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 investigation 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, you are making whole sections of our older cities more livable, more attractive to home buyers.

This all makes such sense. By promoting city dwelling we reduce expenditures on brand new roads, sewer pipelines, gas, electric, and phone lines, thus assisting our town and country treasuries. For within historic districts exists the needed infrastructure.

None of it has to be built—it is already in place because of the past exodus of residents. Washington, DC is typical of our older cities where the population has gone from 800,000 in 1950 to 540,000 today—a 32 percent drop.

And, there are tremendous economic benefits to what you are doing. Studies have shown that dollar for dollar, historic preservation is one of the highest job-generating economic development options available. In other words, one million dollars spent on rehabilitation creates more permanent jobs, does more for retail sales, and does more for family incomes in a community than a like amount spent on new construction.

Because of efforts of the members of the National Trust over the years, and the leadership it has given, my state is a microcosm of what is taking place across our nation. Many of our magnificent marble palaces in Newport were saved from being subdivided into a series of apartments and instead were preserved as originally built. Now, they are by far the largest tourist attractions in our state, and extremely important to the economy of Newport.

Likewise, historic districts are flourishing and home owners are eager to buy turn of the century homes that were so soundly built.

This didn't just happen. It came about with the consent inspiration and guidance from the National Trust.

Let me move to point two. You are on the cutting edge of the environmental movement.

Why do I say that? If we can be successful in enticing a goodly portion of our citizens to live within our cities, we have helped stanch the flow of what we've come to know as urban sprawl. We are losing our farmland at a frightening rate—two acres every minute of every day, according to estimates of the American Farmland Trust.

There is no question that every new home that is built in our suburbs or every new housing development that is created, affects some creature's habitat. I have long held that if we give nature half a chance, it will rebound. But we must give it that half a chance. Regrettably, in too few areas are we doing that. The National Trust is at the forefront of environmental action by making our cities more attractive, thus reducing the paving and development of our countryside.

Few environmental challenges equal that of global warming, and the principal culprit in that area is the automobile. If people remain within cities, there are indeed fewer autos on the road, which means less pollution, less global warming.

Now for point three: some suggestions to make your efforts even more effective.

Do all you can to make the federal government a leader in historic preservation. When we do something really good, cheer us on. For example, we can all be delighted and encouraged by the inclusion of large sums of money in transportation legislation for so-called enhancements. These substantial moneys can be used, among other things, to restore historic buildings. Senator Pat Moynihan deserves the principal credit for the Enhancement Program, which we first did in the 1991 Highway Bill and continued in the 1998 Transportation Bill known as TEA–21. This was a radical departure from previous highway bills and Senator Moynihan deserves tremendous credit.

We in the federal government can also lead by example by restoring post offices and courthouses rather than abandoning them and moving their activities to the suburbs.

Let me give you an example of a courthouse we managed to save that was historically and architecturally important. Almost a decade ago, I visited the traditional home of the federal judiciary in Old San Juan, Puerto Rico—a court house that had fallen into disrepair. It was a shambles, and there was a movement underway to abandon the structure in favor of constructing a new one in the suburbs. But the building's historic significance coupled with such architectural flourishes as a beautiful two-story loggia overlooking the harbor, warranted its preservation.

Thanks to the General Services Administration's preservation efforts, and a $35 million restoration, this beautiful courthouse has been saved and will be dedicated next spring.

The restoration of the Courthouse should spur a renaissance in San Juan's historic quarter. Lawyers doing business at court will frequent nearby restaurants and shops. Hotels and other businesses may spring up as more people visit the area.

We can create incentives in the tax code to promote restoration. As many of you know, those who restore historic buildings for commercial purposes re already eligible for tax credits. Since these provisions have been in place, $18 billion dollars have been generated in private investment. You should be proud of these numbers, for they didn't happen of their own accord. They came about with the constant inspiration and guidance from the National Trust.

I have long hoped to extend these credits to homeowners through legislation called the Historic Homeownership Act. It would allow homeowners who rehabilitate homes in historic areas to take a tax credit equal to 20 percent of the project's cost. This credit could be used toward one's tax liability or in the form of a mortgage credit certificate. Because of this flexibility, these provisions would be attractive to low and middle income homeowners, not just those in the top tax brackets.

There has been overwhelming support for this legislation across the political spectrum. Earlier this year, we enacted a version of it as part of the tax bill approved by Congress. That was the bill the President subsequently vetoed. The prospects for enacting that homeownership tax credit bill this year are dim. Hopefully, next year we can do it. Before I go, I want to get this done! You can help by pestering your Senators and Representatives to support the Historic Homeownership Act.

Another major way you can lend a hand is by giving vocal support to efforts states, counties, and towns are making to preserve open spaces. If the land is going to be saved, then homes are not going to be built there.

Clearly, open space conservation and historic preservation go hand in hand. In fact, Senator Joe Lieberman and I are pressing for legislation that would accomplish both goals. It is called the Natural Resources Reinvestment Act. It would fully fund the Historic Preservation Fund at 150 million dollars per year and encourage states to set aside open space. While we may be addressing these concerns at the federal level, the time is ripe to promote ballot initiatives in your own towns and counties.

Last year, voters approved the vast majority of the 200 ballot initiatives for open space purchases to curb urban sprawl at state and local levels.

With such wide-ranging support, evidently these measures are not just the province of the elite. No, the rich and poor alike support them, because they benefit everyone.

One of the biggest successes occurred in New Jersey where voters, in 1998, set aside $98 million to buy open space.

And, just last week, two local anti-sprawl initiatives made news in the Washington area. In Montgomery County, planners proposed to spend $100 million over the next decade to preserve historic properties and undeveloped land. In addition, the city council in Rockville, Maryland approved a six-month development moratorium on single-use retail stores of 60,000 square feet or more.

There are many ways that we can encourage historic preservation at the federal level. But absent your cooperation, none of the preservation work would get done. So the rest is up to all of you. And I trust that you will carry out these initiatives with purpose and enthusiasm. Do what you can to recruit others to join your ranks.

Naysayers may ask: What difference does saving one train station or post office truly make in the future of America? My response is this: preservation is not just about conserving brick and mortar, lintel and beam. It is about the quality of life, and the possibility of a bright future. Carl Sandburg expressed the danger of losing touch with our past when he said:

''If America forgets where she came from, if people lose sight of what brought them along, . . . then will begin the rot and dissolution.''

Who could say it better!

On behalf of the city of Providence and Rhode Island, we look forward to sharing our historic treasures with you during your 2001 conference. Keep up the good work. Thank you.

THE AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate voted on a modest package of trade bills which included the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Caribbean Basin Trade Enhancement Act. As a long time supporter of expanding trade opportunities for Vermonters and all Americans, as well as people in developing countries, I reluctantly cast my vote against this bill.

Exports are a key component of Vermont's economy. As a small state, we must promote our products beyond the Green Mountains. Vermonters are reaping the benefits of more open markets around the world and these markets are creating new jobs here at home. Not long ago, I led a Vermont trade delegation to Ireland which has one of the fastest growing economies in Europe.

Having said that, trade is about more than financial statistics. It is about more than increasing market opportunities for American products, as important and laudable a goal as that is. In our increasingly inter-connected world, trade involves a broad range of issues and concerns. As the wealthiest nation, we also have a responsibility to do what we can to ensure that the benefits of the global economy are enjoyed by people from every walk of life, here and abroad. And when we vote, we have a responsibility to ensure that legislation entitled the ''African Growth and Opportunity Act'', actually benefits African workers and protects their families' health and welfare, and the natural environment. The bill that was passed yesterday will not do that.

I have felt for some time that our relationship with Africa needs to change. It cannot continue to be based almost exclusively on aid, when the real engine of development, as we have seen