I question EPA's judgment, especially in Hastings' situation, and know the agency

has been overzealous or irrational with its regulations and enforcement of Superfund. However, I realize EPA has a bad law to enforce. But why should Congress keep giving EPA funds to implement a bad law? And what incentive does EPA have to work with Congress to reauthorize Superfund if we keep it so well funded? Congress must stand up to the pressure to simply throw money at a problem without understanding what we are dealing with. For example, why haven't we asked about the true nature of risk from hazardous waste sites, and why haven't we had a national dialogue on how to prioritize spending on Superfund sites?

It's time to ask these questions and to reform Superfund. The Bipartisan Budget Agreement requires that Congress enact comprehensive reform before there is any increase in funding. I urge my colleagues to resist efforts to increase funding for this program and to support Superfund reform.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 15, 1997

The House in Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union had under consideration the bill, H.R. 2107, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes:

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to recognize the good work of a local organization in my congressional district, the Greater Cleveland Chapter of the Korean War Veterans Association, and the contribution they have made to one of our Nation's memorials. Included in this bill are funds for the National Park Service, which oversees our national memorials, including the Korean War Veterans' Memorial here in Washington, DC.

The Cleveland Chapter of the KWVA has an active membership and its leadership includes Mr. Joe Shearer, who serves as second vice president. Recently, Mr. Shearer brought to my attention and to the attention of Senator GLENN and others in the Ohio congressional delegation the troubling story of the condition of the Korean War Veterans' Memorial. Apparently the memorial was in a state of disrepair due to problems associated with poor construction and engineering.

In true American "can-do" spirit, Mr. Shearer and some of his fellow veterans drove to Washington, DC, to personally inform me of this situation. Letters were sent to the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service expressing concerns about the memorial. Due to the efforts of Mr. Shearer and other veterans, I have been assured by the National Park Service that repairs are currently underway and adequate funds needed to repair the Korean War Memorial have been made available.

The Korean War Veterans Memorial is a tribute to those who served in "the forgotten war." Our Korean war veterans deserve our utmost respect and deserve a memorial in