

Utah wilderness problem, pass this bill, without that attached to it.

I think we could all go home as Republicans and Democrats and be proud of what we have done. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I support the comments of my colleague on the Presidio. I have lived all my life one block from the Presidio. I know it well. The Presidio bill is predicated on something that is unique. It is a private-public partnership whereby the more than 500 historic buildings and the additional buildings would be leased out, with a hope that over a 15-year-period it would be able to make public areas of the Presidio self-supporting.

Having said this, I am hopeful that every Member of this body could realize the longer it takes to get a bill, the more in jeopardy that plan becomes. Because of the rains, because of the fact that many of these buildings are now boarded up, they are subject to intrusion, to vandalism; they are subject to the absence of an adequate policing authority on that 1,500-acre post. The Presidio, by each day of delay, is placed in jeopardy.

I am also hopeful, and I address these remarks to the distinguished majority leader, that he would be willing to become a party to negotiations which I think can go on, on the subject of the Utah wilderness, so that we might be able to get an agreement that would be satisfactory to the two Senators from Utah, as well. I think it is possible. I think that every area is not the same as Yellowstone or Yosemite. They have certain unique characteristics which need to have attention, as well.

I am hopeful, Mr. Leader, that in the ensuing days, perhaps under your auspice, there might be negotiations which could be carried out. At least we should try and see if we cannot get some agreement which can either enable the package to move ahead as a package, or enable the Presidio, something which my colleague just said, does have unanimous consent in this body, to move ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am happy to indicate for the record that I would be pleased to try to be helpful in an effort to resolve the differences. Obviously, the one big difference is the Utah wilderness provision. The other projects, I understand, are not particularly controversial. I indicate that I am happy to be of help, or to take the leadership and try to bring people together. I have already spoken briefly to the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI. It is the hope in the next few days we can make some progress.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT OF 1995—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with consideration of the conference report.

Mr. DOLE. I understand the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is on his way to the floor. Hopefully, we can have the agreement before we commence the debate on the line-item veto because debate is 10 hours in the agreement. We would like to have it immediately start taking affect. If we speak for an hour or two beforehand, that would be an additional time.

The Senator from New Mexico will be here, as will others who are interested in this issue. Hopefully, we will not use the full 10 hours, have a vote early this evening, and then take up the farm bill conference report tonight.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, do I understand that we are awaiting the approval of the other side for the unanimous consent?

Mr. DOLE. Senator BYRD.

Mr. MCCAIN. If I could, Mr. Leader, while we are waiting for Senator BYRD, I express my appreciation for the work of Senator LOTT, who brought together some very different views on this issue. He did, I think, a magnificent job in reconciling the differences that we had on this side of the aisle.

I also want to thank the Senators from Alaska and New Mexico who obviously have a very deep and abiding interest, given their responsibilities as chairmen of the respective committees. Again, I also thank you for your leadership in making this nearly come to reality.

I understand that Senator BYRD will have certain motions to be made on this issue.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, before we enter into the time agreement, while Senator MCCAIN and Senator COATS are on the floor, I want to congratulate them. This has been a long and arduous effort on both their parts. They have been single minded and resourceful about wanting to get line-item veto in as part of the legislation that Congress passed, and pass on some additional authority to the President.

I think the bill we have come up with, while there are some compromises from their original stand and certainly some from the original stand of the bill that left the Senate floor, I think we have a good bill. I think history is going to be made some time before too late in the evening, and it will be passed here in the Senate.

I think it is a well-rounded bill. It is a little broader than the original concept of line-item veto, but overall, I extend my hearty congratulation and most sincere feelings to them about their efforts, the two Senators who have led this cause.

I also want to comment on what our distinguished whip did. I want to say thanks to Senator LOTT. It was not as easy as some think to put this together. He brought us together. I want to thank our distinguished majority

leader because he actually said to the whip, "Let's get it done." Our distinguished whip takes that kind of a challenge as a serious one, and it did not take too long for us to get the job done.

With that, until Senator BYRD arrives, unless someone else wants the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand that Senator SNOWE from Maine wants to address the Senate with reference to the death of Senator Muskie.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I will take just a moment of the Senate's time to prepare for a general debate. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 4 minutes as in morning business.

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

THE EPA STUDY ON ACID RAIN

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, New York State, or upstate New York, has been shocked—I think that is a fair term—and finds itself in near disbelief to learn that the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] has closed the Ithaca station, which is part of a broad network of monitoring stations that collect data critical to understanding the impact of acid rain on the Adirondack Preserve. There is little enough institutional memory around Washington, but one should think the EPA would know that the concern about acid rain began with the disappearance of trout from a number of lakes in the higher Adirondacks. This was a puzzle and, in the end, it was resolved by a fish biologist at Cornell University, Dr. Carl Scofield, who traced the cycle: acid rain caused by increasingly acidified air released aluminum from the granite surrounding the lakes. That aluminum leached into the lakes and was absorbed into fish gills. The fish died.

In 1980, I obtained approval of legislation—the Acid Precipitation Act—which was based on a bill I introduced here in the Congress the year before. My bill was incorporated as title VII into the Energy Security Act of 1980—Public Law 96-294—and directed the EPA to study, over a 10-year period, just what was going on—not to panic, not to go screaming to high Heaven that the skies were opening with awful substances that would burn holes in our children's heads, and things like that—but just to say, "What is this?"

Some longitudinal work obviously was in order. The effort was to last for 10 years, at \$5 million per year.

During the Reagan administration, as demand for action grew and knowledge was needed, money was collected from research budgets around the country, such that our project, in the end, became a half-billion dollar research project, the largest of its kind. We ended up knowing more about this subject than any of the other industrialized nations. It is a real enough subject, but if our understanding of it is to progress confidently, we need more data, such as can be collected by normal scientific inquiry.

In the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments—Public Law 101-549—we made the best use we could of our research on the subject. We called for large reductions in emissions in the Middle West. Winds blow those emissions toward the Adirondacks, of course. And just to see that we continued along this track, as the then-ranking member of the Committee on the Environment and Public Works—in the conference committee on the bill—I included certain provisions. One was designed so that the lay person could understand what was going on. The provision directed the EPA to compile and provide a registry of acidified lakes. Now, in Florida, that could be all lakes, of course; but it would not be in Pennsylvania or in New York. With the registry, over time, we would see how many lakes were being added, how many were being subtracted; how might we measure, essentially, the effect of our legislation? That has not been done.

I asked for other research measures in law, in statute, that have not been followed. And now the EPA has the arrogance and the insolence and the stupidity to close the research facility at the site where this whole subject was first understood, brought to national attention, and was addressed with national legislation.

Mr. President, I regret to say this, but I hope the administrator is hearing. I am not surprised that persons are calling for the abolition of the Environmental Protection Agency. If it will not obey the law, and if it will not follow elemental common sense, do we in fact need it, or is it an obstacle to the environmental concerns we share?

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor.

Ms. SNOWE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

THE DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today with a heart full of sadness, reflection, and fond memories of one of

the true giants of this institution—former Senator Edmund S. Muskie of Maine.

Like millions of Americans across the country, I awoke Tuesday to the news of Ed Muskie's passing. My heart goes out to his wonderful wife, Jane, their five children, grandchildren, and the entire Muskie family. I hope that their grief is tempered with the knowledge that their loss is shared by a Nation grateful for the life of a man who gave so much.

Like many other Members of this body, upon hearing the news, I found myself looking back on the remarkable career and lasting legacy of this first son of Maine who became one of the legendary figures in American political life.

Ed Muskie was a gentle lion. He sought consensus, but backed down from no one. He fought for what he believed in, and was loyal to his country. His greatest goal was to leave this Earth a better place for generations of Americans to come. And he succeeded.

Mr. President, as every citizen of my home State knows, Ed Muskie transformed the political landscape of Maine. Before he was elected Governor in 1954, Ed was fond of saying "the Democrats in Maine could caucus in a telephone booth." Well, much to the chagrin of some Republicans, Ed Muskie's election as Governor changed all that. He was literally the creator of the modern Democratic Party in Maine. After two 2-year terms as Governor, he went on to become the very first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history. And ultimately, his distinguished career culminated in his service to this Nation as Secretary of State.

But of all the positions he held in public service, it was here—as a Member of this institution, Mr. President, that Ed Muskie left his most indelible mark on history.

Whenever Washington gets mired down in partisan battles, I think of the example set by Senator Muskie and his Republican colleague, the late Senator Margaret Chase Smith, who died last year. They worked together across party lines on behalf of the people of Maine and the Nation. Although they may have had differences, they were united in their dedication to public service and to reaching consensus. They represented the best of what bipartisanship has to offer.

In our present-day budget battles, I think of Senator Muskie, who helped shape the modern budget process as the first-ever chairman of the Budget Committee. Ed possessed a rare wisdom and discipline which allowed him to express in very simple terms why it is so difficult to achieve fiscal responsibility in the Congress. "Members of Congress," he once said "have won reelection with a two-part strategy: Talk like Scrooge on the campaign trail, and vote like Santa Claus on the Senate floor."

Ed brandished that incisive wit many times in this very Chamber, Mr. Presi-

dent, and perhaps it was this humor, along with his commonsense approach to political life, that made Ed Muskie so effective throughout his remarkable career.

During his 21 years in the Senate, Ed Muskie was known for his moderation but he did not hesitate to tangle with his colleagues when he felt passionately about an issue. His reputation as a fighter was established early in his Senatorial career when he went head-to-head with another giant of this body, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

One day, as the story goes, the freshman Senator from Maine decided he just could not support the majority leader on a particular issue. Now, crossing the leader of your party is always risky, but that risk took on added significance when the leader was Lyndon Baines Johnson. But possessing a stubborn streak of downeast yankee independence that perhaps only a fellow Mainer can understand, Ed held his ground. He would not give in.

So, in his typically forgiving—and nonvindictive—way, LBJ promptly assigned the freshman Senator his fourth, fifth, and sixth committee choices.

From this rather dubious beginning, Ed Muskie landed a seat on the not-so-choice Public Works Committee. The rest, as they say, is history. It did not take him long to leave his mark on Washington—or on the land that stretches from the Allagash Wilderness of Maine, to the Florida Everglades, to the Redwood forests of California.

You see, growing up in western Maine, Ed had developed a deep appreciation for the environment. Thoroughly committed and visionary, Senator Muskie helped transform the Public Works Committee and went on to become the founding father of environmental protection in America by sponsoring both the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act of 1972. These two landmark pieces of legislation have both produced enormous benefits to the health and well-being of our Nation and its people. It is his unwavering commitment to environmental protection that is, perhaps, Ed Muskie's single greatest legacy to the American people. He was indeed Mr. Clean.

With the news of his passing, my thoughts went back almost 2 years ago to the day—because Ed Muskie's birthday is March 28—when Ed and Jane Muskie, accompanied by their children and grandchildren, came to celebrate Ed's 80th birthday at the Blaine House, Maine's executive mansion, as the guests of my husband Gov. Jock McKernan and me. It was a great privilege for us to give Ed and Jane and their family an opportunity to come back to a place that held some of their fondest memories. It was a very special time for all of us. And they spent the night. It was a truly honorable moment in my life.

That evening, Ed spoke passionately about the opportunities he enjoyed as a young man, and of the commitment