AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Edmund S. Muskie

LATE A SENATOR FROM MAINE

MEMORIAL TRIBUTES

IN THE CONGRESS OF
THE UNITED STATES

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE 1914–1996



(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

S. Doc. 104–17

Memorial Tributes Delivered in Congress

Edmund S. Muskie

1914–1996

Late A Senator from Maine

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1996

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Compiled under the direction
of the
Secretary of the Senate

by the
Office of Printing Services

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

CONTENTS

	Page
Biography	ix
Proceedings in the Senate:	
Resolution of respect	15
Tributes by Senators:	
Baucus, Max, of Montana	4
Biden, Joseph R. Jr., of Delaware	2
Boxer, Barbara, of California	24
Cohen, William S., of Maine	16
Conrad, Kent, of North Dakota	23
Daschle, Thomas A., of South Dakota	11
Dodd, Christopher J., of Connecticut	15
Domenici, Pete V., of New Mexico	9
Hollings, Ernest F., of South Carolina	2
Mikulski, Barbara A., of Maryland	13
Nunn, Sam, of Georgia	20
Pell, Claiborne, of Rhode Island	1
Sarbanes, Paul S., of Maryland	21
Snowe, Olympia, of Maine	5
Proceedings in the House:	
Tributes by Representatives:	
Baldacci, John Elias, of Maine	26
Longley, James, of Maine	25
Moran, James P., of Virginia	26
Message from the Senate	27
Memorial Services for Edmund S. Muskie:	
The Church of the Little Flower, Bethesda, MD	31
Eulogies by:	
Stephen O. Muskie	34
The Hon. Leon G. Billings	35
The Hon. Madeleine K. Albright	36
Letter from President Bill Clinton	38
The Hon. George J. Mitchell	38
The Hon. Jimmy Carter	41
Edmund S. Muskie, Jr	43
Reading the prayer written by his father for the Presidential Prayer Breakfast	43
Bates College Chapel, Lewiston, ME	45
Memorial reflections:	
Mr. Donald W. Harward, president, Bates College	49
Remarks, Statements and Speeches:	
Bates College Memorial Minute for Edmund S. Muskie	57
Remembering Ed [Bates Magazine, Summer 1996]	58
What Might Have Been, What Wonderfully Was, [Bates Magazine, Summer 1996]	60
Why Ed Muskie Mattered, The Policy Journal of the Environmental Law Institute	63

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Page

Testimony of the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie, before the Committee on Environment and Public Works 69
NEPA to CERCLA, The Environmental Forum Journal 73
The State of the Union, A Democratic View, remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Washington, DC 81
Statements from the Congressional Record:
S. 1359, April 7, 1975 89
Freedom of Information Act—Amendment No. 1356, May 28, 1974 92
Amendment No. 1356, May 30, 1974 92
S. 1142, March 8, 1973 95
Our Failure to Plan for Our Nation's Growth, November 20, 1973 96
Liberal Party Dinner, New York City 103
Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Cape Elizabeth, ME 109
Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie on S. 3708 113
Inaugural Address of Edmund S. Muskie, Governor of Maine to the Ninety-Eighth Legislature 119
Inaugural Address of Edmund S. Muskie, Governor of Maine to the Ninety-Seventh Legislature 133
Roosevelt Campobello Park Commission Tribute to Edmund Sixtus Muskie 145
Letter to Senator Muskie establishing Franklin D. Roosevelt Campobello International Memorial Park 146

Articles and Editorials:
Edmund S. Muskie Dies at 81; Senator and Secretary of State, The Washington Post 150
Edmund Muskie Dies, Senate Stalwart Was 81, Boston Globe 154
Edmund Muskie Dies at 81, Revered Statesman Personified Maine, Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME) 156
Lofty Tributes Honor Solid, Humble Man; From Around the State, People Fondly Recall Memories of Ed Muskie, A Man Most Often Described as Lincolnesque, Portland Press Herald 161
Edmund Muskie Dies of Heart Failure; Distinguished Senator Brought Zeal to Office, Baltimore Sun 163
A Leader in the Best Sense; Edmund Muskie, U.S. Senator, Statesman, Dies at 81, Portland Press Herald 165
Presidents, Politicians Remember 'Legend,' 'Hero', Sun-Journal 170
Ed Muskie, Bangor Daily News 171
Muskie Brought Glory to His State and Nation; Maine Shaped His Voice and His Character and Never Let Go, Portland Press Herald 172
Maine Mourns Loss of 'Giant,' Sun-Journal 173
Muskie Remembered for Service to Public, Ex-Secretary of State Dies of Heart Failure, Des Moines Register 178
It All ended in Tears, Guardian Newspaper Limited 179
Edmund S. Muskie, Washington Post 181

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

	Page
U.S. Loses Its 'Mr. Clean,' Newsday	182
Muskie's Legacy: Clean Air, Water, San Francisco Examiner	184
McGovern, Muskie Bonded by New Hampshire, Bangor Daily News	185
Muskie's Tears Were Ahead of Their Time, Dallas Morning News	186
The Man Who Showed His Emotion Too Soon, Baltimore Sun	187
Ed Muskie of Maine Gave Politics a Good Name, News & Record (Greensboro, NC)	188
Edmund Muskie, The Economist	189
To Senators and Clerk, Muskie Special Person, Portland Press Herald	191
Muskie's Gift, Washington Post	192
Muskie Coveted the Trust of Mainers, Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME)	194
Muskie Buried Amid Tributes to Environmentalism, Washington Post	195
Edmund Muskie, Our Engineering Officer, Dallas Morning News	197
'Great Man' Laid to Rest; Muskie's Integrity, Legacy Honored, Portland Press Herald	197
Muskie Eulogized as Environmentalist, Negotiator; Carter, Mitchell Speak at Funeral, Washington Times	199
Muskie: Reason to Weep, Washington Post	201
As Sportsman and Statesman, Ed Muskie Was the Finest Kind, Portland Press Herald	202
Nation Honors Maine's 'Greatest'; Jimmy Carter, George Mitchell Eulogize Muskie, Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME)	203
A Cleaner Androscoggin Is Muskie Monument, Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME)	205
Ed Muskie and the Second Political Resurrection of Richard Nixon, Los Angeles Times	206
The Man From Maine, Ellsworth American	209
Ed Muskie Still Heroic to Intimates, Montgomery Advertiser	210
Remembering Secretary Muskie, Christian Science Monitor	212
Edmund S. Muskie, Commonweal	213
Remembering Ed Muskie, New Democrat	215

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

BIOGRAPHY

EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE was born on March 28, 1914 in Rumford ME, the second of six children. He was graduated cum laude from Bates College in Lewiston, ME in 1936, where he was a Phi Beta Kappa and class president. In 1939 he was graduated from Cornell University Law School. He enlisted in the U.S. Navy and served in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters.

Mr. MUSKIE was elected to the Maine House of Representatives in 1946, 1948, and 1950 where he served as minority leader during his second and third terms. From 1951–52 he served as the State director of the Office of Price Stabilization and was the Democratic National Committeeman from 1952 to 1956.

Mr. MUSKIE was elected Governor of Maine in 1954 and served two terms before being elected to the United States Senate in 1958. During his 22 years in the Senate, he served on the Foreign Relations Committee, the Governmental Affairs Committee, the Environment and Public Works Committee, and as Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget. In 1968 he was the Democratic nominee for Vice President.

He was the author of the autobiographical book, Journeys, published in 1972 and has received over thirty honorary degrees from colleges and universities throughout the country.

Mr. MUSKIE was sworn in as the 58th Secretary of State on May 8, 1980 and served until January, 1981. He was currently a senior partner with Chadbourne & Parke, an international law firm with offices in Washington, DC, New York, Los Angeles, Hong Kong, London, Moscow and New Delhi.

He was the Chairman Emeritus of the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy at Georgetown University, Chairman Emeritus of the Center for National Policy, and served on the board of directors of the American Academy of Diplomacy and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. In May of 1981, Mr. MUSKIE received the Notre Dame Laetare Medal and the Distinguished Service Award from the Association of Former Members of Congress. He also received the Presidential Medal of Freedom in January, 1981.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Mr. MUSKIE was appointed by President Reagan in December, 1986, to serve on the three-member Special Review Board to investigate the role of the NSC in the Iran/Contra affair. The Board's report was released in March of 1987.

Mr. MUSKIE married the former Jane Gray of Waterville, ME on May 29, 1948. The Muskies have five children—Stephen, Ellen, Melinda, Martha and Edmund Jr.—as well as seven grandchildren.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

MEMORIAL TRIBUTES

TO

EDMUND S. MUSKIE

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Proceedings in the Senate

TUESDAY, *March 26, 1996.*

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in paying respect to the memory of former Senator EDMUND MUSKIE. He was a very productive Member of this body and he made great contributions to its deliberations and to the welfare of our Nation. I admired him very much.

I first came to know ED MUSKIE when he was Governor of Maine and a delegate to our party's national conventions. I always found him to be a person of great common sense and practicality, traits that reflected his years of experience in the Maine State Legislature and before that as a city official in Waterville.

He was always a highly effective advocate for the interests of New England, and in that role as in other aspects of his wide ranging Senate career, he was capable of displaying his sense of righteous indignation in the interests of producing results.

Perhaps his greatest and most lasting contribution was his work in securing enactment of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and his subsequent service as the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. Here his practical vision saw the need for a consolidated legislative budget that coordinated and reconciled legislative appropriations with executive spending.

ED MUSKIE's Senate career came to a sudden and surprising conclusion with his elevation to the office of Secretary of State in the Carter administration at the height of the Iran crisis in 1980. It was a measure of Senator MUSKIE's statute in the Senate and in the Nation that President Carter turned to him at a time when circumstances called for a steady and authoritative hand.

It was a fitting climax to a career of exceptionally distinguished public service.

I join my colleagues in honoring the memory of EDMUND MUSKIE and I extend my sympathy to his wife Jane, family and many associates in Maine and across the country.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to a colleague and friend of mine who has just recently passed away. To those of us who were here during the sixties and seventies, EDMUND MUSKIE was more than a fellow legislator, he was a model of what a Senator should be. He was well liked and respected by all, and he listened to his constituents closely, and he effected change on their behalf.

To put it simply, ED MUSKIE was the best. Today, with all the talk about the Government being too big, and all the public scorn for the establishment, it is easy to lose sight of the optimism that used to be a driving force of politics. Senator MUSKIE embodied that optimism; he looked upon government as an opportunity, as a solution to problems. Characteristically, he acted on these beliefs to get things done. He led the demand for fiscal responsibility. As the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee in 1974, he virtually created the budget process. He will also be remembered as a great environmental legislator. The Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act: these were not a part of MUSKIE's political agenda due to pressure from lobbyists or special interest groups. They were things that he believed were necessary, and so he made them happen.

I knew ED MUSKIE long before I came to the Senate, and he always felt things keenly. I used to joke with him about what I called his righteous indignation, but I always respected the moral conviction and strength that lay behind it. Senator MUSKIE detested the influence of lobbies and partisanship, and what they were doing to politics. He was in government to do a good job, not to play games. He was—and in this city, this is a great compliment—a man who got things done. The principles that he lived by came through in his work, whether as a Senator, a Secretary of State or as a lawyer and statesman. He knew the importance of character and of listening to the voter.

In 1970, Senator MUSKIE gave a memorable speech in which he said: "There are only two kinds of politics. They are not radical and reactionary, or conservative and liberal, or even Democratic and Republican. They are only the politics of fear and the politics of trust." As we head into another election year and another century, these are words to remember. ED MUSKIE was a champion of the politics of trust. We will remember him fondly.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, few who ever served in this body have been as universally mourned as those of us from

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

both sides of the aisle who knew him will mourn our former colleague, ED MUSKIE, who died here in Washington early this morning.

The reports already circulating on the news wire services and the obituaries that will appear in tomorrow's newspapers, all will make much, and rightly so, out of his long and distinguished service as a public man.

Few men or women in our history have contributed so much to the Nation as ED MUSKIE did as a U.S. Senator for 21 years and as Secretary of State; few have contributed as much to their native State as ED MUSKIE did as a member of the Maine House of Representatives and as Governor of the State he loved so much; and few have contributed as much to one of the major political parties as ED MUSKIE did to the Democratic Party, which he served as a Vice Presidential candidate in 1968 and as chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

It is fitting that, upon his death just 2 days before his 82d birthday, Americans should be reminded of his long and faithful public service and leadership—but those of us who knew and served with ED MUSKIE will remember him more familiarly as a man of principle, as a powerful personality, and, most of all, as our good friend.

One thing that I learned very quickly, serving with him on the Budget Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, was that while he exhibited the gravitas—the character and substance—that might be expected of a man whose full given name was EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE, he was a very human, very good-humored man—most of the time—who was most comfortable simply as ED MUSKIE, and who if he was your friend was your friend for life.

It is true that his good humor would sometimes momentarily desert him—he had a temper that verged on the volcanic, and he was capable of weeping public tears over an insult to the wife whom he loved—but those moments occurred, for the most part, because ED MUSKIE never believed that a career in politics obliged his head to divorce his heart; despite a powerful intellect that won him a law degree, a Phi Beta Kappa key and a long, successful career both in law and in politics, he never believed that political feelings must somehow be set aside.

He was passionate about his politics—he believed the work we do here is important to improving the lives of Americans—and he believed that what he felt was as important to achieving that end as what he thought.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

But though ED MUSKIE sometimes wore his heart unashamedly on his sleeve, he was also very much a Yankee, very much a man of Maine, who put great stock in getting things done, and getting them done at the right price.

By that I am not referring so much to his chairmanship of the Budget Committee—although he certainly exerted a strong hand at that helm, often to the dismay of bureaucrats throughout the land and not infrequently to Senate colleagues who failed to make a strong enough case for their favorite program—no, for him, getting things done at the right price meant achieving that meld of idealism and realism which we often say a democratic system of Government requires but which few of us ever achieve with the grace and consistency of an ED MUSKIE.

The people of Maine understood that as well as we did here in the Senate, and he understood and loved them, as well.

I remember him saying one time, "in Maine, we tend not to speak unless we think we can improve upon the silence."

Out of his wisdom, out of his passion, out of his drive to get things done, ED MUSKIE often spoke up for Maine and for America—and we need only feel the silence of his passing gather about us now to know how much he improved upon it during a long and accomplished life.

In the words of William Shakespeare, "he was a man, take him for all in all, [we] shall not look upon his like again."

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this morning we were sad to learn of the passing of one of our most distinguished former colleagues, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine.

ED MUSKIE served our Nation in many ways. He was a soldier. A Governor. The first chairman of the Budget Committee. The Secretary of State. The Democratic Party's candidate for Vice President.

He also was responsible, in large part, for one of the most positive and profound legislative achievements of postwar America: the passage of the environmental laws of the 1970's, to clean up our Nation's air, water, and waste.

Remember what things were like 25 years ago. We had experienced decades of industrial growth without environmental protection. Lead in the air caused brain damage in children. Toxic waste dumps all across the country caused cancer. The Cuyahoga River even caught fire.

Something had to be done. And, as chairman of the Environmental Protection Subcommittee of the Environment and Public Works Committee, ED MUSKIE saw that it was. He

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

worked tirelessly to create bipartisan support for landmark environmental laws.

The Clean Water Act, requiring rivers and streams to be fishable and swimmable; the Clean Air Act, cutting emissions from cars and factories; the Safe Drinking Water Act; the Endangered Species Act.

These laws are not perfect. But, on the whole, they have been remarkably successful. Our air is cleaner. Lead emissions fell nearly 90 percent. To put it another way, we took nearly five ounces of lead out of the sky for every American man, woman, and child. Emissions of sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and particulates are way down, and half as many Americans live in cities with unhealthy air as in 1970.

Our water is cleaner. You can swim without getting sick and eat the fish you catch in twice as many rivers and streams. Even the Cuyahoga River has revived, to become a center for tourism in downtown Cleveland. The bald eagle is back from the brink of extinction.

Overall, because of the work of ED MUSKIE and his colleagues, our children are growing up in a more healthy and beautiful America.

Mr. President, I am reminded of the Latin epitaph on the tomb of Sir Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Paul's Cathedral. It's inside the cathedral, and it says, "If you would see his memorial, look around."

So it is with ED MUSKIE. If you wish to see his memorial, look around you: at the air in our cities; at the Potomac River, or the Cuyahoga; at a cleaner environment from Maine to Montana; at a Nation that is more healthy and more beautiful because of his work.

He was a great environmental statesman, and his passing diminishes us.

WEDNESDAY, *March 27, 1996.*

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

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

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."

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ED brandished that incisive wit many times in this very Chamber, Mr. President, 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 man-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

sion, as the guests of my husband Governor 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 and dedication that his parents had to their family and their community. And he spoke of the love and devotion that his father—a Polish immigrant—had for his new Nation.

He spoke of how much his roots in the small town of Rumford, ME, meant to him. It was those deep roots, along with his strong sense of family, that gave ED MUSKIE the foundation upon which he would stand as he became a leading figure in American political life. And he cherished his father's roots, and from the standpoint that he viewed it as America giving every opportunity to anybody who sought to achieve.

I was struck with a very real sense of history listening to his reminiscences during that visit. I do not think it is possible for any Maine politician, regardless of party affiliation, to have come of age during the MUSKIE era and not have been influenced in some way by his presence. He was that preeminent in the political life of my State.

ED MUSKIE was a towering figure in every sense of the word. In his physical stature, in his intellect, in his presence on Capitol Hill, in the extent of his impact on the political life of Maine, and in the integrity he brought to bear in everything he did.

And ED was thoroughly and proudly a Mainer, with the quiet sense of humor associated with our State. Each year, the distinguished senior Senator entertained guests at the Maine State Society lobster dinner at the National Press Club by rubbing the belly of a live lobster, causing it to fall asleep, something only a real Mainer would know how to do.

Personally, I will always remember and be grateful for the warmth, friendship, and encouragement that ED MUSKIE gave me over the years. When I entered the U.S. House of Representatives in 1979, I was the newest member of the Maine congressional delegation. ED was the dean of the delegation. We were congressional colleagues for only a year and a half, but our friendship lasted throughout the years. And when I was elected to the seat which he had held with such

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

distinction, I was touched by his kindness, and grateful for his advice and counsel.

Throughout his life, he never failed to answer the call of duty. He answered the call from the people of Maine. . . . He answered the call from America's rivers and streams . . . and he answered a call from the President of the United States and a worried Nation when Senator MUSKIE became Secretary of State MUSKIE in a moment of national crisis.

Mr. President, 75 years before EDMUND MUSKIE was born, another famous Mainer, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, captured what I believe is the essence of the wonderful man we remember today. Longfellow wrote:

> Lives of great men all remind us
> we can make our lives sublime,
> And, departing, leave behind us
> footprints on the sands of time.

ED MUSKIE's footprints remain on those sands. They are there as a guide for those of us who would follow in his path. They are big footprints, not easily filled. But we would all do well to try.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I cannot speak about Senator ED MUSKIE with the depth of knowledge that Senator Snowe had of his background and his impact on his beloved State of Maine. But it has fallen to me to be, at every stage of my growth in the Senate, on a committee with Senator MUSKIE.

My first assignment was the Public Works Committee. I was the most junior Republican, and Senator MUSKIE was the third-ranking Democrat and chaired the Subcommittee on the Environment. I also served on that subcommittee. I saw in him a man of tremendous capability and dedication when he undertook a cause. He learned everything there was to learn about it, and he proceeded with that cause with the kind of diligence and certainty that is not so often found around here. There were various times during the evolution of clean water and clean air statutes in the country that we could go in one of two directions, or one of three. Senator MUSKIE weighed those heavily, and chose the direction and the course that we are on now.

No one can deny that Senator MUSKIE is the chief architect of environmental cleanup of our air and water in the United States. Some would argue about its regulatory processes, but there can be no question that hundreds of rivers across America are clean today because of ED MUSKIE. There can be no doubt that our air is cleaner and safer and

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

healthier because of his leadership. I really do not think any person needs much more than that to be part of their legacy.

But essentially he took on another job, and a very, very difficult one—to chair the Budget Committee of the U.S. Senate. Again, it fell on me as a very young Senator to be on that committee. I have been on it ever since. I was fortunate to move up. He became chairman in its earliest days.

I might just say as an aside that the Chair would be interested in this. When we moved the President's budget—$6 billion in those days—that was a big, big thing, and we had a real battle for it. He would take the Presidents—no matter which ones—on with great, great determination.

But I want to close by saying that one of the things I will never forget about him is that he saw me as a young Senator from New Mexico. I had a very large family. He got to meet them and know them. On a number of occasions he personally said that he would very much like to make sure that we did not do things around here to discourage young Senators like Domenici from staying here. I think he was sincere, even though I was on the Republican side. I think he saw us with an awful lot of feeling ourselves up here in trying to establish rules that were very difficult, and he used to regularly say, "I hope this does not discourage you. We need to keep some of you around."

So to his wonderful family and to all of those close to him, you have suffered a great loss, but I can say that his life has been a great legacy for the country. That ought to lend you in these days of sorrow a bit of consolation, because that legacy is great. Death is obviously inevitable. He accomplished great things before that day occurred.

Mr. DASCHLE. On behalf of myself, Senator Dole, Senator Cohen, and Senator Snowe, I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 234) relative to the death of EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

Whereas, the Senate fondly remembers former Secretary of State, former Governor of Maine, and former Senator from Maine, EDMUND S. MUSKIE,

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE spent six years in the Maine House of Representatives, becoming minority leader,

Whereas, in 1954, voters made EDMUND S. MUSKIE the State's first Democratic Governor in 20 years,

Whereas, after a second two-year term, he went on in 1958 to become the first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history;

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE in 1968, was chosen as Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee,

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE left the Senate to become President Carter's Secretary of State,

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE served with honor and distinction in each of these capacities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE, formerly a Senator from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourns as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

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

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, in the earliest days of our Nation, George Washington said it was the duty of public servants to "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair."

In his more than five decades as a public servant, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE not only raised the standard of wisdom and honesty in public office. On many occasions and in many ways, he set the standard.

Today I join my colleagues and, indeed, all of America, in saying goodbye to this extraordinary American.

Senator MUSKIE served two terms as Governor of Maine—something of a minor political miracle in such a rock-ribbed Republican State.

He also served with great dignity and distinction as our Nation's Secretary of State under President Carter.

But it was his service in this Chamber, and as his party's candidate for Vice President, for which Senator MUSKIE will be best remembered—and rightly so.

In 1974, I came to Washington as a Senate staffer. Senator MUSKIE had already served 15 years.

What first impressed me about him was his compassion, and his unshakable belief in the infinite possibilities of America. It was a belief he learned from his immigrant father, a belief that animated his entire life.

ED MUSKIE knew that government cannot guarantee anyone the good life. But government has a responsibility to help people seize possibilities to make a good life for themselves, their families and their communities.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

He held other beliefs deeply as well.

ED MUSKIE believed that we have an obligation to be good stewards of this fragile planet.

He was an expert on air and water pollution, and he served as floor manager for two of the most important environmental laws ever—the Clean Air Act of 1963 and the Water Quality Act of 1965.

ED MUSKIE believed that more was needed to solve the problem of poverty than money from Washington. Thirty years ago, he called for a new creative federalism.

"No matter how much the Federal partner provides," he said, "no Federal legislation, no executive order, no administrative establishment can get to the heart of most of the basic problems confronting the State governments today."

ED MUSKIE believed that politics ought to be a contest of ideas, not an endless series of personal attacks.

In 1970, ED MUSKIE was the presumptive front-runner for his party's 1972 Presidential nomination. In that role, he was the victim of malicious and false attacks.

Rather than counter-attack, Senator MUSKIE appealed for reason and decency and truth. I want to quote from a televised speech he made back then, because I think it bears repeating today.

"In these elections . . . something has gone wrong," he said.

> There has been name calling and deception of almost unprecedented volume. Honorable men have been slandered. Faithful servants of the country have had their motives questioned and their patriotism doubted. . . .
>
> The danger from this assault is not that a few more Democrats might be defeated—the country can survive that. The true danger is that the American people will have been deprived of that public debate, that opportunity for fair judgment, which is the heartbeat of the democratic process. And that is something the country cannot afford.

Senator MUSKIE went on to say:

> There are only two kinds of politics. They are not radical or reactionary, or conservative and liberal, or even Democratic or Republicans. They are only the politics of fear, and the politics of trust.

Senator MUSKIE believed in the politics of trust.

And he believed in honest negotiation. Testifying before the Senate a few years ago, Senator MUSKIE said, "There's always a way to talk."

There is always a way to talk.

In his later years, Senator MUSKIE helped found an organization called the Center for National Priorities to find new ways to talk in a reasoned manner about the big problems facing our Nation.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Today, we mourn ED MUSKIE's death. But let us also celebrate his extraordinary life. And let us rededicate ourselves to the beliefs that shaped that life.

The belief that America is and must remain a land of possibilities—for all of us.

The belief that we must protect our environment.

The belief that it takes more than money alone to solve our problems. It takes hard work and personal responsibility, and people working together.

Let us rededicate ourselves to Senator MUSKIE's belief the politics can and should be a contest of ideas, and that we have a responsibility to talk straight to the American people.

And let us remember that we have a responsibility to talk straight to each other. There are many great and urgent issues facing this chamber.

There must be a way we can talk.

ED MUSKIE is gone. But we can keep his spirit alive in this chamber. The choice is ours.

In closing, I offer my deepest condolences to Senator Muskie's widow, Jane, to their children, and to his many friends the world over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the resolution is agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the remarkable life of EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

He was a great American, a true statesman, and I'm proud to say, a good friend.

Mr. President, I am the first woman of Polish heritage ever elected to the Senate. ED MUSKIE took great pride in my election, since we shared a common heritage and a common set of values. He was gracious in helping me to learn the ways of the Senate. He was a strong mentor, and I have always been appreciative of the sound advice and concrete suggestions he offered to me.

He offered all of us a model of what a Senator should be. He stuck to principles, never afraid to take on the powers that be. He fought hard for what he believed in, but he bore no grudges. EDMUND MUSKIE believed, as I do, that programs must deliver what they promise.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

He made change his ally, and was never wedded to the past. If what we had been doing wasn't working, he fought to fix it. And he sought always to build consensus, to serve as a voice of moderation and practicality—in keeping with his New England roots.

I was proud to be a national cochair of his campaign for the Presidency in 1972. It still strikes me as a great injustice that this good and decent man never had the opportunity to hold the highest office in the land. What a wonderful President he would have been.

Although he never realized his dream of becoming President, his contributions to our Nation were immense.

EDMUND MUSKIE deserves the thanks of all Americans for his decades of public service. All of us who cherish our wilderness areas owe him a debt of gratitude for his steadfast defense of our environment as a distinguished Senator for 21 years. He was the father of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act. The air we breathe is cleaner and the water we drink more pure because of Senator MUSKIE's dedication to environmental protection.

Those of us who care about fiscal responsibility—about making sure that America's hardworking taxpayers get a dollar's worth of services for a dollar's worth of taxes—owe him thanks for his stewardship of the Senate Budget Committee. As chairman of the committee, Senator MUSKIE fought to curb excessive Federal spending, while also ensuring that the Government did not turn its back on those seeking a helping hand.

We owe him thanks for his service as Secretary of State under President Carter. He undertook that important responsibility at a difficult and sensitive time—while the President was working to free American hostages being held in Iran. And he fulfilled his duties with honor and wisdom.

Those of us who are Democrats also owe him a special debt. Virtually single-handedly he revitalized a dormant Democratic party in his beloved State of Maine. He became Maine's first Democratic Governor in 20 years.

Without him, the Senate might never had been honored by the service of our former Majority Leader, George Mitchell, and the United Nations might never had benefited from the enormous contributions of Madeleine Albright. He mentored them both, providing them with some of their first experiences in government.

Mr. President, America is a better place because of the dedicated public service over many decades of EDMUND S.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE. I thank him and honor him for his service to our country.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife, Jane, his children and the entire Muskie family.

Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. Dole, Mr. Cohen, and Ms. Snowe) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 234

Whereas, the Senate fondly remembers former Secretary of State, former Governor of Maine, and former Senator from Maine, EDMUND S. MUSKIE,

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE spent six years in the Maine House of Representatives, becoming minority leader,

Whereas, in 1954, voters made EDMUND S. MUSKIE the State's first Democratic Governor in 20 years,

Whereas, after a second two-year term, he went on in 1958 to become the first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history,

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE in 1968, was chosen as Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee,

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE left the Senate to become President Carter's Secretary of State,

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE served with honor and distinction in each of these capacities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE, formerly a Senator from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wanted to take a few moments today to speak about the death of former Senator EDMUND MUSKIE.

I first met ED MUSKIE during his visits to my family's house in Connecticut more than 30 years ago as he traveled back to Maine from Washington.

And like my father before me—I was honored to serve with him in Congress. I came to greatly admire and respect his leadership, his conviction, his knowledge and his great devotion to public service.

EDMUND MUSKIE was a truly dedicated member of this body for 22 years. He served both the people of Maine and all the American people as a committed and able legislator.

And when his party and his President called on him he answered. He twice ran for national office as a Democrat: Once for Vice-President in 1968 and once for the Democratic nomi-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

nation for President in 1972. And he finished his career as Secretary of State, under President Carter in 1980.

Throughout his more than two decades of public service ED MUSKIE was ahead of his time in his efforts to keep our environment clean and America's fiscal house in order.

He earned the apt nickname "Mr. Clean" for his pioneering work on the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act, both of which he shepherded through the Senate. Generations from now, when Americans are enjoying our safe and healthy air and water, they should thank EDMUND MUSKIE for having the foresight and vision to place a clean environment on top of the political agenda.

And even before the era of exploding Federal deficits in the 1980's, EDMUND MUSKIE strived to bring fiscal discipline to Congress, as chairman of the Senate Budget Committee.

Yesterday, former President Jimmy Carter said he had "never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States." And it is to the American people's misfortune that a man of such principle never had the opportunity to reach the Oval Office.

As a fellow Democrat and Northeasterner I remain committed to the policies that EDMUND MUSKIE so energetically championed as a U.S. Senator.

My thoughts and prayers go out to his wife Jane, his children, his friends and the people of Maine.

THURSDAY, *March 29, 1996.*

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, last Tuesday, the State of Maine and the entire Nation mourned the loss of a political giant, EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

From Maine to California, the newspapers are filled with long stories detailing and encapsulating the life and times of ED MUSKIE and his accomplishments. There were columns that appeared in the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Boston Globe, the Bangor Daily News, the Portland Press Herald—all across the country.

While each of the articles was written from the unique perspective of the authors, there were common elements in each one of them. The articles spoke of Senator MUSKIE's intellect, which indeed was muscular. They spoke of his integrity, which was unquestioned. They spoke of his candor,

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

which was unmatched. They spoke of his courage, which I think was incomparable.

He took on some of the most powerful interests in this country and, never once, did he ever flinch, he never sought favor, and never acted out of fear. He was indeed a brave heart.

He was careful, and some say he was cautious.

I read a tribute recently, which I will quote:

> Perhaps the strongest feature in his character was prudence, never acting until every circumstance, every consideration, was maturely weighed; refraining when he saw doubt, but when once decided, going through with his purpose whatever obstacles opposed. His integrity was the most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives or interest or consanguinity, or friendship or hatred being able to bias his decision. He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man.

These words were not about ED MUSKIE. These are the words of Thomas Jefferson assessing the character of George Washington. But they might just as well have been said about ED MUSKIE.

In Ecclesiastes, the question is asked, "What is best for men to do during their few days of life under the sun?"

Well, it was clear from the very beginning what the answer was for ED MUSKIE. He was not born to be a spectator or a bystander. He did not come into this world to sit in a darkened theater and express his approval or rejection of those on stage.

He knew, as Justice Holmes before him knew, that "Life is action and passion, and we must share in that action and passion at the risk of being judged not to have lived."

ED MUSKIE was at the very center of the action of his days—whether it was on the civil rights legislation, or protecting the environment, or waging the fight to control the budget, as chairman of the Budget Committee, or promoting America's role in a dangerous world, as the Secretary of State.

When he was on the Senate floor in full-throated debate, and when he blended that magnificent mind of his with the rhetorical power and grace of the orator, then he became one with the poet Hopkins, who said, "What I do is for me; for this I care."

Dr. Robert Sheehan once wrote, "The world belongs to those who laugh and cry. Laughter is the beginning of wisdom, the first evidence of the divine sense of humor. Those who know laughter have learned the secret of living."

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Well, ED laughed a lot. He had a wry, down-east Yankee wit. He loved a good cigar, a good story, and he loved a good joke.

While passion was his virtue, it was also said to be his vice. He had a cool, cerebral intellect, but he also had a quick and, some would say, also Vesuvian temper, particularly when he witnessed an injustice being done, an act of hypocrisy or unfairness being inflicted. He had little tolerance for character assassination.

We are all familiar with that fateful moment in New Hampshire when he was standing on a flatbed during a snowfall. ED MUSKIE decided that he had enough of the dirty tricks that were being practiced upon him at that time, enough of the daily diatribes that appeared in one of New Hampshire's newspapers. But, of course, he was not the only object of attack that week. He rose on that day to denounce the attacks against his wife, Jane, as being mean and cowardly. There was one prominent journalist, David Broder, who wrote that Senator MUSKIE appeared to be crying during that time—although, to this day, there is some question as to whether they were actually snowflakes falling or streaming down his cheeks, as opposed to tears.

But it was a moment in history—a turning point in his campaign for the Presidency because many, after that moment, judged him to be too passionate to be President.

There is some irony in the retelling of this story and this event because, some 16 years later, another Democratic candidate for the Presidency was thought to be too cool, too bland, and bloodless in his response to a question about what he would do if his wife had been raped.

So we have come to learn that politics is not a sport where the rules are always well defined, or indeed consistent.

Some people who have run unsuccessfully for the Presidency are broken by the experience. Defeat never shattered ED MUSKIE's love of politics and his love for this institution. He possessed an inner self-confidence and self-awareness of his place in the uncompleted puzzle of existence. It was a serenity which permitted him to continue to serve nobly in the Senate and then later as Secretary of State.

Mr. President, back in 1976, I had given consideration to running against Senator MUSKIE. I was then a young Congressman from the Second Congressional District of Maine. I was being urged, indeed, to run against Senator MUSKIE. I was pondering. I thought about it for a long time. I retreated to Sugarloaf Mountain in Maine to contemplate

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

whether or not I would take this great step. I had with me at that time a book called "Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance" written by Robert Pirsig. It was one of the most intellectually challenging books I think I had read at that time.

As I was reading through the book, the decision really clicked into my mind. I came across the words of Pirsig when he said:

> When you try to climb a mountain to prove how big you are, you almost never make it. And even if you do, it's a hollow victory. In order to sustain the victory you have to prove yourself again and again in some other way, and again and again and again, driven forever to fill a false image, haunted by the fear that the image is not true and someone will find out. That's never the way. . . .

I knew, upon reading these words, that I was in danger of letting my own ambition race beyond my abilities and that even if I could defeat ED MUSKIE—and the polls showed me doing that—I knew in my heart that I would need a fistful of four-leaf clovers and a whole lot of money. Even then in my heart of hearts I knew that it would be a tough race for me to run, and that, even if I were to win—which was always in doubt—the State of Maine and this country would not have been well served. He was by far a superior man, and history has proven that to be the case.

So I declined to enter the race. I called ED MUSKIE and told him of my decision—never revealing at that time that I had been reading "Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance" which helped me reach that conclusion.

John Kennedy once remarked that when the high court of history sits in judgment on each of us, recording in our brief span of service whether we fulfilled our responsibilities, our success will be measured by the answers to four questions:

First, were we truly men of courage?

Second, were we truly men of judgment?

Third, were we truly men of integrity?

Fourth, were we truly men of dedication?

As history judges ED MUSKIE, the answer to each of these questions is an unqualified "yes." These are the very qualities that characterized his service in Government. He will be remembered as one of the finest public servants to ever have graced the Governor's Mansion in Maine, the U.S. Senate, and the Office of Secretary of State.

Tomorrow when he is laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery, ED MUSKIE will be in the hearts and in the minds of the people of Maine and this country and shall remain there for generations to come.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I rise to join with my fellow Senators in mourning the death of former Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine, and in paying tribute to one of the most distinguished and influential Members of this body during a turbulent period in our history.

ED MUSKIE worked his way through Bates College, where he was a Phi Beta Kappa, and earned a scholarship to Cornell's law school. After serving in the Navy on destroyer escorts during World War II, he was elected to the Maine House, where he served as minority leader. He won the Governorship of Maine during the Eisenhower years when no Democrat had held the office in 20 years, and was easily reelected. He revitalized the State party and was elected and reelected to the U.S. Senate until his resignation to become Secretary of State in 1980 during the last difficult months of the Iran hostage crisis. It was a time of great tension following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, during which the United States boycotted the Olympic games in Moscow.

ED MUSKIE was Hubert Humphrey's Vice-Presidential running mate in 1968. Few people remember how close that election was, and one reason it was so close was the strength ED MUSKIE brought to the ticket. He started out the frontrunner, but his own campaign for the Presidential nomination in 1972 was unsuccessful, damaged by the dirty tricks the Nation would only learn about only later. It is ironic, but a tribute to the man, that the most damaging thing his enemies could point to in his conduct was that he loved his wife enough to lose his usual control when they attempted to slander her.

Senator MUSKIE returned to the Senate and in 1974 became the first chairman of the Budget Committee. I had the privilege of serving with him on the committee during my formative early years in the Senate. He was a strong voice for budget stability. The processes he established for monitoring Federal spending, and his insistence on holding down spending across a broad range, including the areas of his own major concerns. This is the same process being used today in our attempt to achieve a balanced budget by 2007.

Senator MUSKIE deserves major credit for most of the important early environmental legislation. He held together fragile coalitions of liberals and conservatives in budget battles, challenged Presidential policies and his own wing of the Democratic party for its failure to change. Through it all, he earned the respect of both allies and foes.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

After his stint as Secretary of State, he retired to private law practice. He returned briefly to public service in 1987 on the Special Review Board on the Iran-Contra Scandal, also known as the Tower Commission.

ED MUSKIE was a big man, big enough to still the voices of hecklers by inviting them up on the platform with him, big enough early in his Senate career to stand up to Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson at the height of his power, and big enough to gain the respect of his fellow Senators, and of Johnson himself. He believed in what he called a politics of trust, not of fear.

ED MUSKIE was often described as "Lincolnesque." His middle name, SIXTUS, was the name of five Popes during the 15th and 16th centuries. His last name had been shortened by immigration officials from what they considered the unpronounceable Polish name of his forefathers when his father arrived at Ellis Island. But whatever people called him, wherever his names came from, ED MUSKIE was his own man.

What we remember is not the occasional flash of temper but his modesty, moderation, and self-deprecating humor, and his capacity for bridging differences. He was a man of great humanity who stood for reason and reconciliation in a time of division and disunity.

ED MUSKIE graced this body with his healing and imposing presence, his self-deprecating humor, and his personal integrity for 21 years. He served his State and country courageously for more than three decades. I am honored to have served with him, and want to express my deepest sympathy, and that of this body, to Jane, his wonderful wife of 48 years, and to their children Stephen, Ellen, Melinda, Martha, and Edmund, Jr.

THURSDAY, *April 18, 1996.*

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to our wonderful colleague and dear friend ED MUSKIE who passed away late last month. A distinguished public servant, an accomplished legislator, and a man of great integrity and humanity, EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE represented the best of the Senate and of the Nation.

Throughout his career in public service Senator MUSKIE exhibited a rare and remarkable gift; his extraordinary abil-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ity to see opportunities where others could not and to translate those opportunities into positive changes for the people of Maine and the Nation.

ED MUSKIE began his career of dedicated public service in the Maine Legislature where he initially served as part of a small Democratic minority. From this modest beginning, he assumed the reins of the Maine Democratic party and revitalized it by exercising the vision and leadership necessary to involve people more fully in the political process. His efforts led to his own election as Maine's first Democratic Governor in 20 years, and in 1958, he became the first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history.

But the depth and breadth of ED MUSKIE's vision extended far beyond Maine politics. Upon his arrival in the U.S. Senate, he continued to exhibit the same straightforwardness and independent thinking that won him the trust of the citizens of Maine. These traits enabled him to make the Environment and Public Works Committee the forum which produced this Nation's landmark environmental protection legislation, the Clean Air Act and the Water Quality Act. These critical environmental statutes changed the way Americans view our precious natural resources and his work provided the foundation upon which all subsequent environmental protection statutes have been built.

In addition, his efforts were instrumental to the passage of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, establishing the beginnings of the modern coordinated Congressional budget process. As the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, ED MUSKIE was committed to the effective disciplined Federal spending; demonstrating that promoting fiscal responsibility and meeting the needs of our people were complementary objectives.

Throughout his lifetime of public service, ED MUSKIE was a man his country could turn to in a time of crises. As a U.S. Senator, a Vice-Presidential and then Presidential candidate, and as Secretary of State, he demonstrated an unsurpassed commitment to improving the welfare of all Americans. In his candid, forthright and honest way, he encouraged the free exchange of ideas within the democratic process, working to transcend partisan boundaries and foster what he called a "politics of trust" in this Nation.

One of his many legacies to our country is the large number of former Muskie staff members who under his leadership made such extraordinary contributions to our Nation's welfare. Many of these individuals continue to render dedi-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

cated public service and they constitute a national asset which is yet another tribute to ED MUSKIE's sterling qualities.

Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity not only to honor the life and service of EDMUND MUSKIE, but to extend my deepest and heartfelt sympathies to his wife, Jane, and to his children, Stephen, Ellen, Melinda, Martha, and Ned, and their families. We thank them for sharing their husband and father with the Nation—America is a far better place for ED MUSKIE's contributions.

On Saturday, March 30, 1996, an exceptionally moving service for ED MUSKIE was held at the Church of the Little Flower in Bethesda, MD, followed by burial at Arlington National Cemetery. At that service, eloquent and heartfelt eulogies were delivered which greatly moved all of us who were present. In testimony to ED MUSKIE's life of quality and honor, I ask unanimous consent that these eulogies be printed in the Record.

[Reference on page 34.]

FRIDAY, *April 29, 1996.*

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the death of ED MUSKIE marks a deep personal loss for me, and a loss for our Nation. Senator MUSKIE was a close personal friend and leader in both the Senate and our national political scene. As a young man, I can remember my admiration for his integrity and dedication when I served as a midwestern State coordinator for his Presidential campaign in 1972. In the Senate he was the leader in urging creation of a Senate Budget Committee so the Chamber would have a committee with a board overview of the budget process. In this time of public concern over the Federal budget, it is important we remember that as the first chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator MUSKIE warned the Congress and the Nation of the need to balance our Federal budget to protect America's future. Those of us who serve on the committee today are still mindful of the foresight he showed, and are working to see that his legacy is fulfilled. Americans of this generation also owe a debt to the former Senator from Maine for his vision and his tireless efforts in awakening Congress and the Nation to the critical importance of enacting comprehensive laws to protect our Nation's environment for future generations. Our

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Nation owes him a deep debt of gratitude we can never repay.

FRIDAY, *April 29, 1996.*

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as all Senators know, former Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE passed away on March 26, two days before his 82d birthday. Senator MUSKIE served in this body from January, 1959, until May 1980, when he resigned to become Secretary of State in the Carter administration.

As a freshman Senator, ED MUSKIE ardently desired a position on the Foreign Relations Committee. He was disappointed to be appointed to the Public Works Committee instead. But his loss proved to be the Nation's gain. As a Member of the Public Works Committee, later the chairman of the Environmental Pollution Subcommittee, Senator MUSKIE became the chief architect of America's first environmental laws.

At the funeral service for Senator MUSKIE, his protege and former chief of staff, George Mitchell, who took MUSKIE's Senate seat and went on to become the Senate majority leader, delivered a wonderful tribute to Senator MUSKIE's environmental leadership. I would like to share his remarks with the Senate today by asking unanimous consent that they be printed in the Congressional Record at this point.

[Reference on page 38.]

Mrs. BOXER. Finally, Mr. President, I would also like to share with my colleagues a beautiful prayer, written by Senator MUSKIE for the occasion of the Presidential Prayer Breakfast in January, 1969. The message of this prayer—a plea on behalf of all public officials for mutual trust and understanding, cooperation and compassion—is more relevant today than ever. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the prayer be printed in the Record.

[Reference on page 43.]

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Proceedings in the House

TUESDAY, *March 26, 1996.*

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty this afternoon to inform the House of the passing of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine this morning at about 4 a.m.

Senator MUSKIE was 81 years of age, a graduate of Bates College and Cornell University Law School, a very distinguished public servant of the citizens of Maine and of the United States. He served three terms in the Maine House of Representatives in 1946 and 1948 and 1950, including a final term as the Democratic floor leader. In 1955, he was elected Governor, he served a second term, and he followed that with a career in the U.S. Senate that began in 1958.

In 1968, he was Democratic candidate for Vice President of the United States and built and earned a tremendous national reputation for his decency, his compassion and his moderation during that difficult time during the end of the Vietnam war. He also served as Secretary of State in the Cabinet of President Jimmy Carter from 1980 to 1981.

While there are many distinctions that we can discuss, not the least among them is the Senator's accomplishment in creating a second party, making Maine a two-party State, which is in the best interest of all of our citizens, but certainly as his legislative accomplishments on the national level are beyond peer, particularly in the area of environmental protection.

Senator MUSKIE was the author of many of the first pieces of legislation that this body passed back in the early 1960's dealing with the need to protect the quality of our air and our water. There are other issues that I could mention, but I think none more important than the fact that Senator MUSKIE was a kind and decent man who exercised and practiced respect for all of his constituents and all those with whom he had dealings. His demeanor is going to be missed. Certainly his integrity and his honesty are universally respected.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

So we mourn his passing and we also express to his wife, Jane, and his five children, Steven, Ellen, Melinda, Martha, and Edmund, Jr., our deep and sincere regret at his passing.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Democratic minority, it is appropriate to take note of a distinguished Governor, U.S. Senator, Secretary of State, and Vice Presidential candidate. It is on ED MUSKIE's shoulders that much of the intellectual foundation of our foreign policy rests in terms of the primary of human rights and the sustainable progress of economic development throughout the world. It was on Senator MUSKIE's watch and on his shoulders that these priorities were defined and promoted.

It is also appropriate to say that it was on his giant shoulders, that were so strong with integrity, that many of us lesser public servants have attempted to stand. Senator MUSKIE always stood tall and made us all proud to be public servants, and we deeply mourn his passing.

WEDNESDAY, *March 27, 1996.*

Mr. BALDACCI. Madam Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn yesterday of the death of Senator ED MUSKIE. As a new Member of Congress from Maine, I have been privileged to call on ED MUSKIE for advice and wisdom.

ED MUSKIE was a leader for Maine and a statesman for the Nation. He never lost sight of his roots, nor wavered from his principles.

The people of Maine and the Nation are indebted to ED MUSKIE for his passionate work on a wide range of issues. His vision in developing environmental legislation, especially the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts, is a legacy which will be recognized and honored by generations to come.

We can all learn much from the life that ED MUSKIE led. I will never forget the advice that he gave to me shortly before I took office. He said, "Be yourself, work hard, and tell the truth." Those simple principles guided his life, and are what I strive to live up to every day.

Senator MUSKIE's devotion to Maine and his dedication to improving the quality of life for all Americans will long be remembered and appreciated. I know that my colleagues join me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Ed Muskie's wife, Jane, and the rest of his family.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

THURSDAY, *March 28, 1996.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 234

Whereas, the Senate fondly remembers former Secretary of State, former Governor of Maine, and former Senator from Maine, EDMUND S. MUSKIE;

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE spent six years in the Maine House of Representatives, becoming minority leader;

Whereas, in 1954, voters made EDMUND S. MUSKIE the State's first Democratic Governor in 20 years;

Whereas, after a second two-year term, he went on in 1958 to become the first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history;

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE in 1968, was chosen as Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee;

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE left the Senate to become President Carter's Secretary of State; and

Whereas, EDMUND S. MUSKIE served with honor and distinction in each of these capacities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable EDMUND S. MUSKIE, formerly a Senator from the State of Maine.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Memorial Services for Edmund Sixtus Muskie

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

A SERVICE
in
THANKSGIVING
for
THE LIFE
of
The Honorable
Edmund Sixtus Muskie

The Church of the Little Flower
Bethesda, Maryland

MARCH 30, 1996

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

PROGRAM

ENTRANCE HYMN—On Eagle's Wings

FIRST READING—BOOK OF WISDOM 3:1–9

Melinda Muskie Stanton

RESPONSORIAL PSALM

SECOND READING—*2 Corinthians: 4:14–5:1*

Ellen Muskie Allen

GOSPEL—*John 14:1–6*

HOMILY

PRAYERS OF THE FAITHFUL

OFFERTORY HYMN—Be Not Afraid

OFFERTORY PROCESSION

Martha Muskie and Members of the family

COMMUNION HYMNS

Amazing Grace
Taste and See

CLOSING PRAYER

EULOGIES

Stephen O. Muskie
The Hon. Leon G. Billings
The Hon. Madeleine K. Albright
The Hon. George J. Mitchell
The Hon. Jimmy Carter
Edmund S. Muskie, Jr.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

RECESSIONAL—Battle Hymn of the Republic

CLERGY

Monsignor William J. Kane, Main Celebrant
James Cardinal Hickey, Archbishop of Washington, in attendance
Bishop Joseph Gerry, Bishop of Portland, in attendance

ORGANIST

Christopher Candela

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Remarks of Steve Muskie

Reverend Clergy, President and Mrs. Carter, Ed Muskie colleagues, family and friends. From my mother and everyone in our family, I want to thank you for coming here today to remember and honor my father. I expect that you will hear others speak about Dad's political life and the work he did over his long career of public service. But I would like to take a few minutes to tell you a little about some of the things that we, his wife, children and grandchildren, remember fondly. Thursday night we had a family dinner to celebrate Dad's 82nd birthday. We drank a toast to him, sang happy birthday and the youngest of Mom and Dad's seven grandchildren blew out the candles on two birthday cakes that we brought to the party. Of course, the celebration was bittersweet because Dad was not physically present. But he was present in spirit, in the thoughts of all of us who learned from him and loved him, you could see and hear the evidence all around the room—in the sixteen people there—some blood relations, others bonded by marriage into the Muskie family. I saw it in their mannerisms, vocal inflections, proclivity for puns or quiet contemplation, in a hearty laugh or a mischievous twinkle of an eye. They were the telltale signs of Dad's lasting imprint on our lives. We have all been recalling images of Dad, many of which had been lost for a long time, tucked away in the recesses of our memories. For me, one of the most vivid is an image of cold summer mornings at our Birch Point cottage on Maine's China Lake, 40 years ago. The odor of smoke and the crackling sound of a fire just coming to life greeted Ellen and me when we padded down the stairs and climbed onto Dad's lap as he sat next to the fireplace in a big leather chair. While we warmed ourselves by the fire it was Dad's want to repeat the story that we most enjoyed hearing, a tale of young Biddo Bear who woke one cold morning, just as we had, and went with his father on a fishing trip. The story was replete with the kind of sound effects the public never heard from Dad during speeches. For example, Dad talked about Biddo Bear's father's tug on the starter cord of their small boat's outboard motor—Paroom! Putt-putt-putt! "They drove down the lake to catch some fishies," he said. That was a time when Dad was Governor and the demands on his time were less than they were by the time the last of his children were almost grown. My brother Ned recalls that even when Dad was Secretary of State, he regularly showed up at school, casually dressed and surrounded by security agents to attend a baseball game in which Ned might be pitching or to help Ned haul luggage and boxes into a new dormitory room. Ned of course swears the security agents didn't do any of the work.

Another powerful image is of Dad seated at the dining table surrounded by several of the youngest grandchildren. They always wanted to be near him at meal time, because he inevitably played games with them, walking his fingers across the table to tickle them or to catch their tiny hands in his big ones until Mom gently chastised him "now stop that poppa." The kids grinned feeling they had gotten away with something. As much as I would like to stand here displaying my photographs of Dad, these images and others like them are much more powerful than those captured by a camera because they improve and evolve with age and the mix of other memories we recall. They will never leave us. However wonderful and com-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

forting those images are, more important are the lessons we learned and the characters we developed as a result of watching and trying to follow Dad's strong examples. My youngest sister, Martha, told me yesterday that her interest in social work really grew from some of those examples. She said,

> "Dad believed that all people really are equal. That the color of your skin, the source of your beliefs, where you live or how much money you have doesn't matter."

When Greg Singleton, from the SW side of Washington, lived with us for several summers, "it was never any question," said Martha, "that he would be treated exactly like the rest of us." Martha's statement made me realize that we have all grown up and lived under the strong influence of both the public and private ED MUSKIE. Today we acknowledge our love and gratitude and share with you a celebration of his life.

Leon Billings

People who loved ED MUSKIE, welcome. As was so often the case in the 30 years I worked for ED MUSKIE, 15 of which I was paid, I have the honor of speaking for the staff. Those who actually worked for the Senator and those he thought worked for him. The nameless, faceless staff. A couple of years ago, I had lunch with the Senator. By then I was in my early 50s, about the same age he was when he hired me. I decided that I could start calling him ED. So we sat down and I used his first name and he looked at me and said, so its going to be ED now is it? So Senator . . . Before I tell a couple stories I remember of some of our lighter moments, I want to say something about your role as this Nation's most important environmental leader. Many times you would take a globe of the earth in your hand and point out that the earth's atmosphere was no thicker than that thin patina of shellac that covered that globe. And you would say, "that's all that protects human life. That thin layer, no thicker than that layer of shellac is all that is between humankind and extinction." That analogy in simple terms stated your commitment to achievement of a healthy environment. A concept you invented, a concept you institutionalized and a concept that you internationalized. You changed the way the world acts towards the environment. That legacy will endure as long as people breathe on this earth. From the Clean Air Act of 1970 to Global 2000 as Senator and Secretary of State, you took a problem too few people cared about and converted it into a movement and then into a reality. I recall after the Senate unanimously passed the Clean Air Act in 1970, Senator Eugene McCarthy said to the Senator in the elevator, he said "ED," (he could call him ED) he said, "ED you found an issue better than motherhood, there are even some people opposed to motherhood." So everyone here, please take a deep breath, and while holding that breath think just for a moment that each of us, our children, our grandchildren and the children of centuries yet to come, owe a single debt to you, Senator MUSKIE.

Sometimes working for you wasn't a day at the beach. But we were rewarded by your brilliance, your courageousness and your creative public policy mind. You evinced incredible loyalty. People stayed with you for years,

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

for decades. What a luxury it was to be associated with someone about whom there were no doubt, no doubts about intellect, commitment and integrity. And Senator you gave us a lifetime of stories. Some are even repeatable. Each of us has a favorite and I'm going to tell a couple. Senator MUSKIE was an avid fisherman and though I was never invited to accompany him, I want to recall two occasions both of which involved President Carter. On the way back from the funeral of Prime Minister Ohira in Japan, the President and Senator MUSKIE went fishing in Alaska. And when they came back I learned that the President had caught many fish, and the Senator got one. I asked him to explain the difference and he said gruffly, "its easy to catch them if the secret service ties them down." And you know that's all the explanation I got!

On the other occasion, and this will be particularly memorable to some of you who are on the Senate staff. I was on the Senate floor during a budget debate and he called me over. I assumed he wanted my advice on the issue at hand. He said, "I can't find my fishing pole." He said, "President Carter is coming to Maine to fish and I can't find my fishing pole." So I called Gayle Cory, the longest and the loyalist of the Muskie staffers. She was out at his house and I asked her to find the pole and I went back and said, Gayle is at the house and she'll find the pole. And he said, "Gayle wouldn't know what a fishing pole looks like." Needless to say, Gayle found the pole, I didn't have to go out to the house to look for it, and I never learned how many fish he caught on the trip.

I want to close with one story which will be poignant to those who had the opportunity to travel with the Senator, and particularly to Jane, I think. The Senator always took the window seat on an airplane and the staff, and Jane, sat on the aisle to ward off intruders. It was his want to get on a plane and lose himself in a book or magazine and sometimes not talk to anyone for the entire 5 hour trip. On the occasion that Eliot Cutler remembers on a trip to Los Angeles, the Senator said not a word and at the end of the trip as they arrived to the gate, Eliot got up to proffer him his coat and he looked at Eliot and he said "what are you doing here?" He is smiling now, because I suspect he would say to us today, "what are we doing here?" Senator we came here to say good-bye. We came here to say thank you for 5 decades of public service and personal friendship and most of all, we came here to thank you for being the first steward of the planet earth.

Madeleine Albright

Dear friends, my heart is sad for I have lost a friend. I asked myself why I feel such a void. It's not only the personal memories, memories that I share with many of you, although that is surely a part of it. It is also the fear that what EDMUND MUSKIE represented, what he lived for and stood for, might somehow go with him. He has been our connection to each other, he has been our link to a proud democratic heritage. He gave validity to a vision of our country and service to it that has influenced each of our lives. There is an army of us in Washington, Maine and around the country who worked for him as he rose through the ranks of service to America. Whether we were interested in State government or just plain good government,

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

clean air and water, a budget process that worked, a generous foreign policy that reflected our goodness and strength or just because we believed that politics and principles go together. He attracted us. Even today, when members of the Muskie team see each other anywhere, we exchange the political equivalent of the high-five. The reason that such a diverse group would have so much in common is that ED MUSKIE didn't see his public service as compartmentalized. The Federal Government was not the enemy of State government. Democrats could work with Republicans. A healthy environment was important not only here, but globally. While as budget chairman, he often asked what was so liberal about wasting money, he worried about jobs and he never denied the resources needed to keep America strong. Can you imagine that he actually believed in the United Nations and Foreign Aid, not only when he was Secretary of State, but even when he was in the Senate. EDMUND MUSKIE made history because he understood history. A lot of it he read, a lot of it he experienced personally and what he didn't know, he asked about. All of us who have been on the receiving end know how persistently he could ask questions. The look on his face or the "not so gentle" reproach when we didn't know the answers became an enormous incentive to learn. As a result, we grew with him. In his book we all, but mostly he himself, were accountable. His roots became ours. The great American leaders and their principles became ours. When he arrived at the State Department in May 1980, having been named by President Carter, he brought with him his capacity for endless questions. He brought Leon, Carole, Gayle and Berl. The foreign policy bureaucracy had a bit of trouble with the approach, not to mention with Leon. In the Department and over at the National Security Council, there were rumblings. "Why all these questions about environmental consequences, fiscal implications, congressional consultations and public opinion." As Secretary of State he did not leave his old identities behind. He was still Mr. Clean, the father of the budget process, the chief sponsor of the War Powers Act, an elected official responsive to the people. Still he insisted on looking at all sides, still he wanted to reason everything out. That is why he got along so famously with his deputy, Warren Christopher, another who values principle and reason. Together, they worked patiently to answer the questions and solve the problems our Nation faced. Most important they negotiated the safe return of the hostages from Iran. Reuniting families and leaving for the successor administration a clean slate from which to begin. When he left his official foreign policy post, along with the rest of us in January, 1981, he simply began pursuing public policy by private means. Although he was quite in the opposition he did not use his various platforms or chairmanships, of the Center for National Policy and Georgetown's Institute for the Study of Diplomacy to mention two of my favorites, for the politics of protest but characteristically for the politics of healing. For example to consider mending relations with Cambodia and Vietnam, and in this, as in so many other things he was often ahead of his time.

Before I end with a personal message from President Clinton, I must say one more thing. I would obviously be here in my capacity as a proud member of the Muskie political family no matter what. But I would definitely not be here or anywhere else representing the President of the United States if it were not for ED MUSKIE. It might not be the right answer for

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

feminist groups and I do love Eleanor Roosevelt. But the truth is that this man was my role model. While we all had a good laugh when he sometimes slipped into political incorrect vocabulary or shielded his female staff members from some of his salted language, he was the man who earlier than others enabled women to take their place as public servants. Because he had faith in us, we had faith in ourselves. He was the first to name a woman, Karen Hastie-Williams, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee, as head of the Congressional Budget Office, Alice Rivlin, he gave me the responsibility as his chief legislative director, for coordinating Leon, Al From, Doug Bennett and John McEvoy. The U.N. Security Council is a piece of cake. No wonder I learned about the politics of foreign policy. Finally I want to read a letter,

> Dear Jane,
>
> Hillary and I were so sorry to learn of ED's death and our hearts go out to you. Our Nation was blessed to have EDMUND MUSKIE in public service for so long. As Governor, as Senator and Secretary of State. He was a leader of conscience and conviction and I will always be grateful for his wise counsel. His broad knowledge of both international and domestic affairs. His stalwart protection of our precious natural resources and his unshakable integrity as a public figure and private citizen earned him support of millions of Americans and the respect of all of us who were privileged to know him. As a mark of that respect, citizens across our country and around the world are lowering the American flag to half staff today. Hillary and I extend our deepest sympathy to you and your family and we hope you will take comfort in remembering that your husband has left an enduring legacy of public service that continues to inspire us all. We are keeping you in our thoughts and prayers.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> BILL CLINTON,
> *President of the United States.*

Dearest Jane, thank you for sharing this great man with us.

George Mitchell

Jane, Steve and Lexi, Ellen and Ernie, Melinda and Eddie, Martha, Ned and Julia, and other members of the family, Cardinal Hickey, Bishop Gerry and other members of the clergy, President and Mrs. Carter and other distinguished guests and friends of ED MUSKIE. Senator MUSKIE once said that he didn't like being called "Lincolnesque" but it fit. With his lanky frame, his long and craggy face, his powerful voice, he was an imposing figure. He was loved and trusted by the people of Maine because they saw in him the qualities they most admire, independence, fairness, the lack of pretense, the willingness to speak the truth even when it hurt. He was plain spoken even blunt at times and they admired him for it. He had his faults and he made mistakes as do all human beings but he conquered his faults and he learned from his mistakes and as a result, he became the greatest public official in Maine's history and one of the most effective legislators in our Nation's his-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

tory. He accomplished much in a long and distinguished career. In that impressive record, nothing surpasses what he did to protect America's natural environment. Harry Truman once said that men make history, not the other way around. In periods where there is no leadership society stands still. Progress occurs when courageous skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better. ED MUSKIE changed things for the better. When he went to the Senate, there were no national environmental laws, there was no environmental movement, there was hardly an awareness of the problem. Industries and municipalities dumped their wastes into the nearest river and America's waters were, for the most part, stinking open sewers. The air was unhealthy, the water polluted, ED MUSKIE changed that. It's one thing to write and pass a law, it's another thing to change the way people live, it's yet another and a far more difficult thing to change the way people think. ED MUSKIE did that. With knowledge, skill, determination and patience he won approval of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act and America was changed forever for the better. Any American who wants to know what ED MUSKIE's legacy is need only go to the nearest river. Before ED MUSKIE it was almost surely not fit to drink or to swim or to fish in, because of ED MUSKIE it is now almost surely clean. A source of recreation, even revenue. Despite the efforts of some to turn back the clock, these landmark laws will survive because the American people know what a difference he has made in their lives. It has been said that what we do for ourselves, leaves this world with us, what we do for others remains behind. That's our legacy, our link with immortality. ED MUSKIE's legacy will stand as a living memorial to his vision. It is his immortality. Each of us could say much more about ED MUSKIE's public career but we are here today to pay tribute to ED MUSKIE the man, so I would like to say a few words about the man who was my hero, my mentor, my friend. Thirty-four years ago this week, I received a telephone call that changed my life. It was from Don Nicoll, Senator Muskie's administrative assistant and close friend who is here today. He invited me to come up to Capitol Hill to meet the Senator who was looking for someone from Maine to fill a vacancy on his staff. To help him evaluate me, Don asked that I prepare a memorandum on the legal aspects of an issue that was then being considered by the Senate. I prepared the memo and went up for the interview. I thought the memo was pretty good, but unknowingly I had made a huge mistake. I reached a conclusion that was the opposite of the Senator's. I had never met him but he didn't bother with any small talk. Within minutes of our introduction, he unleashed a ferocious cross-examination. He came out from behind his desk, he towered over me, he shook his finger at me and he took my memo apart, line by line. I was stunned, so intimidated that I couldn't control the shaking of my legs even though I was sitting down. I tried as best as I could to explain my point of view and we had what you might call a lively discussion. As I left he said the next time you come in here, you'll be better prepared. That's how I learned I'd been hired and I sure was better prepared the next time. ED MUSKIE was even more imposing intellectually than he was physically. He was the smartest person that I ever met with an incisive analytical mind that enabled him to see every aspect of a problem and instantly to identify possible solutions. He challenged everyone around him to rise to his level of excellence. No one quite reached his level, but those who

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

took up the challenge were improved by the effort. Those who knew him learned from that relationship, those of us who worked for him, most of all. Just about everything I know about politics and government I learned from him. Just about everything I have accomplished in public life, can be traced to his help. No one ever had a better mentor or a better friend. No discussion of ED MUSKIE would be complete without mention of his legendary temper. After he became Secretary of State, a news magazine in an article described his temper as entirely tactical, something that he turned on and off at will to help him get his way. I saw him a few days later, he showed me the article, in fact he read it to me, and then he said laughingly, "all these years you thought my temper was for real." Well, I said, you sure fooled me, and a lot of other people. I think the reality is that it was both. When he yelled at you it was terrifyingly real, but you could never be sure that it wasn't also a tactic to move you his way, to get you to do what he wanted done and that's the way he wanted it and liked it. Almost as unnerving as one of his eruptions was the swiftness with which it passed and was forgotten. He was a passionate man and expressed himself with emotion. His point having been made, he moved on, he didn't believe in looking back or nursing grudges and maybe that's how he got past the disappointments he suffered. It surely also helped that he was a secure man, confident in, and comfortable with his values. Those values were simple, yet universal in their reach and enduring in their strength. They were faith, family and country. He was constant in his faith. He was comforted by it and he was motivated by its message. The prayer printed on the back of the program today written by Senator MUSKIE more than a quarter century ago with its emphasis on compassion and tolerance was the essence of his faith. He was totally devoted to his family, especially to Jane. They would have celebrated their 48th anniversary in May and for all those years, she supported him, she comforted him, she helped him. He was a passionate believer in democracy and especially in American democracy. I had the privilege of traveling all over Maine and all this country with him. Back when I was on Senator Muskie's staff we didn't have the resources available today so we used to share a motel room in small towns all across Maine as I drove him from one appearance to another. And I can recall the many times he spoke of his Father who he greatly admired and who he was very much influenced by. His Father was a Polish immigrant who, like many others who fled from tyranny, flourished in the free air of this blessed land. No person I have ever heard and few in our history could match ED MUSKIE's eloquence on the meaning of America. Once in public office, his profound respect for American democracy led him to act always with dignity and restraint, lest he dishonor those he represented. As a result, he was the ideal in public service, a man who accomplished much without ever compromising his principles or his dignity. Character is what you are when you are alone in the dark as well as with others in the daylight. ED MUSKIE's character was strong. Strong enough to light up other people's lives. He taught us that integrity is more important than winning. That real knowledge counts more than slogans or sound bites. That we should live our values rather than parading them for public approval. Many years ago, Maine's greatest poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, wrote of another great man these words: "Were a star quenched on high for ages would its light still traveling down-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ward from the sky shine on our mortal sight. So when a great man dies for years beyond our kin, the light he leaves behind him lies upon the paths of men." A great man has died and for years his life will shine upon our paths. Goodbye ED, may God bless you and welcome you.

President Jimmy Carter

ED MUSKIE had the appearance, the mannerisms, the actions of a true statesman. I first knew about him when I became Governor and faced the almost overwhelming lobbying pressure from the power companies with their smokestacks spewing forth black smoke and the thirteen pulp mills in our State that were destroying our rivers. I saw the difficulty then of an incredible political battle. But there was a hero in Washington which has been mentioned several times who faced much greater lobbying pressure from nationwide pollutants of our streams and air. ED MUSKIE changed all of that. One of my heroes in Georgia was Dr. Benjamin Mays, a graduate of Bates College which was very close to ED MUSKIE. And in an unpublicized way, ED MUSKIE was also a champion of basic civil rights at a time when it wasn't popular to be so. And he and Dr. Benjamin Mays worked hand-in-hand to inspire people like me and other governors and public servants around the country who looked on him with great admiration. I hope everyone here will read the prayer on the back of the program that George just mentioned that was given by ED MUSKIE at a Presidential prayer breakfast in 1969, and see how pertinent it is to our Nation's Capitol today, how ED MUSKIE is needed. He saw then a budget problem in Washington and he decided to do something about it. He helped orchestrate and get passed a new budget law. He became the first Chairman of the Budget Committee and despite the equally formidable challenges that we now face, that he faced then, he was able to bring order out of chaos and to work harmoniously not only with the Senators, but Members of the House of Representatives, jealous of their own prerogatives and with the Presidents who served with him. Democrats and Republicans, President Nixon, President Ford, and me. I think that ED was so successful in bringing this coalition together and healing the disparities between Capitol Hill and the White House, because when he spoke you knew at least three things: First, he deeply believed what he said, second, he knew what he was talking about, and third, it was the absolute truth. So I admired him from a distance until the Spring of 1972 when ED was campaigning for President and he came down to Atlanta for a fund-raiser. I very eagerly invited him to spend the night with me at the Governor's mansion because of my admiration and because I had in the back of my mind, you won't believe this, the thought that he was going to get the nomination and he might be looking for a southern governor to be his running mate. So I wanted to make a good impression on him and I wanted him to think that I was a little more sophisticated than I was. So that night in the so-called Presidential suite in the front of the Governor's mansion, late at night he was very tired, he had been campaigning all day and I said "Senator would you like to have a drink?" He said "yes Governor I believe I would." I said "well what would you like," he said "I'd like Scotch and milk." I was taken aback. I knew about Bourbon and Branch Water and a few

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

other drinks of that kind but I tried to put on the appearance of being knowledgeable and I left him in the room and went down to the kitchen to prepare a drink. I got about halfway down the hall and a terrible question came to me and I went back into the room and I think ruined all my chances of being on the ticket. I said "is that sweet milk or buttermilk?" He very gently said "sweet milk." Later when I was elected President, I turned to ED MUSKIE as one of my closest and most valued advisers. He was still a hero to me and I turned to him often. In 1980, as some of you would remember, my administration was in trouble. Fifty-three hostages were still being held by militants in Iran. In April we tried to rescue them and my Secretary of State in protest resigned with a great deal of public fanfare. I was facing a revolution in my own party from Senator Kennedy and others who were more liberal than I and it seemed very doubtful that I would even be renominated as an incumbent President. I turned to ED MUSKIE who had a secure seat in the U.S. Senate and I asked him if he would serve as Secretary of State, and after checking with George and others, he said "yes." In a way I thought that I was doing him a big favor but when we had the little ceremony in the White House, I introduced him as the new Secretary of State being willing to serve and his comment was, "Mr. President, I'm not going to say thanks, I'm going to wait a few months and then make a judgment about whether I thank you or not." But he brought to the State Department, as Madeleine just pointed out, his formidable knowledge as a long-time Chairman of the Budget Committee, of every domestic and foreign policy program that our Nation had and that statesmanship from Maine that let the Members of our Congress, the people of our Nation and leaders throughout the world know, that here was a man who spoke with absolute integrity. When the Prime Minister of Japan passed away, Ohira, who was one of my closest friends as Leon has pointed out, I wasn't going to mention this, we went to the funeral with a very devout expression on our face but arranged to stop in Alaska for a day of fishing which ED suggested as a way for me to forget my troubles,. I don't guess he was worried about his own troubles. We went to a little lake about an hour and one-half helicopter flight from Anchorage and were fishing for Grayling and I have to confirm part of Leon's story, I did catch 15 or 20 Grayling, the Secret Service were quite a distance from me I might add, and ED only caught one fish. So after we got through fishing, ED came up to me and said "Mr. President, I'd like to make a comment about the trip" and I waited for his approval and he said "you really need to practice your cast" and I said "thank you very much, Mr. Secretary." Later he sent me a wonderful fishing rod that I still have Leon. In the last few days of our administration it was ED MUSKIE's integrity, his sound judgment, his wisdom and his determination and his patience that had made it possible for us to bring every hostage home, safe into freedom. Typically, ED MUSKIE did not seek any credit for that achievement, he let others take the credit. I looked up last night the citation I read when I gave ED MUSKIE the Presidential Medal of Freedom. "As Senator and Secretary of State, candidate and citizen, EDMUND MUSKIE has captured for himself a place in the public eye and in the public's heart. Devoted to his Nation and our ideals, he has performed heroically and with great fortitude in a time of great challenge." His response was you forgot that I was also Governor. This week I made a statement about my friend ED MUSKIE

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

and I closed the statement by saying of all the people I've ever known, no one was better qualified to be President of the United States—but Jane, I'd like to say now that I don't believe many Presidents in history have ever contributed as much to the quality of life of people in our Nation and around the world as your husband, EDMUND MUSKIE. I am grateful to him. Thank you very much.

Edmund S. Muskie, Jr.

I could not be more proud than to be here to read to you a prayer that my father wrote. He delivered this prayer at the Presidential prayer breakfast here in Washington, DC in January of 1969.

> "Our Father, we are gathered here this morning, perplexed and deeply troubled. We are grateful for the many blessings You have bestowed upon us—the great resources of land and people—the freedom to apply them to uses of our own choosing—the successes which have marked our efforts.
>
> We are perplexed that, notwithstanding these blessings, we have not succeeded in making possible a life of promise for all our people in that growing dissatisfaction threatens our unity and our progress towards peace and justice.
>
> We are deeply troubled that we may not be able to agree upon the common purposes and the basis for mutual trust which are essential if we are to overcome these difficulties.
>
> And so, our Father, we turn to you for help.
>
> Teach us to listen to one another, with the kind of attention which is receptive to points of view, however different, with a healthy skepticism as to our own infallibility.
>
> Teach us to understand one another with the kind of sensitivity which springs from deeply-seated sympathy and compassion.
>
> Teach us to trust one another, beyond mere tolerance, with a willingness to take the chance on the perfectibility of our fellow men.
>
> Teach us to help one another, beyond charity, in the kind of mutual involvement which is essential if a free society is to work. We ask it in Jesus' name, Amen."

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

MEMORIAL SERVICE

in

GRATEFUL MEMORY

of

The Honorable
Edmund Sixtus Muskie

Bates College Chapel
Lewiston, Maine

APRIL 28, 1996

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

GATHERING RITE

Choir Preludes

Agnus dei—from Requiem Mass—Gabriel Fauré
Lamb of God who takest away the sins of the world: Grant them eternal rest. Let light perpetual shine upon them, Lord, we pray: with all they saints in endless glory, for thy tender mercy's sake. Grant them eternal rest, Lord, we pray to thee: and light perpetual shine on them.

In Paradisum from Requiem Mass—Gabriel Fauré
God's holy angel lead you to paradise: may saints in their glory receive you at your journey's end, guiding your footsteps into the Holy City Jerusalem. Choir of angels sing you to your rest: and with Lazarus raised to eternal life, may you rest in peace forevermore.

Word of Welcome

SONG OF GATHERING—AMAZING GRACE, JOHN NEWTON, 1779

Amazing grace (how sweet the sound)
that saved a wretch like me!
I once was lost, but now am found
was blind, but now I see.

'Twas grace that taught my heart to fear,
and grace my fears relieved;
how precious did that grace appear
the hour I first believed.

Through many dangers, toils, and snares,
I have already come;
'tis grace that brought me safe thus far,
and grace will lead me home.

The Lord has promised good to me,
his word my hope secures;
he will my shield and portion be
as long as life endures.

And, when this flesh and heart shall fail,
and mortal life shall cease,
I shall possess, within the veil,
a life of joy and peace.

Greeting

Prayer

Please rise.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Liturgy of the Word

Reading
Wisdom 3:1–9

Psalm 91
Congregational Response—On Eagle's Wings

Reading
2 Corinthians 4:14–5:1

Gospel Acclamation
Celtic Alleluia

Gospel
John 14:1–6

Homily
General Intercessions
Sung Response—Lord Hear Our Prayer

Lord's Prayer

Memorial Reflections

Hon. Angus King
Mr. Donald W. Harward
Hon. Frank M. Coffin
Mr. Shepard Lee
Hon. William S. Cohen
Hon. George J. Mitchell
Mr. Stephen O. Muskie

Closing Rite
Final Prayer and Commendation

Closing Hymn
Shall We Gather at the River

Please Rise.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Participants in the Liturgy

President and Homilist

Most Reverend Joseph Gerry, OSB, Catholic Bishop of Portland

Attending Presbyters

Reverend Vincent A. Tartarczuk, Pastor to Holy Martyrs Parish, Falmouth
Reverend Michael J. Henchal, Co-chancellor of the Diocese of Portland
Reverend W. Larch Fidler IV, Chaplain, Bates College

Proclaimers of the Word

Ms. Ellen Muskie Allen
Mr. Donald E. Nicoll

Chaplain to Bates College

Reverend Wesley D. Avram

Ministers of Music

Ms. Suzanne Proulx Powell, Cantor
Mr. John H. Corrie, Director of the Choir
Mr. Marion R. Anderson, Organist
The College Choir

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

EULOGY BY DONALD W. HARWARD, PRESIDENT, BATES COLLEGE

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Class of 1936—a son of Bates.

Raised in Rumford, ME, EDMUND MUSKIE longed to attend college, but knew that the opportunity might be slim, as his family's resources were modest. Reflective, and fond of the comfort of solitude, he recalled that

> "In the fall of 1928, I entered high school. At that time, I was a shy, self-conscious child with no idea of making myself prominent. In the next 4 years, I conquered the greater part of this [shyness] and graduated valedictorian of my class."

[In addition to college documents, James Gardner Ross, in his 1986 Honors Thesis of the early years of Senator MUSKIE, provides accounts, letters, and interviews with the Senator regarding his family and early experiences.]

> "My whole life has demonstrated to me . . . that my convictions about proving yourself, achieving excellence, and growing is the key to success. That involves determination and will power, and you've got to face problems and overcome them; . . . you can't let yourself [become] discouraged; . . . you've got to have resiliency."

He excelled.

> "Everything just seemed to come to him," said his school friends. [T]he [high school] administration recognized [his] unique ability and EDMUND would be asked to run the class."

In 1932, he was, as a high school senior, paid $2 a day to be a teaching substitute.

> "In 1929 the Depression hit the world. As a result, upon my graduation from high school in 1932, my father was doubtful about my going to college."

Bates' tuition was $250; housing in Parker Hall was another $80; and board ranged upwards of $250.

For him to attend college, the family had to look for financial assistance from Bates; he received one of 10 scholarships given to the highest academic ranked students among New England high schools.

In 1932, there were 634 students at Bates, 46 percent were from Maine. The total financial aid budget for the college was $20,300.

As a first-year student, he established his courses around the requirements of a degree in mathematics; in addition, he took chemistry, biology, German, and English. He received A's in every course.

Though his first 2 years primarily revolved around mathematics and science, he took none of these courses his junior year. The courses he enrolled in were concentrated in history and government and he changed his major from mathematics to history and government.

> "What I majored in when I first went to Bates was mathematics at the same time that I was debating. I found that, although I did well in math . . . the issues that we debated on politics were of

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

more interest to me than mathematics and I just didn't want to become a math teacher."

The one constant interest he participated in during his 4 years at Bates was debating.

Though all of his first debates were away, his parents did have the opportunity to hear their son perform. Radio debates were held in order to keep the public informed of the issues. Mr. and Mrs. Muskie would often try to catch these debates on their radio. Unfortunately for them, the reception in Rumford was poor and, as they wrote their son, "Your broadcast last Saturday wasn't very good in Rumford; the Portland stations don't come in in the evening."

As representatives of the College, he and classmate Irving Isaacson (because of the great height differential they were referred to as "Mutt and Jeff") went on a debate tour in which they visited five colleges, debating the judicial review of the Supreme Court and the negative effects of the Social Security legislation passed the year before.

Irving Isaacson recalled:

> "Debating was one of the things which Bates excelled in intercollegiately. ED and I had been involved with debating but this was the first time, as I recollect, that we were teamed up together. Professor Quimby had enough confidence in us to let us out loose on our own, so to speak, and wander around the college circuit."

Even Edmund Muskie's Honors Thesis was presented in the form of a debate: "Resolved that there is a necessity for Social Security legislation as a part of a changing economic order which demands a change in our constitutional machinery." The ability of seeing both sides of an issue was to be one of the effective skills which he took from Bates. A staff member discussed Senator MUSKIE's legislative ability as though he were describing the art of debate.

> "I think he's at the best in terms of problems. He devours alternatives. He rejects an a priori argument, rejects things that are not factually based, not founded on data, that one can't explain or defend. MUSKIE is always interested in alternatives, and usually has some of his own. He deals with mirror images; that is, he sees the backside, the opposite side, which means he sees the whole idea—and the fragments into which it can fall . . ."

He served as an officer of the Politics Club and the Student Council; he analyzed his student colleagues performances in Shaw's "Candide" and Shakespeare's "Much Ado About Nothing"; he debated at the Cambridge Forum, at Brooklyn College, New York University, Rutgers, and Lafayette. He ran track; he made trusted and life-long friendships.

He was Phi Beta Kappa; an Honors candidate and the recipient of the designations of his fellow classmates as "Most Respected"; "Most Likely to Succeed"; and "Best Scholar."

> "It never occurred to me to [pursue law]. That wasn't in my field of vision at all. But President Gray called me into his office one day, I think it was during Commencement time, and said that Cornell Law School, because of the excellent record that Bates grad-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

uates had made in Cornell, was making a scholarship available to anyone of his choosing. He asked me if I would like it . . . Well, that was justification for my motivation . . ."

1936 was the aftermath of the Great Depression, but it stirred in a young Bates graduate the appeal of public service and a commitment to the general good. His college experiences had encouraged self-reliance, resourcefulness, confidence in his own intellectual and critical strengths, and the confirmation of his own integrity and industry.

College had been for EDMUND MUSKIE a surprising place, pulling him in new directions. It had been a demanding place, and stimulated the formulation of his own criterion for excellence. The experience had attended to his individual strengths and needs and encouraged him to compete, to participate, and to succeed.

The 1936 Class gift to Bates was a panel of three stained glass windows here in the Chapel—it is the panel in which Plato is the central figure, and Phidias (the sculptor) and Euclid (the mathematician) are on either side.

You recall in Plato's Republic that the leaders (the rulers or philosopher kings) are born—empowered as a function of the metal of their soul. It was, Plato argued, the magnificent myth which, if repeated, for generations, would justify the exertion of power by a few and compliance by many. It is ironic that EDMUND MUSKIE chose to mark his yearbook entry with the caption "Kings are not born; they are made by universal hallucination."

Senator MUSKIE knew the irony of the rhetoric of leadership for he understood the power of principled action and straight talk. Leadership, like trust, was to be earned; it was not a natural right of the privileged.

In 1955 Senator MUSKIE was extended an honorary doctorate degree from Bates; and in 1957 he joined the Board of Trustees of the College and served, with only a few years of interruption, until 1988, when he retired as Trustee Emeritus. In 1984 he received the first Benjamin E. Mays Medal for Distinguished Accomplishment and Service.

His papers and public policy contributions were recognized in 1985, in the opening of the Muskie Archives, as invaluable resources for scholarship in foreign policy, environmental policy, and enlightened public interest. In their reflection of a public life, the Archives give testimony to leadership and dedicated service, to a career of thoughtful, direct, and passionate consideration, linked to action for the good of others.

Humane and wise, absent of puffery, directed by principle, a child of Rumford, ME, a son of Bates, and a treasured sibling of the Nation's citizenry. Institutions are reflections of the qualities of the people who engage in them. Bates has been honored by the life and service of EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE 1914–1996

PUBLIC SERVICE

Member of Maine House of Representatives, 1946–51; minority leader, 1948–51.

Candidate for mayor of Waterville, 1947.

Director, Maine District, Office of Price Stabilization, 1951–52.

Governor of Maine, 1954–58; first Democratic Governor in 20 years.

United States Senator, 1958–80.

Chairman of Budget Committee, member of Environmental and Public Works Committee (chairman, Subcommittee on Environmental Pollution); member of Foreign Relations, Governmental Affairs and Banking and Currency committees and Special Committee on Aging; assistant majority whip.

Chief sponsor and floor manager, Water Quality Act, 1963.

Key player in passage of Clean Air Act, 1963, and its amendments in 1967 and 1970.

Member and rotating chairman, Roosevelt-Campobello Island International Park Commission, 1964–96.

Secretary of State, 1980–81.

Member of Tower Commission appointed by President Reagan to investigate Iran-Contra case, 1986–87.

Chair, Maine Commission on Legal Needs, 1989–90.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Democratic National Committeeman, 1952–56.

Chairman, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, 1967–69.

Democratic nominee for Vice President, 1968.

Candidate for Democratic Presidential nomination, 1972.

BATES COLLEGE

Enters Bates after graduating from Stephens High School, Rumford, 1932.

At Bates, 1932–36; varsity debater; class president; student council vice president and secretary-treasurer; Politics Club; Ivy Day speaker; track.

Graduates from Bates, cum laude and Phi Beta Kappa, with degree in history and government, 1936.

Receives honorary doctor of laws degree from Bates in 1955.

Member of Bates' Board of Trustees, 1957–66 and 1970–88.

Receives Benjamin E. Mays Medal for distinguished accomplishment by an alumnus, June 9, 1984.

Joins former President Carter for dedication of Muskie Archives, September 28, 1985.

PERSONAL

Born in Rumford, the son of Stephen and Josephine Muskie, March 28, 1914.

Graduates from Cornell Law School and admitted to Massachusetts bar, 1939.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Enlists in U.S. Navy, 1942, serves as officer aboard destroyer escorts in Atlantic and Pacific theaters.

Marries Jane Gray of Waterville, May 29, 1948.

Children: Stephen (1949), Ellen (1950), Melinda (1956), Martha (1958), Edmund Jr. (1961).

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Remarks, Statements and Speeches

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Bates College Memorial Minute For Edmund S. Muskie

May 25, 1996.

President Harward, we, the trustees of Bates College, wish to express for ourselves and for this record our respect and admiration for our colleague, EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE, who died on March 26, 1996 at the age of 82.

Traditionally, the purpose of these remarks has been to provide a testimonial for a departed colleague and to show our respect and appreciation for his having been one of us. Normally, we would describe his achievements and the place he attained in our college world, or in our greater society, through good or great deeds. However, I do not believe that an additional recital of ED's public accomplishments is necessary or even fitting for our purposes here today. Instead, I would like to provide a somewhat different view of ED as a person and as the product of a peculiarly Bates environment.

On my wall at the office, I have the pictures of three great public figures of our time: Franklin D. Roosevelt, inscribed to my father, Peter A. Isaacson; George Mitchell, and ED MUSKIE. Each of them overcame adversities of one form or another to become leaders and symbols of our time.

Normally, when an alumnus becomes successful, wealthy or even famous, the college seeks to imply to a greater or lesser degree that it had a significant share in the becoming. Usually, it is not that easy to demonstrate a clear and convincing relationship between a college environment and the graduate's subsequent achievements. In the case of ED MUSKIE, I believe we can justifiably point to a college career which strongly influenced his fitness for a public career.

ED and I both came to Bates in 1932. Being what we were, we naturally gravitated to the Bates debating team and for 4 years, he and I were debating partners. There, we came under the influence of one of the really great teachers in the history of Bates College: Professor Brooks Quimby, the debating coach. Brooks had an amazing ability to challenge his debaters teaching them to talk naturally and convincingly to groups, both large and small; teaching them to organize their thinking, to be articulate without being verbose, to analyze complex materials under pressure, and to be quick and nimble in response. All of these are the basic equipment of successful politicians and statesmen. Obviously, not every Bates debater would become a respected U.S. Senator or run for the Presidency of the United States. Myself, for example. However, I believe that this training gave organization and direction to the great innate strengths and abilities of ED MUSKIE. It gave him strength to seize his opportunities and equipped him to meet the confrontational demands of a public career. Equally important, he acquired at Bates the assurance and self confidence that he would need in his later life, that he was a man who could move his fellow men. His innate abilities and personality undoubtedly would have made him successful in many fields. When he chose to become a public person, I believe that his career and training at Bates helped make him the successful leader that he was.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

All of us can take pride that Bates College contributed to a significant degree in forming the man that ED MUSKIE became. All of us owe him a major debt for personifying once again the American credo: that neither poverty nor religion nor ethnic background should prevent a person from seizing those opportunities for which nature has qualified him.

We therefore pay tribute to his memory and to his presence among us. His life will be a lesson and a beacon for those who strive.

Presented this day, May 25, 1996, to the Corporation of Bates College, Lewiston, ME.

Respectfully submitted,

IRVING ISAACSON,
Trustee Emeritus.

[From Bates Magazine, Summer 1996]

REMEMBERING ED

(By Ruth Rowe Wilson)

While Maine and the Nation mourn the loss of a great statesman, ED MUSKIE's Bates contemporaries are mourning a different loss, the loss of a great friend whose honesty, fairness, and loyalty defined what we all love about Bates.

Remembering ED MUSKIE has been a journey into the past for us, to the early 1930s at Bates, where friendships blossomed into lifetime relationships. The era—the depths of the Great Depression—was a time when "a Bates man was known by the patch on the seat of his pants," a description coined by K. Gordon Jones 1935. Like many of his classmates, ED MUSKIE worked his way through college and depended on the self sacrifice of his parents. They lived in Rumford, where his father, a Polish immigrant, owned a small tailor shop.

During college, MUSKIE had a summer hotel job in Kennebunkport and was a dorm proctor and a head waiter in John Bertram Hall, then the men's dining hall. When MUSKIE ran out of money the last term of senior year, he went to Dean Harry Rowe 1912 (my father), who told him to go back to class, not to worry. As Norm Ross 1922, then the College bursar, said, "We had an anonymous godfather, George Lane, who wrote a check to help worthy students. ED was a country boy who worked hard and was worth our recommendation for help. We didn't go to the well too often, but he thought a lot of Bates students and helped when they were up against it for cash."

By the time our 20th reunion arrived in 1956, MUSKIE was Maine's Governor. ED and Jane hosted a reception at the Blaine House, an occasion marked by their warm and unpretentious hospitality, Jane's lovely peony arrangements, and ED's sense of fun. He put everyone at ease, took candid pictures, and at one point lined up all the bald-pated fellows for a group photo. And at our 50th reunion, MUSKIE was again the beloved center of our attention. That fall, the college dedicated the Muskie Archives. We were thrilled when President Carter said that "ED MUSKIE should have been President of the United States."

Classmates remember the good times spent with the Muskies. Some friendships began back with the cribbage crowd in Room 11 of Parker Hall, a half-dozen men who later organized a tournament as an excuse to get together over Christmas or New Year's, originally in the Boston area. A Paul Revere bowl, dedicated to the late classmate E. Howard Buzzell as a memo-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

rial cribbage tournament trophy, made the rounds for 30 years with ED MUSKIE a frequent winner.

In their jobs as proctors in East Parker, ED MUSKIE and Joe Biernacki 1936 shared responsibility as mentors and in keeping order, not always a simple task. But whatever the job, MUSKIE always had a good sense of humor and could take a joke as well as make one. At a 1978 Rotary Club dinner, Dean Rowe poked fun at MUSKIE by calling him "the worst proctor Parker Hall ever had. ED, you were terrible. We had more windows broken and more trash cans thrown down the steps during your senior year than ever before or since."

Across campus at J.B., MUSKIE and Biernacki worked as head waiters in Men's Commons, an experience chiefly remembered for ED's attempts at diplomacy, his back to the door, holding back a hungry crowd until it was time to open the dining room. As Governor of Maine, MUSKIE once gave a lecture at Skidmore College, where my husband, Val Wilson 1938, was president. Val, a former J.B. waiter under MUSKIE, introduced MUSKIE not as the Governor of Maine but as the former head waiter at John Bertram Hall.

There was the time when Berne and Joe Biernacki, heading up to Rangeley on their honeymoon, stopped at MUSKIE's China Lake camp outside Augusta. ED, intrigued by the good fishing in Rangeley (and single at the time), hopped in the car and joined them! A few years later, when the Muskies were on their honeymoon, the Biernackis went along.

Larry Butler 1936 remembers taking time off from work to accompany the Humphrey-MUSKIE campaign in 1968. His wife, Louise, spent the summer in Kennebunkport with the Muskie children while ED and Jane were on the road. The Butlers attended MUSKIE's funeral on March 30, and they were moved by the eulogies that emphasized his accomplishments as a "man for the people."

Kennebunkport native Betty Winston Scott 1936 spoke of summer jobs when she and MUSKIE worked in different hotels there. She said ED once even washed her hair in a laundry tub of the old Narragansett Hotel! Scott also went on the Maine Yankee campaign plane, especially as a companion to Jane. She recalls many occasions in recent years when the Scotts, as guests of the Muskies, were invited to state occasions—the Clinton inauguration, the reception at the Democratic Club for U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright, whom MUSKIE had sponsored. "Everywhere we went," Scott observed, "we were impressed with all the people who spoke to ED with respect and affection—not just government people, but the porters and guards, some of whom said 'God bless you,' as they walked by."

Thinking back to freshman year, classmate Damon Stetson, former labor reporter for The New York Times, recalls talking politics in MUSKIE's Roger Bill room. A great admirer of Roosevelt, MUSKIE spoke with fervor about what FDR stood for—intimations, perhaps, of a political career even then. For a time, Damon traveled on the Maine Yankee campaign plane, covering stops in the Midwest and South for the Times. Also along was the late Bob Crocker 1938, a reporter for the Associated Press in Portland. They were on the "hop-skip" tour: When the plane landed, a great cheer would erupt from the crowd; the candidates would meet the local folks for several hours, and then take off shortly for the next stop.

Lewiston attorney Irving Isaacson 1936 reminisced about traveling on debating trips with MUSKIE through New England and beyond. MUSKIE towered over his partner by nearly a foot, and they were dubbed "Mutt and

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Jeff" by their colleagues. Debates in those days included such topics as the desire of Hawaii to become a State and whether FDR should be reelected.

David Whitehouse 1936, retired businessman, says, I would like to think that Bates' debating tradition and Brooks Quimby were major contributors to ED's great success, as I know they were to my career. " While on an assignment at a United Nations meeting in Caracas, MUSKIE lost a golf game—and $5—to Whitehouse, who was living and working in Venezuela at the time. Later, when classmate Don Gautier ran for the Maine Legislature as a Republican from Auburn, MUSKIE saw a chance to win back his $5. Whitehouse, "wholly convinced that the people of Maine were sane and solid and would not vote for a Democrat," bet MUSKIE on the result. ED, having already helped resurrect the dormant Democratic Party in Maine, got his $5 back.

In the 1936 Mirror, under the picture of a thin, lanky ED MUSKIE, is the caption "Kings are not born; they are made by universal hallucination," from Shaw's Maxim for Revolutionists.

Even back in 1936, MUSKIE couldn't stand pretension. Like his Bates classmates, he learned to value relationships based on honesty and fairness. In our memory, ED MUSKIE will live as a giant of a man who never forgot his roots.

[From Bates Magazine, Summer 1996]

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN, WHAT WONDERFULLY WAS

(By Jim Carignan)

In the months since ED MUSKIE's death, many have spoken knowledgeably and eloquently about MUSKIE's formidable career of national public service. The thoughts shared here are about another MUSKIE—the person in the sunset of his life: reflective, satisfied that he had fought the good fight well (and even won a few encounters), and optimistic about the future. He was a man who never stopped looking ahead.

Back in 1968, I remember being proud that a Bates alumnus had conducted himself so well in a tumultuous Presidential campaign. MUSKIE and Humphrey very nearly won that race, and had they won, there would in all likelihood have been no bombing of Cambodia, no Kent State, and certainly no Watergate—threshold moments that turned America in a perilous direction.

Again, in 1972, hopes soared as MUSKIE seemed destined to win the Presidency, but it was not to be. A feeling persists that the Nation lost a significant opportunity for a brighter future when MUSKIE's march to the White House got waylaid on that flatbed truck in Manchester, NH.

Muskie believed passionately that government could work to improve the quality of life for all. In that sense, he was a profound egalitarian—deeply committed to the concept of equity at the heart of American democracy. To remain true to that purpose, he knew the State needed politicians and public servants of high intellect and character to respond to the call to serve.

Late in life, he often sought to sow the seeds of that calling in young people. While others took their considerable accomplishments into a quiet retirement, ED MUSKIE continued to work tirelessly for a brighter future.

For example, each summer for the past 8 years Bates has sponsored the Summer Scholars program. For 2 weeks, high-school students from rural Maine and inner cities come to the Muskie Archives to study "America From

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Kennedy to Carter," the years of MUSKIE's ascendancy on the national scene. Their research is rooted in MUSKIE's voluminous papers in Muskie Archives.

The highlight was always the final luncheon, which MUSKIE himself always attended. The students could ask him any questions they wished, and those sessions were quite lively, going on for nearly 3 hours.

In recent years, when MUSKIE's health was not robust and our invitations were consciously crafted to make it easy and graceful to decline, he insisted on coming to meet with the Summer Scholars. One year, when MUSKIE wasn't feeling well, we didn't invite him. The phone rang one day, and ED, with characteristic bluntness, announced that he had not received the annual invitation. Of course he wanted to come to talk with the students!

Each June for the last 3 years, MUSKIE came to the archives for the annual President's dinner, an evening program that honored the Edmund S. Muskie Fellows, approximately 120 of the best and brightest young adults of the former Soviet Union, who were studying law, business, and economics in the United States. MUSKIE relished those visits. This last year he spoke for half an hour, without notes, in a careful, poignant way. He reminisced about growing up in Rumford, his years at Bates, and his vision of a more free, equal, and environmentally improved world. He said his vision had been nurtured by great teachers who taught him the value of discipline, by books that opened new worlds to him, and by the people he always remained open to.

I once asked MUSKIE what he thought was his greatest contribution. We talked about his environmental legislation, the budget work, the Model Cities program. He mentioned his efforts, back in the forties and fifties, to resurrect the Democratic Party in Maine (he liked being Governor of Maine best). But no single aspect of his career jumped out as the most significant.

As we drove along the Maine Turnpike, the conversation turned to the way he conducted himself in political life. He said he always tried to define the problem or issue first, then he would employ all his abilities to come up with the best resolution. Then he would fight hard for his position, no matter what the political consequence. He turned to me and said that he always found Maine people willing to give him a fair hearing when he behaved that way, even when his position contradicted what his Maine constituents believed.

Of course, what MUSKIE described was his greatness: the integrity that was his signature, the incisive mind that so many unprepared opponents came to respect, the persuasiveness (which he learned at Bates), the patience—always in uneasy tension with his passion and persistence—and his democratic respect for his fellow citizens. ED MUSKIE always gave his best.

We must not forget his wonderful sense of humor. I recall him questioning the dean of the faculty at a trustee meeting about the faculty's efforts to teach sound writing. He was concerned whether students had opportunities to write and rewrite. He recalled how important that was in his own training at Bates. He paused and, with a twinkle in his eye, went on to say, "But I realize the faculty can only do so much." He made his point by telling a story about his mentor and debate coach, Brooks Quimby—and about himself.

Quimby always asked his debaters to give him written copies of their opening speeches. He would then routinely cut them to pieces with his red pencil and demand they be rewritten, no matter how much effort went into their preparation. One time, as MUSKIE told it, he received his draft back with Quimby's red-penciled criticisms. MUSKIE did what every professor

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

fears: He merely retyped the original submission without any corrections. The next day Quimby returned the second submission to MUSKIE with the comment that it was much improved over the first draft.

MUSKIE relished the story, yet he told it in deep respect for a teacher who taught him the virtue of rigorous intellectual and analytical attention to argument.

MUSKIE showed that making connections with people, an ability born out of his respect for the human condition, is necessary for effective public policy making. He showed us that humility is the prerequisite for greatness. He always tried to cultivate the virtuous side of his fellow human beings. By doing that, he proved that one person can make the world a better place.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Why Ed Muskie Mattered

THE ENVIRONMENTAL FORUM

[The Policy Journal of the Environmental Law Institute, May/June 1996]

(By Leon G. Billings)

As the father of the modern environmental movement, EDMUND S. MUSKIE leaves an indelible legacy as one of the pivotal figures of post-war America. Before ED MUSKIE, there was no national environmental policy; there was no national environmental movement; there was no national environmental consciousness. Before ED MUSKIE, we protected places and things. Stewardship was seen only in conservationist terms. Modern environmentalism, which protects human health and welfare, was mostly an academic subject. Through a unique blend of leadership, courage, and foresight, ED MUSKIE made it national policy to protect human health by protecting the air, the water, the land. And that policy, that philosophy, has spread across the geopolitical surface of the planet.

Under his direction, the nation's environmental laws became a fabric. There was legal continuity, definition, and purpose. There was a policy basis which the public could grasp—health in clean air, biological integrity and drinkable and fishable and swimmable in clean water. There were tools to achieve objectives and timeframes for action. There were performance mandates and defined roles for program administrators, the courts, and the public. No earlier federal laws contained all of these. Most contained none.

The Clean Air Act of 1970 was his outstanding achievement. For the first time, it set national statutory environmental goals. It required that air quality which would protect the health of people—not just healthy people, but people sensitive to air pollution-related illness—would need to be achieved within a 5-to-7-year period. Then it gave the responsibility to states and localities to adopt air pollution control measures which would achieve that standard in that timeframe, to give states and localities the maximum flexibility to tailor air pollution cleanup plans to local economic and environmental needs.

To mold that law he combined Senator Howard Baker's commitment to technology-forcing with Senator Tom Eagleton's demand for deadlines and his own insistence that "health" standards be met. And then he challenged his colleagues in committee, on the floor, and in conference to defend anything less than forcing technology to achieve healthy air by a date certain. None did.

The bill established a requirement that emissions from new cars be reduced by 90 percent within 5 years. As important, it required that every car meet those reductions and that the auto companies warrant emission performance to new car buyers. And the bill included a wide variety of public participation, scientific information enforcement and regulatory tools. No environmental law enacted before was as ambitious. None was as powerful. And none became as fundamental to our society despite uneven implementation and repeated attacks over the past 25 years.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The superficial memories of ED MUSKIE are large. He was physically imposing. His flashes of temper were legendary, although overstated. He had a powerful voice, strong opinions, and sizable political ambition. Yet the things that made him so effective were smaller, more subtle—and he was the most effective legislator of his generation. He had not only brilliance, but thoroughness; not only temper but patience; not only a clear and principled vision, but also the ability to find consensus that kept faith with his vision.

There are lessons not only in what he accomplished, but in the way he did it. ED MUSKIE had served as a state legislator and Governor before coming to the U.S. Senate in 1959. He had a lifelong interest in the processes of government. He was a hunter and fisherman and thus had a lifelong interest in conservation. But it was the fact that Maine's rivers were too polluted to allow new businesses to be established that led him to environmental protection.

As a second-generation Polish-American who grew up with the understanding that his father's native land was a victim of totalitarianism, he was a committed internationalist. As the product of a working class background, he understood what economic opportunity—or the lack of it—meant to the average citizen. As a product of Rumford, Maine, a paper mill town, he also knew first hand the price the Earth had paid for economic progress.

As a Democrat in an overwhelmingly Republican state, MUSKIE appreciated the value of process in protecting individual rights, and developed a talent for persuasion, consensus building and compromise. He possessed a combination of intellect, curiosity, and thoroughness that helped make him one of those rare Senators who could change their colleagues' minds. He had a clearly and completely articulated view of government, and, most importantly, he knew the difference between right and wrong—in policy terms, in moral terms, and in terms of human interaction. This gave him an unshakable faith that activism could improve the human condition. And it made him a risk taker.

Much of what was said on the death of EDMUND S. MUSKIE dealt with his political career. That is appropriate because it is not only the most public part of his life, but also the most controversial. It is not, however, that which will secure his place in history. ED MUSKIE came to the Senate at a time when the Congress was controlled by southern Democrats; when the seniority system was the basis for power; when success in program and placement equated to getting along with those power brokers; and when liberals were new and numerous but not very effective. Because he challenged the southern-dominated seniority system on his first vote, he was exiled to three secondary committees. By the time he became chairman of the Government Operation's Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Housing Subcommittee, and the Public Works environment subcommittee, he turned each into not only a major power base but also a laboratory for some of the most creative legislation passed in the 20th century.

As chairman of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, MUSKIE helped redefine the relationship between Federal and State Governments. During President Nixon's "Imperial Presidency" it was MUSKIE who developed the concept of the "New Federalism." His idea of creative federalism recognized that the level of government most able to perform a task ought to be the level charged with the responsibility for implementing the task.

Washington Post columnist David Broder summarized MUSKIE's role this way: "As chairman of the Senate's Intergovernmental Relations Subcommit-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

tee—a backwater assignment if ever there was one—he made it the forum in the 1960s for that favorite issue of the 1990s, downsizing the Federal Government and shifting power and responsibility to the states.

"That was hardly the mind-set of most Democrats in the era of the Great Society, but MUSKIE and a handful of others insisted that as the scope of governmental responsibilities widened, the constitutional relationship between the states and Washington needed protecting. MUSKIE was not averse to activist government, he wrote much of the new environmental protection legislation enacted in the next decade. But he was wise enough to see that many of the new domestic initiatives needed to be tailored to the varying conditions of the 50 States. As later events proved, he was right."

ED MUSKIE was committed to providing opportunities for American workers. He wrote the legislation—carried by other Senators—that created the nation's economic development polices in the 1960s, including the Area Redevelopment Act and the Public Works and Economic Development Act. As chair of the housing subcommittee, he rewrote and floor managed the 1966 Model Cities legislation, which was to define the first major undertaking of the new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

MUSKIE's lasting legacy is the great body of environmental law that guides our national policy and serves as a world model. In it, one can find the proof of all his skills and his defining themes. His appreciation for process led him to propose a shared agencies for environmental cleanup and enforcement. It led him to support citizen suit provisions to provide a vehicle for the victims to help themselves when government would not help them. His commitment to economic opportunity led him toward a rationale for cleanups as an economic necessity, and a view of air, water, and land as limited economic as well as social resources. His commitment to improving the lot of the average American helped him embrace and capitalize upon the concept of public health as the fundamental basis for environmental law—and in the process, helped him define modern environmentalism apart from conservationism. It also provided the essential justification for asserting a strong federal role in cleaning up pollution.

On the Public Works Committee, where he chaired the environment subcommittee, he worked with Senator Baker to break the Highway Trust Fund, making gas tax revenue available for public transit. To the consternation of anti-dam preservationists, he developed a sound working relationship with the redoubtable Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia, chairman of the committee and the greatest public works advocate of the Post War period. His relationship with Senator Randolph, his legislative skill, his appreciation for bipartisan and compromise, his ability to outwait the opposition, his debating skills, his willingness to compromise on everything except principle, all can be seen in the history of these landmark laws.

He guarded his role as environmental leader vigorously, and left his mark on every significant environmental action. He changed Senator Jackson's National Environmental Policy Act from a proposal which would allow government agencies to justify their adverse environmental impacts to a law which gave the public access to environmental impacts and a means to be sure that alternatives were fairly evaluated. He forced a commitment from the Nixon Administration that the Environmental Protection Agency would be an advocate, not an adjudicator, of environmental protection.

In effect, the modern environmental movement started when, at his request, the environment subcommittee—more conventionally known as the Air And Water Pollution Subcommittee—was created in 1963, and he was made its chairman. Prior to that time, there had been virtually no federal

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

laws concerning pollution. There was no national forum to even discuss environmental problems. His first job was to educate himself and build a record against which any initiatives he might propose could be justified. By the time his colleagues began to ask questions, ED MUSKIE already knew most of the answers.

At first, he took ever so modest initiatives to the Senate, trying to chip away at the precedents and prejudices which limited the Federal Government's ability to grasp the pollution problem and deal with it effectively. Over the 7-year period between 1963 and enactment of the Clean Air Act of 1970, the Senate passed numerous environmental laws, a few of which eventually went to Presidents Johnson and Nixon for signature. Each was modest. Each accomplished more than a prior initiative, especially if that initiative had failed to pass. And each reflected a broadening intellectual commitment shaped, urged, and negotiated by the intellect of Senator MUSKIE.

In the environment subcommittee he co-opted his opponents, always seeking to bring the best and the brightest in first, assuming that their colleagues would follow. Frequently, he would try to accommodate the concerns of his most antagonistic colleague, knowing that building that bridge could bring many votes across a philosophical gulf. He could engage Senator Jim McClure to fashion federal policy to keep areas with clean air clean (the so-called "prevention of significant deterioration" policy) and add hazardous pollutants to the provisions of clean water law which established strict, joint, and several liability.

He could convince Senator Jim Buckley to cosponsor the 1972 Clean Water Act. Buckley came to understand the relationship between his conservative political philosophy and the concept of conservation under MUSKIE's tutelage. As a result, he became an articulate supporter of the landmark 1972 Clean Water Act. As Buckley said: "I know of no situation in private life where a newcomer would have been accorded greater consideration, or where differences of opinion would have been given a fairer hearing than that which was characteristic of both the Committee on Public Works and its Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. I feel particularly fortunate to be a member of both and to have been able to work with the two chairmen and the committee staff, who have made so great an effort to accommodate differences of approach to common objectives."

ED MUSKIE staked out a national policy which he himself defined only after the most excruciating of intellectual exercises. He frequently pointed out that the Clean Water Act required 44 Senate committee meetings and as many joint meetings in conferences with the House committee before action was concluded. But he never rushed any of his colleagues, though he tended to be more impatient with those on his left than those on his right.

His influence, of course, extended beyond those three subcommittees into other major areas of policy. In 1975, a Supreme Court decision on impoundment of water pollution funds authorized in the 1972 Clean Water Act created a constitutional crisis. In New York v. Ruckelshaus, the Supreme Court held that the President could not impound—refuse to spend—funds appropriated by the Congress. Impoundment had been a convenient discipline on federal spending. Congress could look good back home by appropriating funds; the President could apply the frugality selectively. It was an informal line item veto. Its collapse forced Congress to reexamine its budget process. ED MUSKIE seized this opportunity for reform and became the first chairman of the new Senate Budget Committee and the father of the modern congressional budget process.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE's interest in foreign affairs led him to seek a seat on the Foreign Relations Committee, and he served on that committee twice. Among his accomplishments was the War Powers Act, once again a far-reaching reform of government process. It was this international expertise, as well as his broad respect gained through two runs on a national ticket, that made him the obvious choice to replace Cyrus Vance as Secretary of State in 1980, where he was able to bring the social welfare principles of modern environmentalism to an international arena.

He was the only Democratic Senator who could sit longer, talk longer, and debate longer than his more conservative colleagues. During the 1975–77 reauthorization or "midcourse correction points" for both basic laws, MUSKIE would schedule 8 a.m. meetings. Often he was the only Senator to show up. Other times, it was he and one or two others and they would exhaust the minutia of each issue.

MUSKIE always tried to identify a position "to the left" of his own position. Thus, when he wanted to clean up motor vehicles in 1970, he pointed to the legislation sponsored by Senator Gaylord Nelson to ban the internal combustion engine as the alternative to federal mandatory standards and deadlines. The provision allowing citizens to sue to enforce environmental laws was juxtaposed with Senator Philip Hart's alternative of class actions to enforce environmental laws based on case-by-case standards established by the courts. And it was Senator Gary Hart's insistence on preserving a politically untenable auto emission standard of nitrogen dioxide which allowed MUSKIE to hold firm in 1977 against John Dingell and the all-out assault on the 1970 standards. (I would be less than complete not to recall that he was also able to tell Dingell that Maine didn't have any auto plants which might close. Dingell, faced with a massive shutdown of auto production, conceded defeat only to become the Clean Air Act's enemy in Congress for the next decade.)

Imaginative and inventive, he used the Nixon administration's attempt to regulate water pollution based on the obscure Refuse Act of 1899 (which prohibited any discharge of any pollutant whatever into the nation's waters), to establish a national goal of "zero discharge" into waterbodies and a federal clean water program based on best available technology.

Whatever the committee, preparation was his first demand. Senator MUSKIE never went to committee or to the Senate floor unless he knew the answer to more questions than anyone else would think to ask. He would beat his colleagues into submission with details. Few would even try to compete. And those that did would frequently ask to "take the matter to the cloakroom" so they could try to resolve the issue offstage rather than in open debate with the Senator.

It was often said of Hubert Humphrey that he had more solutions than there were problems. ED MUSKIE wanted more answers than there were questions. He always had room for one more idea, one more concept, one more way to get things done. But if someone had an idea, a concept, or an option, that person better have the detailed knowledge of how it would work in practical application. ED MUSKIE never turned over the technical detail to staff. And in Washington, which all too frequently wanted to assume that the policy was some staff conspiracy, detractors of ED MUSKIE's environmental laws were frustrated by their inability to make that claim stick.

ED MUSKIE's policy accomplishments will endure, embedded in the average American's expectations as well as in Federal, State, and international policy. The environment is a settled issue for the average American, and increasingly so for the average business leader.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

During the 1995 round of attacks on environmental policy, most Americans did not take the anti-environment rhetoric seriously at first. When they became convinced that the new Congress was seeking to reduce environmental protection, the people found their voice and the GOP House is now scrambling to fashion a cloak of green.

There are lessons for the new leadership in this. There are also lessons in the way ED MUSKIE did his job—with a strong base of knowledge, with thoroughness, with tolerance for opposing views, with the understanding that consensus was essential and comity required, and with an appreciation for process, history, and human welfare. It seems we need his vision more every day.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Testimony of the Honorable Edmund S. Muskie

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
ON THE TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PASSAGE OF THE CLEAN WATER ACT

September 22, 1992.

Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure to be here today. I have not often sat on this side of the table and I do not recall ever having sat here as a witness before this committee. Thus, your courtesy in holding this oversight hearing to review the progress under the 1972 Clean Water Act and allowing me to appear is greatly appreciated. I have a great many fond memories of this room.

Only five Members of Congress who still serve in the Senate or in the other body were on the Public Works Committees in 1972: Senators Bentsen and Dole and Congressmen Roe, Hammerschmidt and Rangel. Some have passed away, like the driving force behind Clean Water legislation in the House of Representatives, beginning before I even came to the Senate, the Honorable John Blatnik of Minnesota. Others, like my fellow co-chairpeople of the Clean Water Celebration, Senator Howard Baker and Congressman Bill Harsha, would be here had their schedules allowed.

Mr. Chairman, there is history about the Clean Water Act that I would like to share with you and on which I had to refresh my memory, perhaps because I wanted to suppress it. This history provides a perspective on how arduous a task it was to create a statute which contained as powerful and lasting program as the Clean Water Act did.

In the period that led to enactment of the Clean Water Act, this committee held 33 days of hearings, listened to 171 witnesses, received 470 statements, compiled 6,400 pages of testimony, and conducted 45 subcommittee and full committee markup sessions. Subsequently, the House and Senate conferees met 39 times.

The House and Senate disagreed fundamentally on the thrust of the Act. The Senate viewed the Clean Water Act as an environmental statute; the House viewed it as a public works bill. The final product was a comprehensive environmental public works bill. But such is the nature of compromise.

Because there was little organized data or scientific information, we acted in the Senate based on our extensive 8-year hearing record. These were some of our findings:

Many of the Nation's navigable waters were severely polluted, and major waterways near the industrial and urban areas were unfit for most purposes;

Rivers were the primary sources of pollution of coastal waters and the oceans, and many lakes and confined waterways were aging rapidly under the impact of increased pollution;

Rivers, lakes and streams were being used to dispose of man's wastes rather than to support man's life and health; and

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The use of any river, lake, stream or ocean as a waste treatment system was unacceptable.

Based on these findings, the 1972 Act set three broad goals: the biological integrity of receiving waters; the maximum use of available technology; and the ultimate goal of zero discharge.

I think I can best respond to your letter of invitation by looking, 20 years later, at those goals in terms of our successes and our failures.

The good news is:

The total population served by central sewers and secondary treatment or better has increased by 76 percent, from 85 million in 1972 to 150 million in 1988.

Federal construction grants plus State and local shares built some 4,000 sewer systems and 2,000 treatment plants between 1972 and 1988.

By 1988, less than 1 percent of the urban population routinely generated and discharged untreated wastewater.

As of June 1990, 87 percent of major industrial dischargers reported substantial compliance with permits, while 85 percent of major municipal dischargers reported compliance.

Marked progress has been made toward the fishable/swimmable goals: 80.3 percent of assessed river miles meet the Clean Water Act fishable goal and 74.6 percent meet the swimmable goal; for lakes the figures are 70.2 percent and 82.5 percent; this is in spite of phenomenal economic and population growth.

Many streams have seen national fisheries and habitat restored. Lake Erie, the Nation's shame in 1972, has largely been restored. The Potomac, the pollution of which triggered Lyndon Johnson's Clean Rivers program in 1966, has witnessed a remarkable recovery. Atlantic salmon are in the Bangor pool in my home State of Maine. And I'm sure there are literally thousands of other measures of progress and improvement.

The bad news is, while we have come a long way towards the goals of the 1972 Act, there is a great deal left to be done.

Today there is a much better understanding of the enormity of our capacity to irreversibly contaminate our environment.

Today we know that the subtle pollutants are often more dangerous than the BOD and suspended solids we targeted in 1972.

Another lesson today is that chronic adverse biological impact may be a greater problem than the acute results of discharge of raw sewage or large toxic spills.

Water shortages and inadequate supplies of clean water have taught us that water is too precious to pollute.

And we understand that the Nation's estuaries, like the Chesapeake Bay, must be a priority for national, not just State or regional, attention.

We knew in 1972, but I think we understand even better today, that our ecologically vital wetlands are too precious to fill.

In 1972 we knew there was a storm water problem, but we did not address it.

We knew there was a combined sewer overflow problem, but we addressed it inadequately.

Mr. Chairman, this ought to be our agenda for the next 2 decades of Clean Water.

I would like to close with this thought: When we embarked on the environmental decade, we didn't have a lot of scientific data. In many respects, we acted on the basis of what we didn't know but suspected, rather than on defined scientific and technical knowledge. I believe if we had not taken

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

that course the degradation—the destruction—of our Nation's water resources and our environment generally would, by now, have been beyond repair. While we have not seen all the progress we need, we can be certain that we have forestalled an environmental Armageddon.

The sewage that does not flow from our city sewers and industrial facilities and the wetlands not lost are the measure of our progress. The more complex, subtle and politically challenging problems I have mentioned are the measure of the job ahead.

I am pleased with the progress that has been made, but I'm not satisfied. I hope this committee continues to share the sense of urgency which we felt 20 years ago. That motivation, combined with the experience of the past 2 decades, in substantive and political terms, will, I hope, help you fashion an even better law for the future.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

NEPA TO CERCLA

[From the Environmental Forum (Journal), January/February 1990]

A little more than 20 years ago, on the very last day of 1970, President Nixon signed the Clean Air Act into law. Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, the primary author of the law, was not invited to the ceremony. At the time, MUSKIE was a front-runner for the Democratic presidential nomination and often antagonized the Nixon White House, particularly by attacking the Administration for denying stronger support to environmental concerns.

In this second in a special series of Forum articles on the laws of the environmental decade, MUSKIE reflects on the drafting and enactment of the original clean air law. "NEPA to CERCLA" celebrates the 20th anniversary of Earth Day by offering reminiscences from the past and advice for the future from the primary architects of our major environmental laws.

Serving as the first chairman of the Senate's Public Works Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution from 1963 to 1980, EDMUND MUSKIE compiled a remarkable record, forging innovative legislative mandates that have served as the basis for our system of pollution control. Under his leadership, many of the nation's major environmental laws were conceived and enacted—including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. As Secretary of State in the Carter Administration, MUSKIE continued to be a key spokesman for international environmental concerns. He is presently a partner in the D.C. office of Chadbourne & Parke, a New York-based international law firm.

The Environmental Forum is pleased to present former Senator MUSKIE's remarks on the 20th anniversary of the Clean Air Act.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT: A COMMITMENT TO PUBLIC HEALTH

(By EDMUND S. MUSKIE)

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the Clean Air Act of 1970—the most comprehensive air pollution control bill in American history. It also marks the 20th anniversary of Earth Day.

In 1970, the members of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution were ready to launch a tough new approach to clean up the nation's air. Earth Day occurred during the hearings. Members were overwhelmed by mail from across the nation. We used every ounce of political leverage the Earth Day constituency created to prod a reluctant President and an equally reluctant House of Representatives to accept landmark clean air legislation.

The Clean Air Act of 1970 defined the air pollution control program we have today. It has been amended since then, but the basic principles still apply. My purpose here is to restate the basic objectives of the original Clean Air Act with the hope that they will be kept in mind in the current clean air debate.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

THE EARLY YEARS: SHAPING CONVICTIONS

The 1970 Act had its modest beginnings in the 1960s, following the establishment in 1963 of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. In the 1960s, air pollution was widely perceived as a Los Angeles smog problem. But as research programs and public hearings were convened across the country, we soon learned that it was a rapidly escalating national health problem. Our legislative initiatives evolved slowly but picked up momentum as the Subcommittee developed confidence in its understanding of what was required.

In the 1963 Act, we expanded programs for research and technical assistance and provided grants to states to develop and improve their air pollution control programs. We directed the development of "air quality criteria" to identify pollutant levels that cause adverse health effects. States could then use these criteria to regulate sources of air pollution. We authorized the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) to convene conferences of state and local authorities to deal with interstate air pollution problems. In 1965, we directed the Secretary to develop emissions standards for new motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines.

By 1967 there was broad agreement that current local and state efforts were inadequate. The nation's air quality, and the accompanying threat to public health, continued to worsen. Federal action was required. The Air Quality Act of 1967, which passed the Senate 88 to 0, provided the first comprehensive federal air pollution control by establishing ambient air quality standards based on federal "air quality criteria."

The debate continued over how to implement these criteria. State and local actions weren't enough, but federal regulation seemed insensitive to local conditions. A regional approach was chosen as a compromise. Under the 1967 Act, HEW was directed to designate broad "atmospheric regions" of the country, where meteorological, topographical, and other conditions were similar. In order to simplify regulations, these regions were also to conform to local political/jurisdictional boundaries with similar industrial conditions. States were required to adopt state implementation plans showing how they would achieve the air quality standards. HEW was directed to report within 3 years on progress towards meeting the new national emissions standards.

Another major feature of the 1967 Act was the federal preemption of the authority of the states—with the sole exception of California—to establish automobile emission standards. The logic here was simple. Trucks and automobiles are mobile sources, frequently crossing state boundaries, and therefore require federal regulation. California fought hard to maintain sovereignty so that its tougher emissions standards would not be preempted. Since the size of the California auto market would prevent this from being too much of a hardship for manufacturers, it was agreed that the state could have such an exemption, and it stands today.

THE 1970 CLEAN AIR ACT

The experiences and lessons of the 1960s prepared the members of the Subcommittee for the challenge of the 1970 Act. It was clear that air pollution continued to threaten public health. Continuing squabbles over establishing the atmospheric regions and enforcing the law make it clear that—while implementation measures must remain sensitive to local conditions—federal standards and action were needed. By 1970 the Subcommittee mem-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

bers were ready to launch a tough new approach in the requirements and the procedures of the Clean Air Act.

A series of outside events helped build political momentum for a tough new law. Earth Day occurred during the hearings. That summer, Washington suffered the worst and longest air pollution episode in its history. Caught up in the spirit of the day, a coalition of labor and other environmental groups went so far as to call for prohibition of the internal combustion engine.

Three fundamental principles shaped the 1970 law. I was convinced that strict federal air pollution regulation would require a legally defensible premise. Protection of public health seemed the strongest and most appropriate such premise. Senator Howard Baker believed that the American technological genius should be brought to bear on the air pollution problem, and that industry should be required to apply the best technology available. Senator Thomas Eagleton asserted that the American people deserved to know when they could expect their health to be protected, and that deadlines were the only means of providing minimal assurance.

Other a period of several markup sessions, those three concepts evolved into a proposed Clean Air Act that set deadlines, required the use of best available technology, and established health-related air quality levels. The success or failure of the program would be determined by measurement against these criteria.

When the bill was made public, the business community was outraged. The auto industry complained about the unanticipated requirement that they achieve 90 percent reductions in emissions by 1975. Most of the business community joined in a demand for hearings.

Public Works Chairman Jennings Randolph directed the committee staff to distribute the subcommittee's print for comment and to meet with any groups desiring an opportunity to discuss specific provisions prior to full committee markup. The result of that process was a modest delay in full committee consideration of the bill, and the inclusion of a provision authorizing a 1-year extension of the strict auto emissions deadline upon a finding that the standards could not be met.

The bill was passed unanimously after just 2 days on the floor. After the vote, Senator Eugene McCarthy commented to me, "ED, you finally found an issue better than motherhood—and some people are even against motherhood."

An extended conference with the House followed, interrupted by the midterm congressional elections. The House was adamant on not accepting the Senate auto deadlines. But with an election year approaching, the congressional members wanted to pass a Clean Air Act. So the Senate stood its ground, and the conference agreement passed by a voice vote in both Houses. President Nixon finally signed the bill on December 31, 1970.

DEFINING THE CLEAN AIR AGENDA

As mentioned above, the 1970 Act set the three-pronged formula for air pollution regulation that is still essentially in place today. A quick review of several sections of the original Act illustrates how the concerns with protecting public health, forcing the use of the best available technology, and setting deadlines were written into law.

Under section 109, EPA is directed to publish National Ambient Air Quality Standards for specific pollutants. The decisions on which pollutants to regulate and at what level they were to be regulated are based on health

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

and welfare criteria. The pollutants selected included carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, ozone, lead, and particulate matter.

The division between primary and secondary standards also reflects the emphasis on health-related issues. EPA was directed to set both primary and secondary ambient air quality standards; the primary standards are aimed at protecting human health with an "adequate margin of safety," and the secondary standards are expected to protect visibility, damage to buildings, materials, plants, and other aspects of public welfare.

Similar health concerns drove the regulation of toxic air pollutants. Section 112 directs EPA to establish limits for the emission of hazardous pollutants, or those air pollutants "which may cause or contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness."

Some standards were tied to the level of control technology available. While existing sources were controlled under State Implementation Plans (SIP), Sec. 111 directed EPA to establish nationally applicable limitations on emissions coming from large new stationary sources, such as factories, smelters, and power plants. The strictness of the standards must represent the application of the best control technology that has been demonstrated to be available.

Development of better technologies was to be "forced" by Sec. 202, which required a 90 percent reduction of automobile emissions by 1975-76. Although there was no assurance that appropriate control devices could be designed and installed on cars within 5 years, strict standards and deadlines were expected to force the development of an appropriate control technology.

For many of the clean air emissions standards, explicit deadlines were written into the law. In order to ensure attainment of these federal standards by the deadlines specified, Sec. 110 required states to develop SIPs that limit emissions. EPA was then required to approve or disapprove the plans within the statutory deadline. If the state plan is inadequate, the Administrator must promulgate another plan that will bring the state into compliance.

A CITIZEN'S RIGHT TO SUE

The 1970 Clean Air Act is significant, not just because it established statutory regulation of the auto industry, or because it established deadlines for achieving air quality levels protective of public health. The Clean Air Act was the first federal environmental statute to include provisions for citizens enforcement. This so-called citizens suit provision allows individuals to sue violators of the Clean Air Act instead by relying on government action. Furthermore, the Act removed many of the former impediments to bringing suits in federal courts—such as the need for the plaintiff to reside in a different state than the defendant.

In order to make that provision effective, little discretionary authority was provided to EPA. Throughout the Act, the word "shall" was used to mandate the functions required to be performed by the Agency. Regulations, implementation, and enforcement all became specific, non-discretionary responsibilities, and enforceable civil and criminal penalties were included.

THE 1977 AMENDMENTS

In the 7 years that followed, a great deal of work was done in the clean air laboratory of the real world. Governments imposed regulations and industries invested in pollution control. Great gains were achieved in controlling automobile emissions, and perhaps most important, new control tech-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

nologies were developed. Some parts of the country even saw improvements in their air quality. At the very least, the deterioration of air quality in many of our growing urban areas was slowed.

In those same 7 years, the special interest mobilized their forces. Industry and business groups—ranging from national oil and coal interests to service stations owners and local land developers—prepared a myriad of studies proving the inappropriateness of the application of the Clean Air Act. Law firms gathered environmental experts. Trade associations hire people specifically to cover the environmental legislation and committees. Environmental over-regulation became a buzzword of business and conservative interests.

The target legislative year was 1977, when the Clean Air Act authorization needed to be extended. The entire focus was on weakening and limiting the application of policies previously adopted. The auto industry waged an all-out battle against the statutory standards. A session-ending filibuster in the Senate pushed consideration of the amendments into 1977, and then the auto industry gained yet another delay of 4 years to comply with the statutory auto emission standards. Fortunately, most of the special interests' political capital was exhausted in the fight for the auto industry amendment, and we were able to avoid a number of other special industry efforts.

Since many of the deadlines had passed without achievement of the emissions standards, the 1977 law included a "non-attainment" section. For example, the amendments provided guidelines for construction of new facilities in areas where ambient air quality standards had not yet been attained. Five-year extensions of deadlines for compliance were provided for all areas that had not yet met the standards.

Tucked into the non-attainment section were a number of special interest provisions that removed important regulatory tools from the clean air toolbox. Land developers were exempted from any air quality related transportation controls. Similar exemptions were extended to service stations, small refineries, and the after-market parts industry. Such provisions may have been politically essential at the time, but they removed significant options available for achievement of health-based air quality standards.

Despite these setbacks, the 1977 amendments also incorporated several major new features. One of the most important was a "non-degradation" or "clean growth" policy to prevent the significant deterioration of air quality in regions where the air is already cleaner than the ambient air quality standards.

MAJOR GAINS AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The Senate Subcommittee did not regard the 1970 Act as the ultimate solution to the problems generated by air pollution. Our knowledge as to its health effects was incomplete. It was impossible to identify a threshold below which health effects could be regarded as inconsequential. But we were convinced that progress toward a maximum reduction of adverse health effects must be the critical test of the Act's effectiveness. We realized that achievement of that result would require the development of technology not yet available. We established deadlines as a technology-forcing mechanism, with progress to be monitored by Congress itself.

As Senator John Sherman Cooper pointed out at the time of final action on the 1970 Clean Air Act, this was the most far-reaching piece of social legislation in American history; it would set in motion a course of events that history could not reverse. He was right. It began a process that yielded a change in the American people's fundamental relationship with their envi-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ronment. It began an ethnic that now pervades the academic, intellectual, and business structure of our country. And it put in place an infrastructure of air quality planning and management throughout the country.

Not everything we charted in the 1970 Act has been accomplished, however. Many of our goals have been delayed. Deadlines have been missed. The air is still dirty. But much has been accomplished and in a few cases we achieved more than expected. These accomplishments are particularly significant when viewed in the light of the continuing growth of the American population and the expansion of the economy over the last two decades.

A major achievement of the Clean Air Act has been the near elimination of lead from the atmosphere. EPA estimates that emissions of this toxic metal, emitted primarily from smelters and motor vehicles, have been reduced by 85 percent since 1970. And continued progress can be expected as older motor vehicles and agricultural equipment operating on leaded gas become obsolete.

In addition, most urban centers are now in compliance with the federal standard for sulfur dioxide (SO_2). Emissions have been reduced by almost 20 percent since 1977, notwithstanding an increase in coal consumption. This achievement will be enhanced if Congress adopts Senators George Mitchell's (D–ME) and Max Baucus' (D–MT) current Clean Air Act proposals requiring the reduction of emissions of SO_2 and nitrogen oxide (NO_x) which produce acid rain.

Because of repeated delays by Detroit to require new cars to meet statutory emissions requirements, and because of a constantly increasing number of cars on our roads each year, mixed results have been achieved in the reduction of pollutants from motor vehicles. But even though the original deadlines of the Clean Air Act were unfortunately permitted to slip, the "technology-forcing" provisions of the Act must still be regarded as substantially responsible for much of the success of mobile source regulation.

The number of vehicle miles travelled by automobiles has increased dramatically. From 1978 to 1987, for example, the number of vehicle miles travelled in the United States increased 24 percent. Despite this increase, emissions of particulate matter dropped by 22 percent, hydrocarbons by 17 percent, while NO_x emissions remained relatively stable. In fact, today's new automobiles produce only 4 percent as much pollution as did their 1970 predecessors.

Regulating emissions of carbon monoxide (CO) has been a particularly difficult feat. Even though CO emissions dropped 25 percent from 1978 to 1987, CO pollution persists today as one of the most intractable air pollution control problems facing society. Specifically, approximately 50 American cities are not in attainment with the CO standard, and 6 of these have a CO problem that EPA classifies as a "serious" health hazard. In addition, about 100 million Americans live in some 80 urban areas that exceed the health standard for ozone.

The continued growth in population, travel, and industrial activity will only exacerbate these problems. One shudders to contemplate the magnitude of the problem with which we would be confronted had we neglected to address these conventional pollutants 20 years ago.

Our persistent air quality problems are also precipitated, at least in part, by the failure of State and Federal Governments to implement the goals of the Act as intended. Current information clearly indicates that further controls on stationary and mobile sources are required in order to achieve enhanced compliance with standards.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

One serious failure, which I greet with great consternation, is the dilatory pace at which the Federal Government has proceeded to regulate, or rather, failed to regulate, hazardous air pollutants. While Sec. 112 of the Clean Air Act clearly provides for the regulation of toxic air pollutants, only seven standards have been established. Many of the pollutants not yet regulated are known carcinogens. In fact, EPA estimates that approximately 1,500 to 3,000 fatal cancers per year may be attributed, at least in part, to the release of air toxics. This does not even include respiratory diseases and birth defects that may be caused by these emissions.

EMERGING PROBLEMS

In the past 20 years, scientific inquiries have revealed the alarming new problems of global warming and ozone depletion. We are now becoming increasingly aware of the contribution of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide (CO_2) and chlorofluorocarbons (CFC) to the phenomenon of global warming, and of the effects of CFCs on the earth's stratospheric ozone layer. The scientific community tells us that global warming, or the "greenhouse effect," is believed to cause rising climatic temperatures, and that depletion of the earth's ozone is believed to cause skin cancer.

The Montreal Protocol is a positive step towards international cooperation of the problem of ozone depletion, but, as our knowledge of CFCs becomes more sophisticated, the international treaty may become outdated. With respect to global warming, many initiatives that could be taken to reduce CO_2 buildup in the atmosphere—such as improving energy efficiency and increasing reforestation—are attractive in and of themselves. However, many unresolved scientific issues still surround the phenomenon of global warming, and the need to accelerate research in both areas cannot be overstated. While we should continue to seek answers and international cooperation, let us not neglect to act on what we know and, if necessary, to act alone.

The authors of the original Clean Air Act were also unable to anticipate the phenomenon of acid rain and the associated long-range transboundary pollution problems. However, the Administration's recent proposals attempt to provide a solution by restricting SO_2 emissions that are known to contribute to the production of acid rain.

To the contrary, indoor air pollution—another new and controversial issue that was discovered subsequent to the passage of the original Clean Air Act—does not appear to be receiving the level of attention that it deserves. New information suggests that a substantial and growing segment of the population suffers adverse health effects as a result of indoor air quality problems. Using the original Act's emphasis on health-related criteria as a guide, this problem deserves more attention.

LEGAL PIONEERS, THEN AND NOW

As we consider these and other new challengers, we should remind ourselves of an essential characteristic of the 1970 Act, one that holds true to this day: it was an "experimental law." It used innovative approaches to achieve the desired results on a more timely basis than provided under any previous law. It defined a new role for government in areas previously believed to involve a private right to a free resource. It was premised on a new and basic public policy tenet—that the Federal Government has a responsibility to assure that the health of the public is protected from the effects of air pollution. In other words, it was pioneering legislation.

The objectives of the original Clean Air Act are still valid. Poor air quality affects the health of millions of Americans. Thousands of rivers and lakes

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

are being destroyed by a change in their acid composition. Auto emissions continue to contaminate the air in too many of American cities. And now pollutants are being found that pose a risk to the health and welfare of our people. It is true that cleanup efforts have already improved many of these conditions. But in considering the future of the Clean Air Act, we would do ourselves a great disservice to harbor any feelings of complacency when we considered the trade-offs at stake.

I continue to believe that a healthy economy and clean air are not mutually exclusive goals. As policymakers guide this Act through the winding corridors of change in national policy, I hope we will bear in mind that a great nation cannot be measured solely in terms of its industrial capacity and Gross Nation Product. Ultimately our progress as a nation will be measured by how well we preserve and improve our own quality of life and that of future generations.

Fortunately, today's Americans now believe that pollution is unacceptable ethically and economically. No amount of resistance to our clean air laws based on claims of cost or antagonism to objectives can change that. That is the message of the 1970 Clean Air Act.

Earth Day 1970 helped create the national psyche which molded that result. But a few committed, progressive Senators' setting in a back room in the Dirksen Senate Office Building made the political and intellectual commitment which forced the achievement of that objective. As Earth Day 1990 approaches, we should call the roll of that small band of men who changed history so we don't forget their important contribution! Jennings Randolph, West Virginia. Stephen Young, Ohio. B. Everett Jordan, North Carolina. Birch Bayh, Indiana. Joseph Montoya, New Mexico. William Spong, Virginia. Thomas Eagleton, Missouri. Mike Gravel, Alaska. John Sherman Cooper, Kentucky. J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware. Howard Baker, Tennessee. Robert Dole, Kansas. Edward Gurney, Florida. And Robert Packwood, Oregon.

The American people owe a great deal to Earth Day, as does much of my success in writing environmental laws. Without the political momentum created by this event, we might not have been able to pass such pioneering legislation. Nor would people the world over be rallying to the global warming issue without the spirit captured in classrooms auditoriums, and amphitheaters across the country in 1970. Earth Day 1990—and today's Senators and Congressmen—have a similar opportunity. We must renew that spirit so that our legislators can tackle the 1990 Clean Air Clean Air Amendments with the same energy and innovative thinking.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

The State of the Union
A Democratic View

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE (D–ME), WASHINGTON, DC

January 21, 1976.

I speak tonight for the restoration of American democracy—for restoration of that now endangered confidence which is essential to the life of freedom and to the meaning of the Republic. It is that confidence which has for 2 centuries animated the labors of a citizenry with the expectation that the common effort would inevitably lead to increasing opportunity—would continually drive back those obstacles which limit the citizen's freedom to direct and enhance the quality of human life.

That confidence and the successful conduct of that struggle is not some romantic dream, an old proverb plucked from some ancient book for occasional Fourth of July celebrations. It is the idea which has constituted and defined our existence and progress as a Nation. It is the reality which is the foundation and justification of everything else—wealth and power, public institutions and private enterprise, the building from which I speak and the Constitution on which it was raised.

Two nights ago we heard from the President of the United States. He struck a theme which profoundly misunderstands both the realities and needs of the America he now helps govern.

However, it is not my intention simply to answer the President or argue with his convictions. The Democratic leadership of the Congress in which I serve has asked me, rather, to present another point of view. It is not the opinion of Congress or of its Democratic majority. For I am only qualified to speak as the senior Senator from Maine, a Democrat, and as Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget. Still, even though some members of my party in Congress may not share all my views, we do share a common bond: The oath and obligation of office—to defend the Constitution of the United States, to advance its principles, and to represent fairly and according to our individual conscience and best understanding, the interests of the people we serve—our own constituencies and in the Nation whose well-being is our constitutional obligation. And I can, and I intend, to represent and discharge, that common mandate whose fulfillment is the obligation of every member.

My message tonight is not one of comfort or reassurance. But it is a truth and it is a warning.

I have just returned from 2 intensive weeks of travel, listening and talking among my people back home in Maine. We talked about a lot of very serious problems which are shared by millions of Americans from coast to coast. The problem which concerns me more than all the rest—because unless we solve it, we cannot solve the rest—is the extent to which you have lost confidence in your political system and your ability to govern yourselves.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Too many of you do not believe the government cares about you and your problems.

Too many of you believe that government can't do anything about your problems.

Too many of you believe that government exists only for the benefit of the few who are rich and powerful.

Too many of you believe that you can do nothing to improve the performance of your government.

Too few of you are willing to try.

Political power in our system is still yours to use—if you will.

If you doubt what I say, recall, if you will, the Watergate affair and the reason why it was finally resolved by an orderly transfer of power involving the first resignation from office of a President in our entire history. It was you who produced that result—not the Congress—not even the courts. Your political institutions moved when you insisted that they do.

You and your elected representatives are in this business of governing together. When communication between us breaks down, when we lose confidence in each other, we lose the very essence of self-government.

I find no confidence that government can restore economic health to our Nation—put people back to work, get our factories open again—and stop the inflation that robs our elderly and poor—and deprives every one of us of our hard-earned dollars.

I find no confidence that government can do something effective about this siege of crime that makes many of you prisoners in your homes, behind doors that lock out the threat which lurks in the darkness.

That government can make schools again into houses where children can learn and prepare themselves for the future.

That government can slow down spiralling health costs, that add more misery to your lives each year.

That government can bring our powerful oil industry under control, to hold down the price of energy.

That government can stop a disastrous retreat from the goal of environmental quality we set so resolutely not so long ago.

And I find no confidence that government would begin to curb the abuses of power that threaten you.

The abuse of power by corporations that dominate the marketplace, charging what they want—who ignore the quality of our air and water—the safety of workers—the quality of goods—who each year push and shove for more tax privileges and more exemptions from law—corporations, in other words, that each year grow more wealthy and more powerful.

And we can begin to do what we must do to insure that government will curb its own abuses.

I find no confidence that government can curb its abuses—the abuse of government power goes on—the abuse of our rights by the FBI and the CIA have been exposed—the war in Vietnam went on for years—the no longer secret war in Angola goes on.

Everywhere I turn in this Nation, these are the problems I hear from your lips.

This is the State of the Union.

And it is also a Congressional agenda for action.

The goodness and the strength of the American people is not diminished by the corruption of a few of our leaders.

Our system of reward for hard work is not discredited by a few years of hard times.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Our government—the model for free people everywhere in the world—has not been destroyed by a few Presidents or the failure of Congress to block them in time.

We have had some very bad times in our country in these last few years.

But our people are still strong.

The Republic still stands.

Our freely elected government can still work.

Who among us would trade America for any other country in the long history of the world?

We don't need a new system.

What we need is the will to make our system work.

We must reject those of timid vision who counsel us to go back——

To go back to simpler times now gone forever.

To go back on the promises we have made to each other.

To go back on our guarantee to every American for a decent job and secure retirement.

To go back on our commitment to quality education and affordable health care.

To go back on consumer protection and worker safety.

To go back on our commitment to a clean environment.

To go back and give up.

We cannot go back.

We cannot give up.

And we will not.

If we've learned anything—as a Nation—from Valley Forge to Yorktown, from the Great Depression to the landing on the moon—it is this: Give Americans the tools and they'll do the job.

We are entering a period when the country's capacity to produce and create can be greater than at any time in recent history. There are houses to design and build. There are roads to build, to repair. There are rivers to clean. There are railroads to mend. There are day-care centers to build and to operate so that more young women can participate in revitalizing America. There are books to be written and printed. There are farms to be expanded and worked. There are cities to rebuild. There are new sources of energy to be developed and produced. Oh, yes, we have work to do.

Clearly, something is wrong in a system in which there is so much work to be done at the same time there are so many people without work.

And that problem is not only the business of business. It is also the business of government.

We all have a big stake in that effort. We all pay for unemployment.

For every 1 percent increase in the unemployment rate—for every 1 million Americans out of work—we all pay $3 billion more in unemployment compensation and welfare checks and lose $14 billion in taxes. That means that today's unemployment costs us taxpayers more than $65 billion a year.

President Ford's budgets for these 2 years of recession have included more than $40 billion for unemployment compensation and jobless payments alone—and another $14 billion in interest on the extra national debt that unemployment has cost.

But the President's budget offers no new jobs. In fact, it proposes cutbacks in the existing, limited emergency jobs program Congress has enacted.

The President's plans for our economy are penny-wise and pound-foolish. Under them, America's factories are producing only three fourths as many goods as they actually could.

That means fewer jobs and higher prices.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

If we had just enough jobs this year to match the unemployment rate of 1968, we would collect enough Federal taxes to wipe out the entire Federal deficit, this year and next.

But the President's budget is designed to keep unemployment over 7 percent for another year and more. To keep 7 million Americans unemployed at this time a year from now. Most economists believe that if the administration's policies are followed, unemployment will not fall below 7 percent in this decade.

We American taxpayers pay a staggering price for these jobless policies.

But the Americans who want work and can't find it pay so much more.

What price does a father or mother pay who cannot support their children? What price does a master carpenter pay when he is reduced to welfare? How can we calculate the cost to America's jobless in lost seniority, job-training, and pension rights? What price will we all pay when two out of every five inner city youths grow up without ever having had a full-time job?

Experts in both government and private enterprise tell us that we can, if we choose, significantly reduce the present unemployment during the next fiscal year. Direct employment programs—using Federal dollars to pay for public service jobs like classroom teaching aides and hospital attendants—would produce the most jobs at the lowest total cost.

Federal assistance to local communities for short-term public works projects and to avoid layoffs in local government services—like police protection and trash collection—also have high job yields for the tax dollars invested.

Yet President Ford says he intends to veto even the limited program pending in the Congress now for short-term public works and financial assistance to local communities which have high jobless rates. This anti-recession bill—which the President seeks to block—would create 300,000 jobs this year.

The President says we cannot afford to help Americans find work.

I say we cannot, as taxpayers, afford not to.

And those jobs should be in addition to the jobs Congress could create in private industry by additional cuts in taxes without increasing present Federal spending levels. And Congress could avoid discouraging private sector employment by rejecting the President's proposals to increase payroll taxes.

As I listen to my people in Maine, and occasionally to those outside the State, it is clear that one of the most frightening economic results of recent years is inflation—and especially the quadrupling of oil prices. They have put the very necessities of life beyond the reach of more and more of our citizens.

The administration has tried hard to make the case that budget deficits are a direct cause of inflation. I wish the American economy were that simple. Curing inflation then would be a simple matter of cutting the budget. Unfortunately, the facts do not bear out the administration claim.

In 1974, for example, the Federal Government deficit was the smallest in the past several years. But in that year, 1974, both inflation and interest rates reached their highest points in 21 years.

Prices were high that year because of the sudden increase in oil prices, steep increases in food prices, and a deliberate policy by the Federal Reserve Board to keep interest rates high. The size of the deficit was incidental.

The administration did not raise oil prices. It was not responsible for poor crops around the world during the late 1960's and early 1970's. But it compounded the problems, partly by inept, often panicky management of the

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

economy, starting with the first Nixon administration. The administration raced the economies engine in election years and then created recessions to curb the resulting inflation. It moved too quickly from one set of wage-price controls to another without ever giving any of them a chance to work. It tried to impose domestic oil price increases on top of the foreign increases that would have doubled the impact. It compounded the poor crop years by selling too much of this Nation's grain reserves to the Soviet Union.

What the Nation needs at this time is leadership that will not jump from one economic panic button to another. We need a consistent, responsible, non-partisan plan for protecting the economy from further shocks.

We need an energy policy that will keep the prices of oil and natural gas at reasonable levels until the economy can absorb increases.

We need a food policy that gives farmers a guarantee of reasonable incomes and consumers a guarantee of reasonable prices. A crop failure in Russia should not be permitted to disturb that balance.

We need a wage-price council which will make life miserable for any big corporation that raises prices without very good reason and will do so in the name of the President of the United States.

We need an anti-trust policy that will move immediately to prevent powerful firms from gaining too much control over both markets and capital, not spend years in court arguing cases after it is too late.

Federal deficits are not the cause of the inflation we have experienced in the last 2 years, but they can be in the future, and we must be concerned about the possibility, as the economy recovers its health.

Beyond that, wasteful government spending, inefficient and ineffective programs, are burdens taxpayers ought not to be asked to carry. More than that, they rob us of the resources we need to serve high priority national needs. Moreover, their very existence undermines that public confidence in government which is essential and so sadly lacking.

Congress, recognizing this, has enacted a new budget process to remedy this now-chronic national financial crisis.

Our job is to decide on a ceiling on spending and a floor under taxes for each year.

In doing so we also set an economic policy for the country and ration the dollars in the budget according to our actual national needs.

Our goal is to balance the budget as soon as the economy permits.

We have imposed a tough spending ceiling on the Federal Government this year.

We will impose a similar spending ceiling next year and every year.

We have held the Federal deficit to the lowest possible level consistent with reducing unemployment.

And, in fact, we have held the Federal deficit $25 billion below the Secretary of the Treasury's estimate of last spring.

And we are using the process to determine the economic impact of tax and regulatory policies.

Finally, we will use all of this information to put spending priorities more in line with real needs, and to weed out programs which cost too much or produce too little.

Last year we reduced the President's requests for defense and foreign military aid to levels we thought were closer to our real defense needs and purposes.

We have used part of the money we saved to increase jobs, health care and social security.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

We rejected at least $10 to $15 billion in other requests to hold down the deficit.

But the new budget reform process is just one step in a broader effort we must undertake.

We need a second spending reform to make sure the Federal money we spend is effectively used.

We should question the most basic assumption about every program.

Any programs not doing the job or duplicating better run programs should be eliminated.

By the end of every 4 years, all programs should be reviewed in this process.

The only program excepted from this review should be the Social Security program, which is, after all, an insurance system.

We have learned that we can't solve our problems by simply throwing Federal dollars at them. In the past 7 years, the Federal Government has provided more than $4 billion to improve local law enforcement. President Ford is now proposing to spend $7 billion more. During the same 7 years crime has increased 55 percent.

At the same time, we know that we can't solve priority problems like pollution or provide a national defense without a substantial commitment of tax dollars. So we must pursue the hard, detailed job of evaluating Federal spending in each and every area of the budget. We must buy only what we need. And at the lowest sound cost.

I was disappointed that the President made no proposals in his State of the Union message to improve government efficiency—to bring new businesslike methods into the bureaucracy.

Under our system the President, after all, is the Chief Executive.

Efficiency in the general government is his responsibility.

But what steps has he taken to improve efficiency and reduce costs in the Executive Branch?

Why does it cost the government twice as much as a private insurance company to process medical claims?

Why does the government take months to get the first check out to a woman entitled to a Federal pension?

Why does the Social Security Administration take a year or more to process a citizen's claim for disability compensation?

Why can't defense contractors be made to deliver their goods at agreed-upon prices without cost overruns? Have you ever heard of a Defense Department employee being fired for permitting a cost overrun paid for with our tax dollars?

Through the new Congressional budget reform process, Congress has laid the groundwork for more efficient government at tax savings to our citizens.

I hope President Ford will join us in that effort.

I do not believe most Americans want their government dismantled.

We can't very well fire the mailmen, discharge our armed forces, or lay off the people who run the computers that print our Social Security checks.

But we can expect maximum efficiency and performance in office by everyone who draws a Federal salary.

Let us now ask ourselves about America's place in the world.

What is your definition of national security? . . . protecting our shores from attack? . . . standing by our allies in Western Europe and Asia? . . . protecting our vital economic interests? . . . playing a leadership role in moving the world away from the arms race? . . . if it is, I would agree.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

We must also ask what is the most dangerous foreign policy problem we face today? I think, once again, it is a gulf of doubt and mistrust between us and our government.

That gulf has widened since the tragic collapse of Vietnam.

It was less than a year ago that we saw films of South Vietnamese soldiers pushing women and children away from evacuation planes in Danang . . . we saw Americans being airlifted from the roof of the American Embassy in Saigon to Navy ships in the China sea. Until that end, this administration was pleading for another $720 million to spend on a cause that the American people had long since recognized was wrong and hopeless.

Vietnam was a bitter disappointment.

But it also offered us some positive lessons: U.S. interests are not served by military intervention everywhere in the world where we see instability. And the U.S. can conduct a responsible policy toward its potential adversaries and toward its allies . . . and can pursue its interests after Vietnam—better, if anything, than before.

Yet just last month, we discovered that the President has involved our Nation in a major way in yet another far off land: in Angola, where our Nation's interests and those of the free world are far from clear.

The Senate voted against any further expenditures for Angola.

As in Vietnam, we find ourselves deeply committed without prior notice or consultation with our people in a country where U.S. interests could not possibly be served at any price.

A free people deserve to be informed and to consent to the foreign policy we pursue.

Much of the world today is watching with amazement as a Congress of the United States examines U.S. intelligence operations overseas. I know many of you must have asked yourselves, as I have, whether it is necessary to hang out the dirty linen—to talk about assassination attempts, to admit what the whole world knows about both us and themselves, that nations spy.

Yes, it is necessary. How else is the American public to get hold of its foreign policy again? How else can we guarantee that interventions in other countries are an appropriate expression of deliberate U.S. policy, and not the making of some faceless bureaucrat? Oh, sure, it is inconvenient to conduct foreign policy in the open, and, certainly there will always be a need for intelligence work and for secrecy within the bounds of established policy.

But a Republic gets its strength from the consent of the governed and from a consensus on shared objectives. It gets only weakness and disappointment from secrecy and surprise.

So let us seek a foreign policy we can talk about in public and agree to in advance.

Let us defend our real interests—and leave no doubt of it. But where our interest is not directly or clearly involved, let our adversaries learn, as we did in Vietnam, the expensive lesson of the limits of their power.

Let us be neither patsy nor bully for the other nations of the world.

Let us pursue a lessening of tensions with the Soviet Union and China, wherever it is consistent with our own interests.

Let us extend a helping hand to the two-thirds of the people of the world who have so little. And let us do so with the confidence of a truly great people. We do not need to always win all our debates with every nation in the world.

Let our greatness be, not that we always win, but that—as God gives us the power to see it—we are always in pursuit of the right.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

In his State of the Union message—and in the budget he sent us—the President has made some serious proposals for reduction in Federal expenditures and changes in our national priorities.

The President's program includes a number of ideas to simply shift the cost of Federal programs from the Federal Government to the States and the cities. We must frankly be skeptical of such proposals that simply raise State and local taxes. But I believe Congress must evaluate the President's proposals with an open mind.

Where they are simply gimmicks or mistakes, they should be rejected.

Where they need amendment, they should be shaped to meet America's actual needs.

Where they make sense, they should be adopted.

We must not be afraid of change.

Just as we cannot go back to the old days, we must be ready to change old ways to meet new needs and present realities.

I do not believe we face any problems we cannot solve.

Our problems are man-made, and men and women can find their solutions.

We need the will to try.

The State of the Union is as strong as the bond between us.

So let us make a pledge to one another tonight.

Assert your right to share control of our national destiny. Decide now that you are going to vote in the Presidential and Congressional, State and local elections this fall, and keep that commitment.

But put the politicians who seek your vote in those elections to a stringent test.

Are they men of their word?

If they promise more government benefits and services, do they also say how much they will cost?

If they say they are going to reduce the size of government, do they tell you which services you are going to go without and how much that will save?

Do they offer specific proposals or simply slogans?

The Congress which meets in this building is your Congress if you participate in its election and supervision.

Together, we are the union.

And I find the State of that Union very strong indeed.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Statements from the Congressional Record

April 7, 1975.

S. 1359

S. 1359. A bill to coordinate State and local government budget-related actions with Federal Government efforts to stimulate economic recovery by establishing a system of emergency support grants to State and local governments. Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNTERCYCLICAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1975

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today I am introducing with Senator Humphrey legislation which I believe will provide much-needed balance to the efforts of this Congress to restore our country to economic health.

Thus far, both the debate we have had and the action we have taken in the Congress to deal with recession have focused on the long-accepted remedy of pumping more money back into the private sector—through tax rebates to individuals, investment incentives to business, and public service jobs to absorb some of the unemployed.

The public sector, on the other hand, has largely been ignored in economic policy considerations to date. And yet, States and local governments not only comprise a major segment of our economy, but also are among the hardest hit victims of today's inflation-recession squeeze.

State and local governments have been fighting the battle against inflation for some time. These governments have been especially hard hit because of the labor-intensive nature of the goods and services they must purchase.

Today, while the costs to State and local governments continue to rise, the deepening recession is adding new burdens to already overstrained budgets. The general economic slowdown is beginning to take a toll on revenues which—because of high unemployment and the standstill in new construction—are not rising as rapidly as anticipated. Rising unemployment is placing new demands on social services while the demand for basic local services—such as police and fire protection—is not diminished.

Earlier this winter, the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations—which I chair—held hearings to try and determine just how bad the fiscal situation of State and local governments really is. The news was almost uniformly bad.

Severe budgetary pressures resulting from the combined impact of inflation and recession are forcing local governments across the country to take drastic steps. Newark, with one of the highest property tax rates in the country, has had to raise that rate two times within the past year, along with laying off hundreds of city employees.

In New York City, revenues for the last 6 months of 1974 fell $150 million short of estimates, while inflation added $280 million to the costs of running

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

the city. To make up for the shortfall, Mayor Beame has had to raise city real estate and sales taxes and lay off city employees possibly numbering in the thousands.

Cleveland has had to lay off several hundred city employees, and has now reduced garbage collection to twice a month. In Wilmington, DE, and Baltimore, MD, job freezes have been in effect for some time, and the latter is still anticipating a substantial deficit for the next fiscal year. In Detroit, the mayor has just announced that as many as 25 percent of the city's employees may be laid off to balance next year's budget, where a deficit of between $65 to $85 million is now projected.

The results of a telephone survey conducted by the National League of Cities and submitted to the subcommittee indicate that the problem is not limited to those large cities which have perennial fiscal troubles. Of the 67 cities surveyed by the League, 42 responded that either tax increases or service cutbacks will be necessary to survive their fiscal squeeze. Thirty-six responded that they were being forced to defer or cancel planned capital improvements. And 43 reported that they anticipate revenues to fall short of original estimates because of the depressed economy. Cities where the fiscal squeeze is forcing such actions include Englewood, CA, DeKalb, IL, Auburn, ME, and Binghamton, NY.

In my own State of Maine, a survey of local government officials conducted by my office revealed that over half of those communities contacted have already had to raise local taxes, or else expect to do so very soon.

The cities and towns included in these two surveys range in size from quite small—in Maine—to a few cities the size of Pittsburgh. Primarily they are medium size. Not included are the giant urban centers that we usually associate with chronic and severe fiscal problems.

At the State level, the fiscal squeeze is not as critical, although there is reason to believe that the States have not yet felt the full impact of recession. Even so, a number of States are perilously close to severe fiscal problems, and a few—most notably New York and Massachusetts—are already there.

Tax increases have been called for by the Governors of New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Vermont. In Rhode Island and Connecticut, tax increases may be unavoidable to balance the State budget. An article from the March 17, New York Times which follows my remarks elaborates further on the current financial problems of several of the States.

These examples do not bode well for the success of our efforts here in the Congress to revive the economy.

While we at the Federal level are trying to speed up economic recovery by cutting taxes, State and local governments are delaying the impact of that effort by raising their own taxes. While we at the Federal level are trying to target the stimulus to those most in need, by using the progressive income tax structure, State and local governments are placing the burden back on those hardest hit by raising regressive local taxes. And while we at the Federal level are trying to create new jobs through public service employment, State and local governments are blunting that goal by cutting back on job-producing capital projects and by laying off regular employees, only to replace them with public service employees.

In the past, when the Federal Government accounted for a much larger share of the public sector than it does today, we may have been able to ignore such counterproductive actions at the State and local level. But subnational government today is one of the fastest growing sectors of the economy, presently employing four times as many persons as the Federal Gov-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ernment, and spending almost two-thirds as much. It is increasingly clear, therefore, that the actions of this major force in the public sector can be ignored only to the detriment of the economic health of the Nation as a whole.

To remedy this situation, economic policymakers need to begin now to broaden their sights to include the public sector in any antirecession program.

The legislation we are introducing today—the Intergovernmental Countercyclical Assistance of 1975—is a substantial move in that direction.

The purpose of this legislation is simple. It is not to bail individual governments out of fiscal trouble—at times such as this, a little belt tightening by all governments is necessary. Rather, it is simply to provide help to State and local governments in bridging the gap caused by today's most unique economic circumstances—so that these governments will have not to rely so heavily upon budgetary tools which run counter to Federal efforts to revive the economy.

The logic behind the legislation is compelling. At a time when economic recovery is our highest national priority, it simply does not make sense to have governments at different levels working at cross purposes to one another.

And the arguments for the legislation are strong.

In the first place, the assistance provided under this proposal is very selectively targeted—to reach only those States and localities hard hit by the recession. Assistance would be triggered initially when national unemployment reached a level of 6 percent. Further, no State or locality would receive assistance under the program unless its own unemployment rate had reached 6 percent.

Second, the program is not self-perpetuating. Unlike most Federal programs which cost more as time passes, countercyclical assistance would phase itself out as the economy grows healthier, and would terminate altogether when national unemployment drops below 6 percent.

Third, and perhaps most important, the impact of this program would be felt now, when it is most needed, not several years down the road.

Both the tax cut we have just enacted and the increased funding for public service employment which we are likely to appropriate have an impact which is more or less immediate.

The impact of a third type of antirecession measure now being considered—accelerated public works—may not be felt for some time. Consider the experience with an accelerated public works program adopted by Congress in 1962. Although the initial obligational authority was $850 million, only $62 million was spent in the first year. The bulk of the funds were not actually spent until 1964 and 1965, after the recession was over.

Countercyclical assistance does not suffer from that handicap.

The Senate Budget Committee will begin this week to consider items to be included in the first concurrent resolution which will be presented to the Senate later this spring.

The choices we will have to make will not be easy. The Budget Committee staff is presently projecting a deficit of $68 billion, without the addition of programs which appear to be well on their way to passage. Economists have suggested that the economy can sustain a deficit of between $70 to $75 billion. That does not leave us much room to work with.

Nevertheless, I believe that we should put countercyclical assistance high on our list of priorities.

The Federal Government will be spending many billions of dollars in the next several months to help revive the economy. Countercyclical assistance

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

to State and local governments can do a great deal to help insure the success of that effort.

May 28, 1974.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1356

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Freedom of Information Act provides that agencies are permitted to withhold from the public classified information relating to national defense or foreign policy (exemption 1). The amendment I submit today to S. 2543 would in no way alter that protection for sensitive military or diplomatic data. It would only provide that suits contesting the priority of agency claims under the first exemption would be handled by Federal judges in the same way as cases challenging the validity of claims under the eight other permissive exemptions from the act's disclosure standards.

The purpose of the deletion I propose is to preserve for judges the freedom to conduct complete de novo review of Freedom of Information Act cases in which information is withheld by agencies under the claim that it falls within exemption 1 of the act, permitting withholding for material "specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national defense or foreign policy"—that is, classified information. The language of section (b)(4)(B)(ii) would, if left in the statute, give a special status to exemption 1 material, unlike that accorded any other claimed Government secrets. The subsection would substitute for de novo judicial review of the Government's case for withholding (with the burden on the Government to sustain its action) an arrangement shifting that burden to a judge to decide whether or not the contested secrecy compiled with the undefined "reasonableness" standard.

If an agency head certified that classified material being withheld is properly classified, the judge—even after in camera examination—may only reject such certification by finding the withholding to be "without a reasonable basis" under the criteria of the Executive order authorizing Government-wide classification practices. There is no definition in the bill or the accompanying report of what such a reasonable basis would be.

I believe there is no reason to require the courts to accord such special status to cases involving classified secrets, as opposed to other types of sensitive information the Government seeks to withhold. The standard of full de novo review should be the same in all Freedom of Information Act cases.

May 30, 1974.

AMENDMENT NO. 1356

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I rise with some reluctance today to offer an amendment to the generally excellent Freedom of Information Act amendments offered by my friend and able colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts. No one should underestimate the diligence and concern with which he and other members of the Committee on the Judiciary have worked to insure that the changes made in the 1967 act will, in fact, further the vital work of making Government records readily available for public scrutiny and making the conduct of the public business a subject for informed public comment.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

It is because the bill before us is so very rare and important an opportunity to correct the defects we discovered in the administration of the act during joint hearings I conducted with Senator Kennedy and Senator Ervin last year that I wish to insure that we fully meet our responsibility to make the law a clear expression of congressional intent. In many important procedural areas, S. 2543, as the Judiciary Committee has reported it, will close loopholes through which agencies were evading their duties to the public right to know.

For example, this legislation will enable courts to award costs and attorneys' fees to plaintiffs who successfully contest agency withholding of information. The price of a court suit has too long been a deterrent to legitimate citizen contests of Government secrecy claims. Additionally, the bill will require agencies to be prompt in responding to requests for access to information. It will bar the stalling tactics which too many agencies have used to frustrate requests for material until the material loses its timeliness to an issue under public debate. And the bill provides long-overdue assurance that agencies will give full report to the Congress of their policies and actions in handling Freedom of Information Act cases.

With all these significant advances in its favor, there should be little reason to argue with the wisdom of the bill's authors. But in one vital respect, S. 2543 runs counter to the purpose I and 21 cosponsors had in introducing its predecessor, S. 1142, and endangers the momentum this Congress is developing toward bringing the problem of Government secrecy under review and control. Responding to the Supreme Court ruling of January 22, 1973, in the case of *Environmental Protection Agency et al.* v. *Patsy T. Mink et al.*, I had proposed in S. 1142 that we require Federal judges to review in camera the contents of records the Government wished to withhold on grounds of security classification. I agree that such a requirement would have been an excessive response to the Court's holding that the original act prohibited in camera inspection, of classified records, and I am completely at ease with the language in S. 2543 that makes in camera inspection possible at the discretion of the judges whenever any of the nine permissive exemptions are asserted. What I cannot accept and what I move today to strike in the subsequent language which would force judges to conduct the proceedings of in their chambers in such a way that the presumption of validity for a classification marking would be overwhelming.

Under the present terms of S. 2543, the Court is permitted to make a determination in camera to resolve the question of whether or not the information was properly classified under the criteria established by the appropriate Executive order or statute. However, if an affidavit is on record filed by the head of the agency controlling the information certifying that the head of the agency in fact examined the information and determined that it was properly classified, the judge must sustain the withholding unless he "finds the withholding is without a reasonable basis under such criteria."

If this provision is allowed to stand, it will make the independent judicial evaluation meaningless. This provision would, in fact, shift the burden of proof away from the Government and go against the express language in section (a) of the Freedom of Information Act, which states that in court review "the burden of proof shall be on the Government to sustain its action." Under the amendment I propose, the court could still, if it wishes, make note of an affidavit submitted by the head of an agency, just as the court could request or accept any data, explanatory information or assistance it deems relevant when making its determination. However, to give express

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

statutory authority to such an affidavit goes far to reduce the judicial role to that of a mere concurrence in Executive decisionmaking.

The express reason for amending the section of the act dealing with review of classified information grows, as I indicated, from concern with the Supreme Court ruling in the Mink case last year. In that case 32 Members of Congress, bringing suit as private citizens, sought access to information dealing with the atomic test on Amchitka Island in Alaska. The U.S. Court of Appeals directed the Federal district judge to review the documents in camera to determine which, if any, should be released. This seemed an appropriate step since the act does provide for court determination on a de novo basis of the validity of any executive branch withholdings.

Unfortunately, the Supreme Court reached a decision in that case which I regard as somewhat tortuous. The Court held that in camera review of material classified for national defense or foreign policy reasons is not permitted by the act. The basis of this decision was exemption No. 1, which permits withholding of matters authorized by Executive order to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or foreign policy.

The Supreme Court decided that once the Executive had shown that documents were so classified, the judiciary could not intrude. Thus, the mere rubberstamping of a document as "secret" could forever immunize it from disclosure. All the Court could determine was whether it was so stamped.

The abuses inherent in such a system of unrestrained secrecy are obvious. As the system has operated, there is no specific Executive order for each classified document. Instead, the President issued one single Executive order establishing the entire classification system, and all of the millions of documents stamped "secret" under this authorization over succeeding years are now forbidden to even the most superficial judicial scrutiny. One of the 17,364 authorized classifiers in the Government could stamp the Manhattan telephone directory "top secret" and no court could order the marking changed. Under the Supreme Court edict, the Executive need only dispatch an affidavit certifying that the directory was classified pursuant to the Executive order, and no action could be taken.

Obviously, something must be done to correct this strained court interpretation. It need not be a drastic step. Actually, it was the original intention of Congress in adopting the Freedom of Information Act to increase the disclosure of information. Congress authorized de novo probes by the judiciary as a check on arbitrary withholding actions by the Executive. Typically, the de novo process involves in camera inspections. These have regularly been carried out by lower courts in the case of materials withheld under other exemptions in the act. They can be barred under exemption No. 1, only through a misguided reading of the act and by ignoring the wrongful consequences.

But in correcting this fault, to permit in camera review of documents withheld under any of the exemptions, S. 2543 would simultaneously erect such restrictions around the conduct of the review when classified material was at issue that the permission could probably never be fully utilized.

By telling judges so specifically how to manage their inquiry into the propriety of a classification marking, we show a strange contempt for their ability to devise procedures on their own to help them reach a just decision. Moreover, by giving classified material a status unlike that of any other claimed Government secret, we foster the outworn myth that only those in possession of military and diplomatic confidences can have the expertise to decide with whom and when to share their knowledge.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

It should not have required the deceptions practiced on the American public under the banner of national secrecy in the course of the Vietnam war or since to prove to us that Government classifiers must be subject to some impartial review. If courts cannot have full latitude to conduct that review, no one can. And if we constrict the manner in which courts may perform this vital review function, we make the classifiers privileged officials, almost immune from the accountability we insist on from their colleagues.

I object to the idea that anything but full de novo review will give us the assurance that classification—like other aspects of claimed secrecy—has been brought under check. I cannot accept an undefined reasonableness standard as the only basis on which courts may overrule an agency head's certification of the propriety of classification. And I cannot understand why we should trust a Federal judge to be able to sort out valid from invalid claims of Executive privilege in the Watergate affair but not trust him or his colleagues to make the same unfettered judgments in matters allegedly connected to the conduct of defense of foreign policy.

Therefore, while I am anxious to compliment the chief sponsor of S. 2543 on the fine work that has been done and to praise the Judiciary Committee for its sincere commitment in improving the working of the Freedom of Information Act, I must respectfully move to strike these 17 offensive and unnecessary lines and to make the bill what we all want it to be—a restatement of congressional commitment to an open, democratic society.

March 8, 1973.

S. 1142

S. 1142. A bill to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, known as the "Freedom of Information Act." Referred jointly, by unanimous consent, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Government Operations.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce today a bill to amend the Freedom of Information Act of 1967 and ask unanimous consent that it be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, these amendments which are cosponsored by 13 Senators from both sides of the aisle respond to a call many of us have heard for full implementation of the people's right to know the way in which they are governed. This bill, the result of intensive investigation in the 92d Congress by Representative William Moorhead's Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, is a major contribution to answering that demand.

We are the best-informed of nations and the worst-informed. Americans in 1973 have access to more data, statistics, studies and opinions than the citizens of any other democracy, including their own, have ever had before. In theory, our people have available to them all the information they need to make wise and intelligent choices on public policy.

In practice, however, the flow of vital information from the Governors to the governed is controlled and restricted by considerations that are alien to our concept of open democracy. The Executive asserts the power to withhold from the people and from the Congress some or all of the expert advice it receives and acts on. A President or his spokesman can make public those

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

facts which best support a decision he has already made and can conceal arguments for alternatives he has rejected.

One branch of the Armed Forces can keep its research secret from the others, putting its competitive drive for appropriations ahead of the public interest in efficiency. Officials in charge of regulating prices or communications or pollution or consumer safety can be subjected to secret influences whose power to affect decision is increased by their ability to operate behind closed doors and to lock their advice into closed files.

Arguments made in private may be persuasive. They may even be correct. But where the public interest is at stake, argument must be open so that it can be rebutted. To be enforceable in a society built on trust, decisions must be reached in a manner that permits all those concerned to have equal access to the decisionmakers.

These amendments go far to remove obstructions which many Federal agencies have put in the way of those citizens who seek to know. They provide that judges shall question the reasons asserted by an executive agency for claiming the privilege of secrecy for its records and shall examine the records themselves to see how reasonable each claim is. They affirm the right of Congress to have access to the information on which the Executive deliberates and acts.

I am proud to bring this legislation before the Senate at the same time it goes before the other body. Together we can examine the problems which have arisen in implementing the sound purpose of the Freedom of Information Act and can work to strengthen that purpose and our democracy.

November 20, 1973.

Our Failure to Plan For Our Nation's Growth

I

Mr. MUSKIE. America is awakening to a new age. I wish I could say it was an age of abundance and unlimited prosperity. It is not.

It is an age when we in America finally realize that our world is not a cornucopia. There are limits to its resources, limits to its air, water and land, limits to its ability to sustain human life.

Many Americans discovered only 2 weeks ago that there is an energy crisis. Most of us here in this room know that this energy crisis was the result of poor planning or worse, no planning at all, on the part of the Nation's energy companies.

We are reacting to the energy crisis with some long overdue energy conservation measures—too many of which are voluntary; with a vigorous Federal commitment to energy policy and planning—which will not show results until the end of the decade; and with a massive effort to increase the supplies—which will not be available to relieve our shortages for some time.

Most Americans don't realize that there is also a critical shortage of land in many parts of this country, and that the shortage is getting worse. Let us all hope that it will not take the kind of crisis we face in our energy supply to do something about it.

II

There are some encouraging signs of a growing awareness of the limited nature of our natural resources.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

In just a few years, public concern has led to the enactment of effective Federal legislation to control the pollution of our air and water—legislation which requires land use decisions for the maintenance and improvement of environmental quality. The Federal awareness of environmental interests and issues has increased vastly.

At the State and local level this new awareness is also apparent and pervasive. In no fewer than nine States, statewide movements exist for protecting scenic areas, preventing over-growth, and slowing development processes that threaten to degrade the environment.

Last year in California this mood exhibited its political viability as well as its grass roots energy in several areas:

Passage of proposition 20, the coastline initiative;

Passage of height limitations for new buildings in Santa Barbara and San Diego;

Approval of open space purchases in San Mateo, Santa Clara and Marin counties;

And, rejections by citizens of the San Francisco Bay area of State highway efforts to construct a new bridge between Oakland and San Francisco.

The new mood indicates that this Nation has begun to realize how far its environment has deteriorated. But stronger efforts to retard future deterioration and to begin to improve the existing environment are urgently needed.

III

It is unfortunate that Americans have waited so long to recognize the relationship between urban growth and pollution. Twenty years ago all levels of Government could have established patterns to accommodate and guide urban growth in ways which would have minimized the harsh effects on the environment and the severe strain on our natural resources.

But the growth syndrome—not the adverse impact of that growth—dominated governmental decisions. A nation growing out of war and depression was not concerned with the by-products of exponential expansion. As with so many other crises, this country has waited and reacted to environmental deterioration when it could have anticipated and planned sensibly to avoid it.

IV

What we must now do is to take those steps necessary to repair the damage inflicted by this neglect and to make constructive plans to avoid future crises. Although our recently enacted Federal laws on air and water pollution have moved boldly in this direction, much remains to be done to control the most important causes of environmental deterioration—population expansion and urban growth.

V

With few exceptions, the varied and complex land use controls in use today by some 10,000 local governments are little more than refinements upon the land use controls developed and validated in the first third of this century.

They have enabled local governments for the first time to place significant restrictions on private land use to protect the larger public interest. Yet, in keeping with the traditional concept of land, the larger public interest was—and still is—interpreted to be protection of property values and the eco-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

nomic value of land. Freely translated, protection of the public interest in land use has been and is protection of the private interest. The dependency of cities on property taxes reinforces this prevailing purpose of land use decisions.

VI

Despite refinements in the last 40 years, planning and regulatory controls have failed to address the pressures accompanying urban growth.

These inadequacies have left four areas where present land use controls and policies need major improvements.

First, to protect property values and to maximize their tax bases, local governments have taken an essentially negative approach to land use. They employ their land use controls simply to prohibit what they view as undesirable uses of land. Most cities have treated these negative local land use regulations as though they represented all the land use planning necessary. Thus, rather than guiding planned development, existing land use controls have protected development while neglecting more comprehensive planning on a metropolitan-wide basis.

Second, States, with few exceptions, have failed to accept responsibility for overseeing local land use planning. The regulations and development they themselves control too often fail to promote the public interest of the local community, and existing plans of local governments too often adversely affect the public interest of larger areas such as the region or the State as a whole.

Third, where planning has been conducted, it has too frequently served single missions or purposes. Planning of this nature has seldom related specific missions or purposes to a balanced range of regional, State or national goals.

Planning for particular kinds of activities has left the planner and the citizen with narrow "either-or" decisions, often on a haphazard case-by-case basis.

Consideration of long-term alternative uses of the land is seldom mandated and even less often achieved in single-purpose planning.

The highway planning of the recent past provides an excellent example of the failure of single purpose planning. Planners have routed highways through parks—where land is invaluable for recreation but cheap for road-building. They have carved up low income districts with commuter access roads. They have poured additional highway lanes into cities unable to cope with more automobile traffic and air pollution. And they have sited major interchanges without regard to the unplanned and often unanticipated growth centers which they generate.

Fourth, many municipalities have land use plans but have failed to provide for their implementation. Throughout the country, in the smallest towns and the largest cities, plans lay collecting dust—mute testimony to the inability of planning alone to achieve land use goals.

VII

Let me give you an example of these shortcomings. A short time ago I received a detailed and elaborate brochure from a small community near Los Angeles which had acquired a large tract of cleared, undeveloped land. This suburb had devised a plan for the development of its new land. It designed the tract to be a congenial mix of houses, parks, lakes, schools and light industry. The new community promised to be very pleasant indeed.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Upon more careful analysis, however, I noted that there was no provision within the plan for disposal of solid waste, or for waste treatment facilities.

Consequently, all of the increased burdens generated by the growth of the new community would fall on existing facilities beyond its bounds.

Some other community must provide a landfill site; or perhaps some coastal town must tolerate the dumping of wastes in its estuary or off its beaches. Neighboring municipal treatment plants must bear an increased burden until the growing new community realizes the need for its own facility.

In a similar way, the new city would produce an increased localized demand for electric power, which must be generated elsewhere. Provision of water for the new community would mean renewed demands on the Colorado River, or the Sacramento, or any of a number of already hard-pressed sources.

Finally, the community plan had little provision for population growth. With the light industry projected, the number of housing lots will be just about adequate for the present decade.

But what thought has been given to the next decade, or the next after that?

This well-intended scheme does not, then, really represent an adequate plan for land use. Its local design was impeccable. But it failed to consider the broader impact to its own development on neighboring communities, neighboring States, and the Nation as a whole. And it failed to include a policy for its own future development.

VIII

Perhaps, more than any other factor, the failure to provide implementation of land use plans illustrates the greatest weakness in our present land use practices.

This failure has one cause: no level of government is willing to accept the responsibility to plan comprehensively and to put those plans into effect by regulating the way private landowners use their land.

Courts never have to concern themselves with comprehensive planning in the nuisance and trespass cases which they decide.

States abdicated their responsibilities for this task when they delegated their powers to municipalities.

And cities avoid the problem by not planning on a comprehensive level of failing to provide the necessary implementation mechanisms.

IX

These kinds of responses are clearly inadequate. Sobering statistics suggest that unless our land use decisionmaking processes are vastly improved at all levels of government, the United States will be faced with a truly National land use crisis.

Over the next 30 years, the pressures upon our finite land resources will result in the dedication of an additional 18 million acres—28 thousand square miles—of undeveloped land to urban use.

Urban sprawl will consume an area of land approximately equal to all the urbanized land now within the 288 standard metropolitan statistical areas—the equivalent of the total areas of the States of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island. Each decade, new urban growth will absorb an area greater than the entire State of New Jersey.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

The equivalent of 2½ times the housing in the Oakland-San Francisco metropolitan region must be built each year to meet the Nation's housing goals.

By 1990, according to estimates of the Department of Transportation, an additional 18,000 miles of freeways and expressways will be required within the boundaries of just the urbanized areas—more than double the total mileage existing in 1968.

Vast areas of land are required to meet plans for industrial expansion. In the next 2 decades, the electrical power industry alone will need 3 million acres of new rights-of-way—and more than 140,000 acres of potential prime industrial land for more than 200 new major generating stations.

Not included here is the amount of land to be consumed for mining for resources—rights-of-way for gas and oil transmission—and land for second home and private home and private recreational development.

Moreover, there is no way to measure the severe effects and conflicts that will develop at the local, State and national levels from this rapid depletion of our land resources.

X

The enormity of these demands makes it mandatory that we begin a new phase of land use management—a phase that corrects failures of the present approach to land use planning and its regulatory mechanisms.

We need policies and programs that treat land use as a resource to be managed, and not a commodity to be exploited.

Realizing this great need, some States have already commenced such programs.

The State of Maine established the land use regulation commission in 1969 to zone and control development in the unorganized townships of the State, 49 percent of Maine's total land area amounting to more than 10 million acres.

Coupled with the site selection permit program administered by the State's board of environmental protection, the land use regulations commission has provided the people of Maine an opportunity to protect their public property rights against private waste.

Likewise, California voters in 1972 approved a citizens' initiative creating the California coastal zone conservation commission with a carefully designed permit program to regulate changes in land use on the California coast.

Federal legislation concerning land use should encourage and, if necessary, require States to adopt regulatory programs similar to these. While the Federal Government may not be the best administering authority for such programs, Federal law should specify the criteria against which land use decisions should be made at the State and local level.

XI

I have proposed Federal criteria which the States should consider, although policies may vary from one part of the country to another.

These include:

Prohibition of public or private development which will result in violation of emission or effluent limitation, standards or other requirements of the Clean Air Act or the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

Prohibition of residential, commercial, or industrial development on flood plains.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

A requirement that major residential developments provide open space areas sufficient for recreation.

A requirement that utilities maximize multiple usages of utility rights-of-way.

Restriction of industrial, residential, or commercial development on agricultural land of high productivity.

Prohibition of industrial, residential, or commercial development which will exceed the capacity of existing systems for power and water supply, waste water collection and treatment, solid waste disposal, and transportation.

XII

In addition to this, however, we need a national growth policy and a Federal land use policy that would guide the management of our land resources in conformity with the national growth policy. This Nation, and the world, continue to grow at exponential rates. If the present population expands at its present rate, the world's population in the year 2000 will be double the 1970 population. Furthermore, there appears to be little possibility of leveling off global population growth before the year 2000 because most of the prospective parents of that year have already been born.

The demands of this population on the earth's resources will undoubtedly produce serious social, economic, political, and environmental conflicts here in America as elsewhere. While we in America may take some satisfaction in the stabilization of our population, we should recognize that our own leveling off will only minimally affect world population totals and the demands of that population on world resources.

Despite the enormous efforts which will be required to meet known demands, and the consequent strains on our human activity, even this Nation has no present policy for directing its growth either to avert such crises or to mitigate the impact.

What we need and do not have is a national growth policy to guide and effectuate economic development, population control, housing distribution, the use of natural resources, the protection of the environment, and the location of government and private development. In short, we must face the larger question of how large and in what directions this Nation should grow.

All levels of government should begin to ask the questions which they have postponed for so many years. Where are we, and where are we headed? The answers will necessitate consideration of major changes in life styles and institutions. They will certainly necessitate changes in our attitudes toward land and land ownership.

Rights of land ownership can no longer be treated as absolute—rather they must be modified by society's larger needs.

The lesson is obvious—and is dramatized by the energy crisis. If finite resources are to serve the needs of more and more people, this use must be planned to insure that the available supply serves the best uses our common wisdom can identify, and those uses must serve the equities of a free society dedicated to the welfare of all its citizens. And that will not just happen.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Liberal Party Dinner, New York City

October 9, 1975.

Four years I spoke to you here about the need for a liberal coalition to enlist a majority of Americans in a drive for change.

I spoke in terms of votes in a Presidential election. For the Presidency is the big apple of politics—without it there can be little change.

We failed in 1972 to reach a majority consensus for liberal change. And on the eve of 1976, we face the grim possibility of failing again. For the liberal consensus again remains unfinished.

How can that happen? After 7 years of a Republican administration distinguished only by its failures, how could the American electorate fail to vote for a new liberal administration?

When we know what's right, how can so many Americans not follow our leadership? How can so many Americans make the wrong choice?

How can so many Americans miss the point?

The answer, I submit, is that we have missed the point.

For in the past decade, liberals have developed an ideology and state of mind that is narrow, unimaginative, and often irrelevant.

Contrast that with the state of liberalism during the Great Depression, when we spoke with the people's voice. We assumed the burden of uniting the poor and discontented every race and ethnic background.

We held them together in a powerful liberal consensus. In the first 100 days of the New Deal, we accomplished some of the most fundamental changes ever to occur in America.

We succeeded then because our proposals went directly to what people wanted—jobs, controls on big business, rights for workers, social security, freedom from fear.

Four decades ago, we had discovered the possibilities of government action to better the lives of Americans. People were excited by the possibilities, and they prospered as a result.

But something has happened since then—and it's basically happened to us.

People still are discontented. They still want change, and it is still our responsibility to help them make change a reality.

Yet when the average citizen turns to us for help, what does he find?

Consider, for example, the 1972 National Platform of the Democratic Party.

If you wanted to read it, it would take a while. It runs about 50 pages, or nearly 15,000 words, and it reads like the catalogue of virtually every problem that we liberals think bothers the American people.

The Platform speaks knowledgeably about the Railway Labor Act, capital gains taxes, funding for ethnic studies, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the new towns program, bilingual education, community-based rehabilitation facilities, the Food for Peace Program, the Protocol on Chemi-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

cal Warfare, and literally hundreds of other aspects of our incredibly complex national government.

It was a wonderfully comprehensive and esoteric document. It showed that we knew all about government, and knew just what government programs needed change.

Yet the results of the election showed that the 1972 platform was irrelevant, for all practical purposes.

For in promising so much for so many, it was meaningless. Nowhere in there was there any statement of what those hundreds of changes would cost. How much, for example would the new towns program cost? Would we need higher taxes to pay for it? How many people really would be helped?

Or, what about capital gains tax reform? Would it soak just the rich? What about retired couples, supplementing their social security check with a blue-chip stock dividend? Would they be soaked, as well?

I'm not trying to say that we need a national effort to write better party platforms. Obviously, there are better ways to communicate with people.

But the Democratic Platform of 1972 represents to me the culmination of years of liberal neglect—of allowing a broadbased coalition to narrow—of progressively ignoring the real fears and aspirations of people—and of assuming we know best what the people need.

For all the fine details we mustered then, and can muster today for political discussions, we still don't deal with the real issues.

And what are the real issues? They're not as finely detailed as the issues we discuss, but they can be found.

I read my mail, I talk with voters in the towns of Maine, and I listen. I find everywhere people who can't cite from the Federal Register but know what's wrong anyway.

They work hard, but they are not so sure anymore—that 14 hour days in a lobster boat or the monotony of an assembly line are worth the effort.

They feel victimized by the economy. Fuel oil is up 118 percent over 1969—bread, up 36 percent—hamburger, up 50 percent. Their jobs are in danger as layoffs continue.

Yet all around them they see special interests which have escaped those troubles, if they are big and powerful enough. Money and power buy access to government, whether it's Lockheed or a firemen's union. And raising hell can get access, if you're loud and organized.

They sense that things are getting worse, not better. Crime went up in Maine last year. There are few hopeful signs on the horizon. They don't feel secure in their homes, on the street, or on the job.

And, most important, they don't believe that government really cares about them. All they need is one encounter with some government bureaucrat to confirm that. In Maine, for example, it now takes a full year to process a social security disability claim.

The people I hear in Maine, plainly, are demoralized and alienated. People everywhere are demoralized.

Louis Harris stated recently that 67 percent of the people feel that "what you think doesn't count much anymore," nearly double the 37 percent who felt that way in 1966. Nearly the same response came to the statement that "the people running the country don't care what happens to you."

Seventy-two percent of the American people stated they do not think they get their money's worth from their taxes, up from 56 percent in 1969.

During the same period of time, people lost confidence in literally every major institution, public and private.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The number of people who expressed great confidence in doctors, down to 44 percent from 72 percent.

In higher education, down to 33 percent from 61 percent.

In the military, down to 29 percent from 62 percent.

In organized labor, down to 14 percent from 22 percent.

In Congress, down to 13 percent, from 42 percent.

In the Executive Branch, down to 13 percent, from 43 percent.

And in local government leaders in central cities, an estimated 7 percent.

At the top of the list, people felt great confidence in local trash collectors. The reason? Harris found that people felt that at least they know whether or not they take away the trash and keep the streets clean.

At the same time people were frustrated with government, Harris found underneath a strong desire for new political leaders who will level with them about problems and solutions. They want leaders who will open up government, and let them participate. They want leaders who are committed to making government work as well as people believe it can work.

A year from now, people will again choose their leadership.

And the liberal task is to make sure that there is a choice.

The Republican Party, predictably, will ignore its failures and run against the Democratic Congress.

And what alternative will we offer? Another 1972 Platform that promises a new, improved program for every problem?

Do we really expect a majority of Americans to support national health insurance, when estimated costs range up to $100 billion a year?

Do we really expect a majority of Americans to support wholesale tax reforms to eliminate loopholes, when such reforms in the past have only made the system more complex and failed to relieve the burden on middle-income people?

Do we really expect a majority of Americans to support massive aid to cities in financial trouble—New York, especially—when their sentiments are to punish cities for overspending?

Do we really expect a majority of Americans to support government mandates for equal opportunities for women and minorities, when it means losing hard-won seniority or the busing of their children?

In other words, do we really expect a majority of Americans to support more government programs—no matter how worthy—at a time when confidence in government is at an all-time low?

At this time, none of us could sincerely answer yes.

Common sense tells us that despite their support for an active role for government, Americans want to see fundamental change—change that can make them again confident in government's ability to help make their lives better.

And there's no good reason that liberals can't do just that.

Why, for example, can't liberals propose fundamental changes in the structure of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government? The government published this year a 799-page manual just to explain its own structure. We have an Executive Branch that has 11 cabinet departments and 36 independent agencies, each with its own budget, bureaucracy and constituency.

We have a system of grants-in-aid that has over 1,000 different programs, each with its own requirements, approach, and money. In the health field alone, there are 228 different Federal programs. It takes 10 different agencies to administer those 228 programs.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

There are 1,240 Federal advisory boards, committees, commissions and councils, run by more than 4,000 Federal employees.

Why can't liberals start backing away at the regulatory bureaucracy where it keeps costs up and competition away?

Why do we tolerate regulatory agencies which stifle innovation, restrict competition, bury businesses with needless paperwork, and cost the American consumer billions of dollars a year?

Much regulation of business is undoubtedly necessary. But we now sit under a creaking regulatory structure—much of it outmoded—much of it captive of the very interests it regulates—often with too few resources to carry out its useful functions.

Why can't we just sit down with those agencies and say: Justify yourself. And you'd better make a good case.

Why can't liberals, for another example, talk about fiscal responsibility and productivity without feeling uncomfortable?

When Congress considered enactment of budget reform—which gave us the resources and procedures to discipline Federal spending and establish priorities—some of the strongest opponents were liberals.

When there is talk of cutting costs, making civil servants responsible for productivity, or just wondering why our Federal budget is now almost $400 billion, you simply don't find liberals involved in the discussion.

My basic question is this: Why can't liberals start raising hell about a government so big, so complex, so expensive, and so unresponsive that it's dragging down every good program we've worked for?

Yet we stay away from that question like it was the plague.

We're in a rut. We've accepted the status quo. We know that government can do much to improve the lives of every American. But that conviction has also led us to become the defenders of government, no matter its mistakes.

Our emotional stake in government is so much that we regard common sense criticism of government almost as a personal attack.

We resist questioning the basic assumptions of the structure and role of government, fearing the unknown, that somehow we have more to lose than gain through change.

Budget reform could mean cutting back spending on health programs, but it could also mean fewer gold-plated weapon systems.

Productivity standards could cost union support, but they could help restore public confidence in the many government workers who work hard.

Or regulatory reform could jeopardize health and safety regulation, but it could also loosen the grip of special interests on agencies.

Plainly, we cannot move forward without questioning such basic assumptions, and running certain dangers.

The American people have already spoken: Government must put its own house in order before it takes on new and bigger responsibilities.

And as long as we shrink from offering an alternative to a system of government people have lost confidence in, we can expect to remain in a minority.

Our challenge this decade is to restore the faith of Americans in the basic competence and purposes of government. That can come only through the hard process of reform.

We must adopt government reform as our first priority—as an end in itself. We must recognize that an efficient government—well-managed, cost-effective, equitable, and responsible—is in itself a social good.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

We must do this secure in the conviction that first priority on efficient government is not a retract from social goals, but simply a realization that without it, those goals are meaningless.

There is no good reason why we can't provide that alternative.

We have a legacy 4 decades old of enlarging the personal vision of every American. It is a legacy of success of government helping to create the opportunities for the good life for Americans. It has brought meaning and hope to countless millions in this Nation.

We also have an unfinished agenda for America. It includes dignity for the worker, for the poor and elderly—clean air and water—free access to the political process—an educational system open to all—a just legal system—fair taxation—and economic fair play—an agenda, in other words, of a Nation strong, confident and compassionate.

And finally, we have an unfinished consensus. It is a consensus for liberal change in America. It remains for us to restore confidence in government, and then to tap again the great moral potential of the American people for common sacrifice and sharing.

We have, in other words, a winning hand. Let's not fold it.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie Cape Elizabeth, ME

November 2, 1970.

Fellow Americans, I am speaking from Cape Elizabeth, ME—to discuss with you the election campaign which is coming to a close.

In the heat of our campaigns, we have all become accustomed to a little anger and exaggeration.

Yet—on the whole—our political process has served us well—presenting for your judgment a range of answers to the country's problems, and a choice between men who seek the honor of public service.

That is our system.

It has worked for almost 200 years—longer than any other political system in the world.

And it still works.

But in these elections of 1970, something has gone wrong.

There has been name-calling and deception of almost unprecedented volume.

Honorable men have been slandered.

Faithful servants of the country have had their motives questioned and their patriotism doubted.

This attack is not simply the overzealousness of a few local leaders.

It has been led, inspired, and guided from the highest offices in the land.

The danger from this assault is not that a few more Democrats might be defeated—the country can survive that.

The true danger is that the American people will have been deprived of that public debate—that opportunity for fair judgment—which is the heartbeat of the democratic process.

And that is something the country cannot afford.

Let me try to bring some clarity to this deliberate confusion.

Let me begin with those issues of law and order, of violence and unrest, which have pervaded the rhetoric of this campaign.

I believe that any person who violates the law should be apprehended, prosecuted, and punished, if found guilty.

So does every candidate for office of both parties.

And nearly all Americans agree.

I believe everyone has a right to feel secure, on the streets of his city, and in the buildings where he works or studies.

So does every candidate for office, of both parties.

And nearly all Americans agree.

Therefore, there is no issue of law and order, or of violence.

There is only a problem.

There is no disagreement about what we want.

There are only different approaches to getting it.

And the harsh and uncomfortable fact is that no one—in either party—has the final answer.

For 4 years, a conservative Republican has been Governor of California.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Yet there is no more law and order in California today than when he took office.

President Nixon—like President Johnson before him—has taken a firm stand.

A Democratic Congress has passed sweeping legislation.

Yet America is no more orderly or lawful—nor its streets more safe—than was the case 2 years ago, or 4, or 6.

We must deal with symptoms, strive to prevent crime, halt violence, and punish the wrongdoer.

But we must also look for the deeper causes in the structure of our society.

If one of your loved ones is sick, you do not think it is soft or undisciplined of a doctor to try and discover the agents of illness.

But you would soon discard a doctor who thought it enough to stand by the bed and righteously curse the disease.

Yet there are those who seek to turn our common distress to partisan advantage—not by offering better solutions—but with empty threat and malicious slander.

They imply that Democratic candidates for high office in Texas and California, in Illinois and Tennessee, in Utah and Maryland, and among my New England neighbors from Vermont and Connecticut—men who have courageously pursued their convictions in the service of the republic in war and in peace—that these men actually favor violence and champion the wrongdoer.

That is a lie.

And the American people know it is a lie.

And what are we to think when men in positions of public trust openly declare that the party of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman which led us out of depression and to victory over international barbarism; the party of John Kennedy who was slain in the service of the country he inspired; the party of Lyndon Johnson who withstood the fury of countless demonstrations in order to pursue a course he believed in; the party of Robert Kennedy, murdered on the eve of his greatest triumphs; how dare they tell us that this party is less devoted or less courageous in maintaining American principles and values than are they themselves.

This is nonsense.

And we all know it is nonsense.

And what contempt they must have for the decency and sense of the American people to talk to them that way—and to think they can make them believe.

There is not time tonight to analyze and expose the torrent of falsehood and insinuation which has flooded this unfortunate campaign.

There is a parallel—in the campaigns of the early fifties—when the turbulent difficulties of the post-war world were attributed to the softness and lack of patriotism of a few, including some of our most respected leaders, such as General George Marshall.

It was the same technique.

These attacks are dangerous in a more important sense—for they keep us from dealing with our problems.

Names and threats will not end the shame of ghettos and racial injustice, restore a degraded environment, or end a long and bloody war.

Slogans and television commercials will not bring the working man that assurance—of a constantly rising standard of life—which was his only a few years ago, and which has been cruelly snatched away.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

No administration can be expected to solve the difficulties of America in 2 years.

But we can fairly ask two things: That a start be made—and that the Nation be instilled with a sense of forward movement, of high purpose.

This has not been done.

Let us look, for example, at the effort to halt inflation.

We all agree that inflation must be arrested.

This administration has decided it could keep prices down by withdrawing money from the economy.

Now I do not think they will ever control inflation this way.

But even if their policy was sound, the money had to come from someone.

And who did they pick to pay?

It was the working man, the consumer, the middle class American.

For example, high interest rates are a part of this policy.

Yet they do not damage the banks which collect them.

They hardly touch the very wealthy who can deduct interest payments from their taxes.

Rather they strike at every consumer who must pay exorbitant charges on his new car or house. And they can cripple the small businessman.

Their policy against inflation also requires that unemployment go up.

Again, it is the working man who pays the price.

In other fields the story is the same.

They have cut back on health and education for the many, while expanding subsidies and special favors for a few.

They call upon you—the working majority of Americans—to support them while they oppose your interests.

They really believe that if they can make you afraid enough, or angry enough, you can be tricked into voting against yourself.

It is all part of the same contempt and tomorrow you can show them the mistake they have made.

Our difficulties as a Nation are immense, confused and changing.

But our history shows—and I think most of you suspect—that if we are ever to restore progress it will be under the leadership of the Democratic party.

Not that we are smarter or more expert—but we respect the people.

We believe in the people.

And indeed we must—for we are of the people.

Today the air of my native Maine was touched with winter and hunters filled the woods.

I have spent my life in this State which is both part of our oldest traditions and a place of wild and almost untouched forests.

It is rugged country, cold in the winters, but it is a good place to live.

There are friends, and there are also places to be alone—places where a man can walk all day and fish and see nothing but woods and water.

We in Maine share many of the problems of America and, I am sure, others are coming to us.

But we have had no riots or bombings and speakers are not kept from talking.

This is not because I am Senator or because the Governor is a Democrat.

Partly, of course, it is because we are a small State with no huge cities, but partly it is because the people here have a sense of place.

They are part of a community with common concerns and problems and hopes for the future.

We cannot make America small.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

But we can work to restore a sense of shared purpose, and of great enterprise.

We can bring back the belief—not only in a better and more noble future—but in our own power to make it so.

Our country is wounded and confused—but it is charged with greatness and with the possibility of greatness.

We cannot realize that possibility if we are afraid or if we consume our energies in hostility and accusation.

We must maintain justice—but we must also believe in ourselves and each other—and we must get about the work of the future.

There are only two kinds of politics.

They are not radical and reactionary or conservative and liberal. Or even Democratic and Republican. There are only the politics of fear and the politics of trust.

One says: You are encircled by monstrous dangers. Give us power over your freedom so we may protect you.

The other says: The world is a baffling and hazardous place, but it can be shaped to the will of men.

Ordinarily that division is not between parties, but between men and ideas.

But this year the leaders of the Republican party have intentionally made that line a party line.

They have confronted you with exactly that choice.

Thus—in voting for the Democratic party tomorrow—you cast your vote for trust—not just in leaders or policies—but for trusting your fellow citizens in the ancient traditions of this home for freedom, and most of all, for trust in yourself.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Remarks by Senator Edmund S. Muskie on S. 3708

DEMONSTRATION CITIES AND METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1966

IN THE SENATE

August 1966.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, throughout history cities have been mainsprings of social and economic growth. Men gathered in them for common protection, for trade, for industry, for the exchange of ideas, for social intercourse, and for the comforts and attractions urban life could offer.

Men have been drawn to cities as if by magnets. Cities have drawn on the power and imagination of their people to create states, nations and even civilizations. However much we may feel drawn to rural scenes and quiet places, we still return to the cities and towns for our business, for government and for the fruits of learning and the arts.

In a real sense cities are creators of life—and at the same time they can be destroyers of lives. The pages of history are full of the tales of those who sought the promise of the city and found only despair. From the book of Job, to Charles Dickens, to James Baldwin, we have read the ills of the cities.

Our cities contain within themselves the flowers of man's genius and the nettles of his failures.

We are all familiar with the photographs of our Capitol, with slums blocking the foreground. We know of the explosive forces rumbling, and sometimes bursting, out of the crowded slums not far from the glitter of broadway, the soaring new buildings of Chicago or the palm lined streets of Los Angeles.

We also know of the "other side of the tracks" in smaller cities, where unemployment comes first and prosperity arrives last.

It is in the slum and blighted areas of our cities that unemployment rates soar to almost 10 percent; it is in the decayed neighborhoods that almost 70 percent of the poor live in dilapidated, overcrowded, or unsafe and unsanitary dwellings; it is in these areas of unrest that public welfare payments are concentrated—24 percent of the population of Watts, for example, was on public assistance at the time of the riots; it is in these areas of stifled opportunity that below average school buildings and teaching are concentrated; it is in these areas of bleak ugliness that recreational facilities are most limited; and it is in these areas that disease, ill health and crime are most prevalent.

For example, a study by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare states that in one city, compared with a control "good area," the substandard area required police charges 2½ times as high, ambulance runs and fire calls almost twice as high, welfare costs 14 times as high. In an-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

other city, the poor housing area produced 36 percent of the city's juvenile delinquency and 76 percent of the city's tuberculosis cases.

Whatever its size, wherever its location in this land of ours, the city is a problem which grows as our Nation grows, a problem which belongs to all of us, a problem which all of us must join in solving.

We are, increasingly, a Nation of urban dwellers. At present 70 percent of our population lives in metropolitan areas. By 2,000 the proportion will probably reach 80 percent.

The two major phenomena of this urban growth are crowded, decaying and blighted areas and the surrounding, too often formless, suburban sprawl. The result is poor housing, inadequate public facilities, limited education and job opportunities, disease and ill-health, excessive dependence on welfare payments and the threats of crime and delinquency for those crowded into the slums and blighted areas. The more affluent members of society, who still use the city for business and entertainment, but who have used modern transportation to escape the problems of living in the city, now battle traffic problems, suffer through smog, recoil at riots in the slums and feel more uneasy over the dangers of urban life.

Too often, for the poor, for those of modest means, and for the rich, our cities have become nightmares rather than dreams.

Our awareness of the problems of the city is not new.

In 1902 my hometown—Waterville, ME—celebrated its centennial. This was an age of universal optimism in that bright period before the first of the world wars. President William H.P. Faunce of Brown University noted in a sermon at the centennial religious mass meeting, June 22, 1902, that "the century which has elapsed since the founding of Waterville has been justly called 'The Wonderful Century.'" Men have discovered more facts and invented more mechanisms in the last 100 years than in all preceding history. But the greatness of our apparatus ought to mean greatness of intelligent and character. The difference between the old hand-loom and the modern loom is enormous; is the difference as great between the man who stood behind the former and the man who stands behind the latter? What is the use of the incandescent light if it does not enable the citizen to see his duty? What is the advantage of traveling at 60 miles an hour if we are as discontented at the end of the journey as at the beginning? The aim of our civilization is not to whiten the seas with the sails of commerce, but to develop simply, homely virtues which are the chief defense of our Nation, the best safeguards of the fireside and the home.

Reverend Faunce's remarks were true 64 years ago, and they are even more pertinent today. He spoke almost a year and a half before the Wright Brothers made their first successful flight at Kitty Hawk. In the brief span of time between his address and our day we have increased man's speed from 60 miles an hour on land to 18,000 miles an hour in space. The goals which he set for American society are relevant to our own time. He called on the citizens of Waterville to "develop a new sense of civic pride and municipal duty." He notes that "Americans have succeeded nobly in founding States, but they have not yet learned to govern cities."

Since Reverend Faunce delivered his sermon we have labored to improve the lot of our cities. Our major efforts go back more than 30 years. During this time Federal, State and local governments have worked together in the search for solutions to urban problems. Planning aids, urban renewal, public housing, aids to education, hospital construction, community facilities construction, public welfare assistance, employment assistance, transportation

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

loans and grants—all these and many more programs have been approved by the Congress.

These programs have accomplished a great deal—but they have fallen far short of the need.

One reason is that every program of Federal aid to the cities has approached a single problem with a single weapon. They have operated side by side—frequently indifferent to each other, sometimes even in conflict with each other.

A city might have urban renewal without adequate low- and middle-income housing, public housing and an inadequate public health program, a welfare program but little vocational training, a recreation program, and inadequate schools. Repeatedly, neglect of one area canceled out efforts in another.

A second shortcoming has been that even where all existing Federal aids have been available to a city, there has been no systematic arrangement for coordinating their impact—cities could be lost in a maze of Federal aids.

There have been no local plans broad enough to make effective use of combined aid programs.

There has been no focal point for concentrating their resources on the problems of a neighborhood.

There has been little incentive for coordinated use of Federal programs.

Finally, present programs are simply insufficient in two ways:

They are not adequate to meet the growing needs of growing urban populations.

They are not designed to meet all the needs that the neglected neighborhoods display.

Compounding these difficulties has been the financial crisis of the cities. Between 1954 and 1963, municipalities increased their tax revenues by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. For the central city the problem has become a vicious circle. The more determined the city's effort to raise funds to meet the need for increased services, the more likely that effort drives its economically affluent citizens to the nearby suburbs. Similarly, the greater burden the city places on industry within its borders, the less its opportunity to attract and hold the industry and commerce its economy requires. So the city becomes, increasingly, a home for the economically deprived, those least able to bear the cost of municipal services. It is not surprising that the cities with the greatest slum problems often have the least capacity to deal with those problems.

Conflicts in program goals, divisions of authority, lack of resources, major program gaps—all prevent us from building and rebuilding cities our urban citizens deserve and all of us need.

Recognizing these human problems of urban life, President Johnson named a task force of distinguished Americans, working with Secretary Weaver, to study these problems, analyze the shortcomings of existing Federal programs, and recommend to him a program for immediate action.

The result was the Demonstration Cities Program.

The essentials of the program the President transmitted to the Congress on January 26, 1966 were these:

The concentration of available and special resources in sufficient magnitude to demonstrate swiftly what qualified urban communities can do and can become.

The coordination of all available talent and aid on these targets in a way which is impossible where assistance is provided across the board and men and money must be spread thin.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The mobilization of local leadership and initiative to assure that the key decisions as to the future of American cities are made by the citizens who live there and to commit local leadership both public and private to a comprehensive attack on urban problems, freed from the constraints that have handicapped past efforts and inflated their costs.

In his message to the Congress, the President said:

"Today, I have placed before the Congress and before you, the people of America, a new way of answering an ancient dream. That dream is of cities of promise, cities of hope, where it could truly be said, to every man his chance, to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity, to every man the right to live and to work and to be himself and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him.

The new way of answering that ancient dream is this:

To rebuild where there is hopeless blight;

To renew where there is decay and ugliness;

To refresh the spirit of men and women that are growing weary with jobless anxiety;

To restore old communities and to bring forth new ones where children will be proud to say, "this is my home."

What I have offered is a massive program, involving everything that we know about building homes and schools and parks and streets that are safe from fear."

The choice facing the Nation was posed by President Johnson in that special message:

"Shall we make our cities livable for ourselves and our posterity? Or shall we by timidity and neglect damn them to fester and decay?"

The Housing Subcommittee and the Banking and Currency Committee have voted to accept the challenge, to make a new beginning in our campaign to improve the quality of life for all our citizens.

The legislation we present today is designed to meet the President's objectives and to achieve the American dream—for the child whose playground is a trash-strewn alley—for the young boy or girl whose class room is a rat-infested cellar—for the parent whose income is uncertain and whose housing choice is an overcrowded tenement room or the street—for the young man who cannot get a job because he lacks training and cannot get training because he lacks funds—for the man or woman who cannot find decent housing because of the color of his or her skin.

The legislation we present today places the central city in the context of the entire metropolitan area, and it addresses itself to the problems of metropolitan regions. It requires better coordination of Federal activities, and it provides incentives for coordinated metropolitan area planning and development.

Finally, the legislation we present today will help the States to provide technical assistance to local communities in making better use of Federal assistance programs.

As I have indicated, S. 3708 is based on recommendations made to the Congress by President Johnson. The subcommittee on Housing made substantial changes in the draft legislation submitted by the administration, but it did not depart from the President's intent.

Mr. President, as reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, S. 3708 has three titles—title I: Comprehensive City Demonstration Programs; title II: Planned Metropolitan Development; and title III: Urban Information and Technical Assistance Services.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

All three titles have a consistent purpose of providing additional Federal assistance to help cities and metropolitan areas make effective use of existing Federal programs in order to make more significant progress toward the accomplishment of the national housing policy of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. This would be done by the bill in two ways: (1) better coordination of existing programs—Federal, State, and local; and (2) additional Federal financial assistance to be used by the locality for activities which supplement existing programs.

Title I of the bill would establish a new city demonstration program of Federal grants and technical assistance to help provide the incentive and the financial means for a city to plan and carry out a program for rebuilding and restoring entire sections or neighborhoods of slum and blight and to improve the general welfare of the people in such areas.

The demonstration city approach places maximum dependence upon the locality and its officials to plan and carry out the program. The Federal Government will help with technical and financial assistance, but it will be limited to those cities presenting imaginative and effective ways of dealing with the physical and social problems of slum and blighted areas.

The financial assistance will be in two forms—planning assistance and program assistance. Planning assistance will be on an 80 percent Federal grant basis with the city making up the other 20 percent of cost. For this purpose the bill authorizes an appropriation of $12 million a year for each of 2 years, fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

The program assistance would provide supplementary financial aid to cities to carry out activities in addition to those already provided under existing Federal law. The supplementary aid will be computed in each case on a formula related to local contributions to Federal programs involved in the project. Under the committee bill the program assistance for any project would be a maximum of 80 percent of the total non-Federal contributions made on all projects under existing Federal law which are being carried out as part of the city demonstration program. The supplemental grant could not be used to reduce local expenditures on existing projects or activities or to reduce the local effort for similar activities. The bill calls for a 2-year authorization of $400 million for fiscal 1968 and $500 million for fiscal 1969. The 2-year authorization is consistent with administration estimates per a 5-year program.

Under this title, the urban renewal grant authority would be increased by $250 million to be used for projects included within a city demonstration program.

Title II calls for improved coordination of Federal activities in metropolitan areas, requires minimum standards of planning and coordination by local governments in such areas, and authorizes supplementary Federal grants to State and local public bodies for metropolitan development projects as incentives for adequate metropolitanwide comprehensive planning and adherence to such planning. The supplementary grant would be authorized only for those metropolitan areas which have met standards for comprehensive planning on a metropolitanwide basis. The grant would be made to the public body sponsoring the metropolitan development project. It would amount to a maximum of 20 percent of the cost of the project. In no case could the total grant (the basic grant plus the supplementary grant) exceed 80 percent of the project cost nor could the supplementary grant exceed the basic grant.

The benefits of this title are for projects in a standard metropolitan statistical area, which is defined by the bureau of the budget as the area in and

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

around a city of 50,000 population or more. The projects to be benefited are generally of a public works nature but are listed in detail in the bill. The authorization under the bill is a maximum of $25 million for fiscal year 1967 and $50 million for fiscal year 1968.

Title III of the bill is designed to help local communities make better use of Federal urban assistance programs by authorizing Federal grants to States and metropolitan area agencies to help finance information centers to serve metropolitan areas and small communities throughout the State. The grant could not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the activity. The bill authorizes an appropriation not to exceed $5 million for fiscal year 1967 and $10 million for fiscal year 1968.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Inaugural Address of Edmund S. Muskie

GOVERNOR OF MAINE TO THE NINETY-EIGHTH LEGISLATURE

STATE OF MAINE

January 3, 1957.

ADDRESS

Mr. President and Members of the 98th Legislature:

Someone much wiser than I has said: "Law is the road-map to happiness. It maps out the direction human acts must take if they are to reach their proper goal. But maps are the products of minds. They are a work of intelligence, a work of reason. Before a man can exist there must be a mind capable of recognizing destinations and the road or roads that lead to them. So it is with the map of human life. There must be a mind capable of recognizing the true goals of human life and the roads that lead to those goals. Law then is always a command or a direction of reason ordering a human act to its proper goal. The goal of all human acts is happiness."

During the winter months which lie ahead of us, we shall be fashioning a map for the guidance of our State in the years to come. To that task we should summon all of the intelligence which we can muster in order that we may clearly recognize our proper destinations and firmly direct our actions toward them.

In a democratic society, we consider that this work is done most effectively if it is the product of government working together with all citizens to achieve goals which will serve the common good. In a very real sense, then, the people of Maine will be working with us and through us in these legislative days to develop a program which will enable us to step forward with confidence on the right road to a brighter future.

Conscious of the responsibility which this imposes upon us, I have listened long and carefully to the advice and suggestions of many citizens, groups, and public officials who have concerned themselves with the improvement of our State. Thus equipped, I have tried to pinpoint the destinations toward which we should move and the means we should immediately adopt to get us there. I shall submit the conclusions which I have reached in these respects to you in this inaugural message and in the budget message which will be delivered next week. It will be your responsibility, of course, to test my conclusions in the light of your own evaluation of public opinion and of the part which State government should play in shaping the Maine of tomorrow.

As I see them, our destinations or objectives have not changed in the past 2 years. They have been affirmed and reaffirmed to the point that there is virtually universal agreement among us as to their nature and importance.

We agree that State government has a proper function, in partnership with private initiative and enterprise, in stimulating the pace of economic activity within the State to the end that our people may realize to the maximum the fruits of their labors. We recognize that our success in this respect is basic to the expansion of our capacity to provide needed services.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

We agree that the conservation and intelligent use of our natural resources calls for enlightened measures designed to preserve them for the long years and the generations ahead.

We agree that the State's future, as well as that of our young people, depends upon our equipping them, by education and training, to realize to the full their potential in material, intellectual, and spiritual satisfactions.

We agree that the unfortunate among us, institutionalized and otherwise, who, because of economic, physical, moral, or mental disabilities, can not advance themselves out of their own resources, have a legitimate claim upon our compassion.

We agree that the machinery of government should be so designed and organized as to be readily responsive to the will of our people and to render the services required of it efficiently, effectively, and economically.

We realize that the attainment of each of these objectives is vital to the attainment of all of them; and that we must constantly make progress toward each if, in the long run, we wish to assure continued progress toward all.

In the past 2 years, we have taken important steps toward these objectives and we have made responsible and constructive analyses of the next steps we should take. Our immediate task is to apply the conclusions which have been indicated in such a way as to assure the maximum advances possible within the limits of our resources without neglecting any of the objectives just described.

As differences of opinion are disclosed—and they will be—they can be resolved if we will bear in mind that we are in agreement as to where we want to go, and that each of us honestly wishes to get there by the most effective and practicable means possible.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

One of the first subjects which should engage our attention is that of economic development.

Beginning with the creation of the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce, we have been in the process of reorganizing our efforts and equipping ourselves with new tools in this field. Our purposes have been as follows:

1. To mobilize a substantial, hard-hitting force of salesmen for Maine, consisting of an expanded core of trained technicians and leaders on the State level working with organized groups of determined and persevering citizens on the community level.

2. The evaluation of our resources in every area of the State in order to direct our efforts most productively toward those industries whose needs we can hope to meet. The new Division of Research and Planning has assumed the leadership in this phase of the work and, despite its limitations in manpower, has made an effective beginning in stimulating local and regional planning, and in the compilation of data basic to a comprehensive knowledge of our assets. Working under similar limitations, the Geology Division is charting the exploration of our mineral resources.

3. The development of "leads" to industrial prospects by direct selling and by use of the various media and channels available to the Division of Public Relations.

4. Continuing, and unflagging promotion of our vacation-land resources and of the products of the soil and sea, all of which should be increasingly identified with Maine and quality across the country.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

The results to date can be described as encouraging beginnings, sufficient to stimulate our greater efforts in the same directions, but insufficient for any measure of complacency and self-satisfaction. We have had, and will continue to have, our set-backs; but there is no reason, short of a reversal of national economic trends, why we should not make substantial and steady progress.

You will be asked to consider the following recommendations designed to strengthen our program:

1. Provision for additional personnel in the Divisions of Development, Research and Planning, and Geology. The work in the latter two divisions, particularly, is handicapped by manpower limitations. Research, exploration, and intelligent planning are vital to a state searching for productive areas for industrial growth; and our rate of progress, long-range, will be influenced greatly by what we do today and tomorrow in these fields. This recommendation is designed to increase our ability to serve the needs of existing industries as well as to attract new ones.

2. Appropriation of State and funds to match Federal and local funds for the purpose of encouraging and implementing local and regional planning.

3. Use of the State's credit to attract risk capital for construction of new industrial buildings.

This proposal merits some detailed discussion. Briefly, it is based upon the following assumptions:

a. That many areas of the State, otherwise potentially attractive to new industries, lack available industrial space and the resources to provide the equity capital necessary to finance its construction;

b. That, under current conditions nationally, capital for this purpose is in short supply and, consequently, becomes selective and gravitates toward only the best loans;

c. That the availability of suitable industrial space or the necessary risk capital to build it will often be the determining factor in attracting a new industry suited to the economy of a particular community or area in the State; and

d. That use of the State's credit will offset the absence of local equity capital and greatly reduce, or even eliminate the risk, on industrial development loans to such effect as to attract risk capital.

The proposal, based on these assumptions, is that an appropriate state agency, backed by the state's credit, insure mortgages on industrial properties. Further details will be spelled out in the legislation to be submitted. However, it might be well to point out that the proposal does not provide for gifts or subsidies to new industries. It is a way for us to place our full faith and credit as a State behind our belief in Maine's economic possibilities, and, as such, merits your serious attention.

This proposal is not intended to slight the valuable contribution made by the Maine Development Credit Corporation in this field. Without the use of the state's credit, that agency has performed an eminently useful service. On the other hand, there is need for the greatly expanded credit resources which the new proposal should provide.

No discussion of economic development in Maine would be complete without reference to our coast-line and the work of the Maine Port Authority. We have some of the finest natural harbors on the Atlantic sea-board. The Federal Government has spent and is spending millions of dollars on dredging so that these ports can be used by the most modern ships. Private capital has spent large sums in developing port facilities. The Maine Port Authority has demonstrated that waterborne commerce can be increased with

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

an active port solicitation and promotion program. I unhesitatingly recommend the expansion of this program. I recommend further the appropriation of the funds necessary to rehabilitate the Maine State Pier—a project which is essential if this valuable state property is to remain operational.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The intelligent utilization and conservation of our natural resources are as much a part of our economic development program as are the essentially promotional activities which I have just discussed. As a matter of fact, unless they are carefully husbanded to assure a continuing supply of the products which they yield, there is little sense to talk of an expanded industrial base.

1. Forests: Probably our greatest natural resource is our forests. Their importance is highlighted by the fact that industries using wood employ about one-third of our people. The extent of our supply is indicated by the fact that we have the largest amount of commercial forest land per capita in the country. In industry, in recreation, for water storage, they are an indispensable, yet often taken-for-granted, asset which can be wasted overnight, but replenished only with the passage of years. We must continue and strengthen our programs to protect them from fire, insects, disease, and improper use.

Your attention is particularly called to the following recommendations:

a. The need to improve forest practices on small wood-lots, considered a major problem.

b. Expansion of the state forest nursery, particularly in cooperation with the Federal Soil Bank Nursery Program, which aims at production of 10 million trees per year to be used on soil bank acreage.

c. Completion of the aerial survey of our forest lands, considered important as a basis to determine policies of expansion, or new uses and locations for industries using wood.

2. Agriculture: A healthy agriculture is essential to the vitality of hundreds of communities in our State and to the prosperity of our whole economy. The number of our farms has been dwindling at an alarming rate. This trend has been influenced, of course, by market conditions nationally or regionally which are beyond the control of a single state. At the same time, we should not overlook possible improvements of those services which can contribute to the well-being of our farm economy.

One of the brightest spots in the farm picture in Maine is the poultry industry which has experienced a tremendous growth. The incidence of poultry disease in our flocks has inevitably increased in proportion to the number of poultry on our farms. The investigation, control, and eradication of these diseases is properly a function of State government; and our services in this connection, both in the department and at the University of Maine, should be expanded commensurate with the needs of this growing industry.

We are requested to assume one half the costs of maintaining a Federal-State Market News Office in Presque Isle. This office is the only source of impartial and accurate daily market information for Maine potato producers and shippers, and is an invaluable aid to intelligent marketing of the Maine potato crop. I recommend that we assume these costs.

You will be asked to consider again the advisability of continuing milk price controls. All are agreed that we need policies which will expand the market for milk produced on Maine farms at prices which will bring a fair return to the producer. There is disagreement as to what these policies should be. There is merit to the suggestion that elimination of retail price

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

controls, or, at the very least, more liberal resale pricing policies, will accomplish the results desired.

The marketing and promotional efforts of several segments of Maine agriculture have been stepped up in recent years. Illustrative is the work of the Maine Dairy Council Committee and the Maine Potato Commission which operate with the proceeds of special industry taxes. It is understood that the poultry industry is considering a similar program. Our policy should be to cooperate with the indicated wishes of the industry in each instance, and, once such a program is enacted into law, to safeguard its sources of revenue. These are constructive and productive efforts and should be encouraged.

3. Inland Fisheries and Game: Our incomparable lakes, streams, and forests constitute the habitat for a profusion of fish and wild-life which serve as a major attraction for our thousands of visitors as well as wholesome recreation and sport for our citizens. It is the responsibility of the department to so manage these resources as to insure a continuing annual harvest of fish and game, sufficient to maintain and, if possible, raise the level of returns to the sportsman. This task is made more difficult by the growth in population nationwide, the increasing number of those who wish to fish and hunt, the decentralization of industry, and factors tending to reduce the extent of land and water areas which will support the production of fish and game.

We must, therefore, constantly review our efforts and redirect them as new practices and programs are indicated. In this connection it is suggested that you study methods which could materially reduce the numbers of special laws now on the books, giving due consideration, of course, to the dictates of sound conservation.

It is suggested, also, that you consider giving the department more specific authority over dams, fishways, screens, and water level controls. It is felt that obstructions in our streams, unless removed or by-passed, are a serious detriment to any program designed to encourage the natural reproduction of fish.

4. Sea and Shore Fisheries: It is estimated that our commercial fishing industry produces nearly 300,000,000 pounds of seafood products valued at $75,000,000. These figures establish it as an important segment of the State's economy calling for wise management to insure its source of supply.

The department's activities consist of enforcement, research, and promotion. Its program should be strengthened as follows:

a. Intensification of the seed lobster program with appropriation of sufficient funds to stimulate the impounding of female lobsters.

b. Utilization of the laboratory facilities at Boothbay Harbor to study lobster diseases and to develop methods of reducing the adverse influences of these diseases on the industry.

c. A resumption of scallop research to develop life history studies and techniques to predict scallop abundance.

d. Continuation of the program to survey closed clam areas for the purpose of salvaging shellfish from these areas; and the addition of a program to carry on bacteriological surveys of open areas in order that the public's health may be more adequately safeguard and to meet the requirements of the U.S. Public Health Service.

5. Water Resources: The pollution of these clam flats is a part of the broader problem of water pollution which touches almost every area of the State, and which must find a solution within reasonable time limits if we are to derive maximum benefits from our water resources.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Surely it is beyond argument that an abundant supply of clean water is essential to our industrial growth, to meet our domestic needs, to encourage the natural reproduction of fish in our streams, and to our coastal economy. We are relatively favored as among the 48 States in our possession of this resource, but we should improve our position as rapidly as we can.

This imposes responsibilities upon industry and upon our communities. Each must make progress to the maximum extent possible in the light of technological advances and reasonable financial requirements. We cannot afford to be rigid, nor can we afford to be lax.

We must really face up to these alternatives in this session of the Legislature. The Water Improvement Commission reports that approximately 15,000 miles of streams will have been studied, covered in public hearings, and prepared for submission to you in its recommendations for classification. If you should adopt these recommendations, the extension of classification then authorized will present problems to nearly every community. Thus, you will be confronted with a sobering responsibility.

With respect to the community problem, the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation appropriating funds to assist municipalities in the construction of sewage treatment works. Under the Act grants are limited to 30 percent of the estimated cost of the works or $250,000, whichever is the smaller. Maine's allotment for the current fiscal year is $627,125. In addition, we are allotted $19,331 in the current fiscal year to assist us in meeting the costs of our program for pollution control. Each project seeking to qualify for the federal funds must be approved by the Water Improvement Commission and must be part of a comprehensive State water pollution control plan.

I recommend that we participate in the federal program and that we supplement the federal funds available to municipalities by the appropriation of State matching funds to the extent of two-thirds of the federal grant.

An alternative to this proposal has been suggested. It would provide a revolving fund from which municipalities could borrow, interest free, funds necessary to construct, not only sewage treatment plants, but also other sewage works. This alternative has considerable merit but would not appear to go as far toward solving the financial problem of municipalities as the matching fund proposal.

I recommend further that the Commission be given the necessary funds to provide consulting and planning services for municipalities, and to employ the technical and enforcement staff needed if the recommended classifications are adopted.

Another suggestion of considerable merit has been advanced. Briefly, it proposes that enabling legislation be adopted providing for the creation of municipal sewage districts under model charters spelled out in the law. Implementation of this suggestion will require considerable study and research, for which appropriate provision should be made. Such legislation would provide a more flexible and ready tool for financing municipal sewage projects.

It is evident that financial and technological limitations dictate caution in the imposition of time limits for compliance if we are to avoid back-breaking burdens upon municipalities and industries. At the same time, let no one mistake our intention to bring this problem under control.

Two other recommendations touching upon our water resources, should be considered:

a. An adequate water supply is almost assumed in Maine except during occasional extremely dry summer months. We know that this supply and its

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

management are important to industry, to the generation of hydro-electric power, to the control of pollution, to agriculture, to the breeding and feeding of fish life, and to our domestic needs. To obtain more of the facts bearing upon these two factors, I recommend that we establish a ground waters survey program to be conducted by the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey.

b. The question of utility rates is one which, biennially, for several years, has attracted widespread public interest, and rightly so. They affect the household budget of every citizen and the competitive position of our industries.

It is clear that, whatever the rate statute may be, utility companies must be provided with sufficient revenues to perform their duty to the public, to operate successfully, to maintain their financial integrity, and to attract capital at a reasonable rate. To set a lower standard than this would be to deprive ourselves of the quality of service which we ought to have.

At the same time, the consumer has a right to expect that the Public Utilities Commission has the authority to fix minimum rates consistent with the foregoing. The present rate statute imposes a formula upon the Commission in its determination of the value of a utility's investment requiring it to give consideration to the "current value" of its properties as opposed to its actual investment. In times of inflation, this requirement tends to permit a utility to obtain a return on money not actually invested. Moreover, the Commission, which cannot compete with private utilities in the recruitment of trained technical staff, is confronted with the uncertain and cumbersome administrative task of determining reproduction cost and other factors which are matters of opinion and not subject to exact, factual verification.

For these reasons, I recommend that the rate statute be amended to provide an exact accounting rate base which will give weight to the utility's prudent investment. I firmly believe that the requirements of the utility and the consumer's interest can both be safeguarded under such a statute.

6. Parks: Over the past 4 years, visitor attendance at all state and Federal parks and recreation areas in Maine has increased by more than 30 percent. This is a reflection of the great demand for outdoor recreation facilities, which nature has equipped Maine to provide in such abundance. The increasing visitor use, which we welcome, is overcrowding our existing park facilities.

The expansion of our parks and recreation areas should have the enthusiastic endorsement of all who are conscious of the economic value of our vacationland resources. The Maine State Park Commission has prepared a long-range program for expansion which, in its basic outlines, should be implemented as rapidly as available funds permit. As is the case with other demands for capital funds, our progress will depend upon our approach to the financial problem involved. This problem will be discussed in the budget message.

The State parks are showcases of Maine's physical beauties and of our hospitality. In the same category should be included various State memorials, the improvement and maintenance of State buildings and grounds here in Augusta, and restoration of a State museum. All of them should receive our attention.

LABOR

Any balanced view of our responsibilities here this winter requires that we give attention to the welfare of the laboring men and women of the State. Their contribution to our economic well-being is an indispensable one

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

and should be recognized by realistic and enlightened legislation designed to insure their equitable participation in the gains which we hope to make.

I recommend the following:

1. A minimum wage law to supplement federal legislation, and a fair labor relations law keyed to our requirements.

2. Extension of coverage and a more favorable benefit schedule in the Employment Security and Workmen's Compensation Laws, and the removal of certain inequities governing disqualification in the Employment Security Law.

EDUCATION

Up to this point, I have discussed our material resources and what we must do to make them productive of a better life for ourselves and our children. The realization of what we hope to be as a State depends as much upon what we do with our human resources.

One of the basic needs of a democratic society is popular education. It has been said that, "Only the full light of learning could—liberate the human mind for self-government." To those who believe this—and I take it that includes all of us—higher educational standards in our schools will equip those who follow after us to work more effectively for that richer and more abundant life which is our goal.

If we accept these conclusions, then we must be concerned with the deficiencies of an educational system which finds itself near the bottom of the ladder of states. There is an explanation for our status in our relatively sparse and scattered population and our comparatively limited financial resources. We should not, however, fall back upon these limitations as excuses for exerting less than our maximum effort.

It is indeed encouraging that, over the past 2 years, an unprecedented amount of attention has been given to our educational problems. The conferences which were held in connection with the White House Conference on Education, the Jacobs report on school finances and needs, the survey of State government by the Public Administration Service, the Committee on Educational Television, plus the continuing studies and planning of educators on every level, have equipped us, as seldom before, to take constructive steps to improve our educational standards.

The recommendations contained in the Jacobs report, if implemented, will advance us toward sound objectives. These objectives may be described as follows:

1. The determination and distribution of state school aid on the basis of a foundation program of school financing, the foundation program being defined as the minimum educational program which the State seeks to assure for all children, and in which the State will participate financially. This minimum program may, of course, be exceeded in municipalities according to their initiative and resources. The recommended formula for state aid will provide some state aid for all municipalities, thus recognizing the principles of shared taxes, and it will also continue the emphasis on the principle of equalization.

2. The establishment of more effective minimum teachers' salary schedules.

3. The establishment of a school district reorganization commission to study the school conditions and needs in each community, to determine specific plans for the establishment of appropriate, larger school districts, and to report its recommendations to the next session of the legislature.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

4. The provision of a financial incentive for proper school district reorganization by an increase of 10 percent in state aid on the foundation formula for a consolidated district.

5. The provision of state financial assistance on school construction required in connection with proper school district reorganization.

These objectives cannot all be achieved immediately, but I recommend that they be adopted in principle and that the necessary funds be appropriated to get us started toward their realization.

The pressing need for an adequate supply of well qualified teachers also commands our attention. The teacher-training institutions constitute our principal source of supply and it is necessary that we act to improve the attractiveness of their educational programs and physical plant. Their capacity should be increased from an estimated 1,200 at present to 2,900 in the near future.

The retention of our young people in the State, and the extent of their contribution to its future, depend, in no small degree, upon the quality and availability of opportunities for higher education which we provide. We are appreciative of the important role played so well by our private institutions of learning. At the same time we know that they are not likely to be in a position to increase their enrollments in proportion to the anticipated increase in the college age population. We also know that we should increase the percentage of the Maine college age group who go to college. These premises dictate that we expand the capacity of the University of Maine while maintaining, and, if possible, improving the quality of its performance. Recent projections suggest that its capacity should reach a low of 7,500, or, a high of 12,000, by 1970.

As we consider the expansion of the University, we should not ignore the requirements of the young people in southwestern Maine, and the possibility of establishing additional state university facilities in that area. There is now under study the possible absorption by the University of Maine of Portland Junior College. Such recommendations as may be forthcoming from the trustees of the two institutions will be deserving of our careful consideration.

There is need for action to provide opportunities in higher education which are not now available in Maine. As a result of authorization 2 years ago, Maine is now a member of the New England Higher Education Compact under which has been established the New England Board of Higher Education. The purpose of the Board is to increase such educational opportunities through the establishment and maintenance of a coordinated educational program. The Board has concerned itself first with the problem of medical and dental education, facing squarely the facts that we use more doctors than the national average and that we do not produce enough doctors from among our own people to meet our needs.

The Board, therefore, proposes a plan whereby, in accordance with a recommended formula, the member States will under-write part of the difference between tuition-income and the actual cost of instructing each New England student in the region's medical schools. It is believed that this plan will serve to "Keep the present doors of opportunity open and to encourage the opening of additional doors for New England students." The plan merits our support.

In addition to the foregoing, you will be asked to consider recommendations, detailed in the budget, relative to vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, the Maine Vocational Technical Institute, the State Library, and the Maine Maritime Academy.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

We in America prize initiative, self-reliance, and the ability to get ahead on our own two feet. We treasure, and will fight, for the right to shape our own destinies as individuals.

At the same time, we recognize that circumstances beyond our control can reduce or destroy our capacity to do so; and we instinctively act to protect and provide for those who are thus incapacitated. Our programs in this respect, because of our limited resources, do not and can not provide a complete cushion against all the blows which misfortune may strike. It is proper and humane, nevertheless, to periodically review the needs and the adequacy of our efforts to meet the most serious ones.

This approach to the problems of those who might be deprived of the necessities of life without our assistance, suggests the following minimum recommendations:

1. In terms of number of recipients and the size of average grants, the public assistance programs for the aged, the blind, the disabled, and for dependent children have had varying histories.

While the number of recipients in the programs for old age assistance and aid to the blind continue to decline steadily, caseloads in the aid to dependent children program have expanded greatly and are continuing to increase. The new program for aid to the disabled already exceeds the aid to the blind program.

Over the past 10 years, these programs have been liberalized and the size of the average grants increased, by legislative and administrative action. Nevertheless, the reduced purchasing power of the dollar has wiped out most of the dollar gain in terms of the goods and services the grants will purchase. I recommend, therefore, that the grants of all recipients under these programs be increased by 5 percent in order to restore some of this loss.

2. I recommend that the citizenship requirement in Old Age Assistance be eliminated. Persons in this group now receive public assistance, but the burden falls almost wholly upon municipalities. If the requirement is eliminated, the burden will be shared by federal funds.

3. There are at least 600 Old Age Assistance recipients at all times in nursing homes, including convalescent homes and rest homes; and it is felt that most old age assistance recipients will have a period during their lives when nursing home care is necessary. In varying degrees, recipients under the aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, and aid to dependent children programs also require the services of such institutions.

The quality of the services in an appreciable number of nursing homes is scaled to the level of grants under these programs. For this and other reasons, as a survey of these homes will disclose, there is need for substantial up-grading in the quality of nursing home care. Indeed, it is felt that this may well be the major need not now included in our welfare program.

Consequently, I recommend that we adopt a program which will meet a significant portion of the cost of nursing home care, thus giving the department a basis on which it can establish the standards of care for which payment will be made.

The program would primarily provide needed care; but, in addition, it will reduce the welfare burden of municipalities, and should diminish, to some degree, the load on the State Hospital Aid Program.

4. The program for board and care of neglected children cries out for our attention. It covers some 2,100 children who have been committed to the department because of gross negligence on the part of the parents. Obviously,

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

it is our responsibility to provide better homes than those from which they have been taken by the courts.

The children are placed in foster homes, and the department pays $30 per month per child for their board and care. In the light of present living costs, this payment cannot be expected to provide the standard of care which it is our obligation, by all humane considerations, to provide. I recommend, therefore, that the payment be increased.

5. Two years ago the hospital aid program was adapted to purchase hospitalization for the recipients of the four categories of assistance programs. Thus, federal funds were claimed to supplement the state's appropriation.

The hospital aid pool thus created does not, of course, serve the needs of the medically indigent who are not recipients under those programs; and the aid to public and private hospitals program was continued. Because of increasing hospital costs, the appropriation for this purpose should be increased.

6. The program of alcoholic rehabilitation, which has expanded rapidly, has reached the limit of development under present appropriations. I recommend that a program of direct service by counseling, education, and some clinic care be added.

INSTITUTIONS

The Public Administration Service, in its report on the survey of State government, says of our mental health program, "No one wishes to see a person committed to a state mental institution and remain there for life no matter how fine the care he may receive there." I am sure that any of us who have had relatives, friends, or neighbors thus afflicted will agree wholeheartedly with that observation.

The report continues: "If only a few, percentage-wise, can be returned to normal home life the monetary savings to the state, not to mention the social and humanitarian benefits, would be real and substantial."

In these two sentences we have a statement of the selfish and the unselfish reasons why we should provide at our mental institutions, first, humane standards of custodial care and, second, intensive treatment and training programs designed to cure as many patients as the advances of science will make possible.

In order to move toward these objectives, each institution must have an increased complement of professional personnel in various categories, including medical, psychiatric, nursing and teaching, as well as an adequate staff of custodial personnel. To attract these people, it is more and more apparent that increased compensation must be offered.

The long-range building programs at these institutions must also be evaluated in terms of a treatment and training program; and, not only must we blue-print the kinds of plants needed, we must also do something about building them.

At our mental institutions we should also formalize and expand the work with respect to out-patient care; and this work might well be coordinated with the community services provided by the Department of Health and Welfare.

A comprehensive approach to the problem of mental health, aimed at prevention, cure, and care, must go beyond the institutional program. Suggestions designed to improve our present program will be contained in the budget; but, in this field, as in others, the organization and coordination of our efforts along program lines would enable us to achieve maximum results from the dollars expended.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The correctional institutions also reveal program deficiencies as well as, in some cases, security deficiencies. New physical facilities and improvements in the occupational, vocational, educational, religious, and recreational aspects of their programs are required.

Our goal should be an integrated correctional system aimed at prevention and the rehabilitation of those who are committed as responsible citizens capable of assuming positions in society commensurate with their abilities. Any such system, of course, includes institutions of maximum, medium, and minimum security. In addition, it should include an effective program of probation and parole, the first as a useful tool in salvaging offenders who are not yet hardened criminals, and the second as a tool used after imprisonment to ease the transition back into society.

One of our shortcomings at the moment, in these terms, is lack of a centralized and unified probation system, staffed by full-time, professional personnel equipped, by training and experience, to give proper guidance to those committed to their custody and to provide competent assistance to the courts.

Such a system, included as a part of our present parole program, would provide an essential service as described, and could also be useful in improving the present method of processing pardon cases; and I recommend its establishment. It might be pointed out that supervision under an effective probation and parole system is much less expensive, and can be productive of greater social benefits, than institutional supervision.

SURVEY OF STATE GOVERNMENT

I have now discussed what State government is doing and ought to do with respect to maximum utilization of our economic resources and our human resources. The legislative agenda would not be complete if it did not include, as well, items relating to the processes of government.

This brings us to the report on the survey of State government which was completed last June by the Public Administration Service.

The report is based on the principle that the executive branch of government would be a more effective instrument of service to our people if the Governor were in fact the center of executive authority and responsibility. The report proposes that he be made just that, and that other changes be adopted which will give him the time and the tools to exercise that authority, to delegate it to appropriate subordinates of his choosing, and to enforce the responsibility for proper execution.

I believe that he should have such authority and responsibility, whoever he may be and whatever his political party, because he is elected by the people; and, as their representative, he should be in a position to direct whatever business is entrusted to the executive branch of government by the Constitution and the legislature. They should be able to hold him primarily accountable for the ethics, loyalty, efficiency, frugality, and responsiveness to the public wishes of the thousands of employees in state service.

I believe that, if he is given such authority and responsibility, the limitations of his time and energies in the light of the many demands which are made upon them, should be recognized; and he should be given such assistance, and the executive branch should be so organized, as to enable him to readily and constantly observe and supervise the operations of State government.

I believe that the full realization of these objectives requires the adoption of a 4-year term for the Governor, the appointment of department heads by the Governor for terms coincident with his own, elimination of the executive

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

council, a reduction in the number of plural bodies which administer the day to day affairs of departments, and consolidation of the 29 major operating agencies and the more than 80 other agencies of State government into a reasonable number of departments.

I believe that the Office of the Governor and the executive branch of government will fall far short of their maximum contribution to the cause of efficient, effective, and economical government unless the foregoing principles are implemented.

The survey report contains recommendations in these respects and should be used as a guide. In addition, the report ranges over the entire field of State government, its organization, its operations, and its programs, making recommendations and suggesting supplementary studies to fully explore the possibilities for improvements. It contains material which can serve as the basis for constructive action, not only in this session of the Legislature, but also in the years ahead.

I, therefore, suggest the following:

1. That you consider and act upon recommendations which are submitted by the Citizens Committee on the Survey of State Government.

2. That you authorize the continuation of the Committee with funds to arrange for appropriate supplementary studies and to draft legislation incorporating its recommendations for submission to the next session of the Legislature.

Over the past 2 years another problem affecting the machinery of government has become cause for increasing concern. You will agree, I am sure, that the machinery can be only as effective as the personnel who man it. Because of the nationwide shortage of certain skills, the competition of private industry and business, and the rising cost of living, we face ever more serious recruitment problems. The impact of these factors has been noted particularly with respect to engineers, custodial and professional personnel at various institutions, and social workers. The Public Administration Service has given us a report on this situation, covering both classified and unclassified positions, and has recommended selective increases in salaries to meet the problem. It merits our attention and action.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

In this message, my discussion has been limited to the broad objectives and the highlights of legislation which will be presented to you. There are many other constructive and forward-looking proposals which are worthy of discussion but which I have omitted because of considerations of time. Highways and other budget matters will be discussed in the budget message.

Before closing, however, I would like to touch briefly upon two other programs, which are of vital concern to us, in order that I may pay tribute to the dedicated citizens who are giving them vitality and meaning; and I refer to the programs of civil defense and highway safety.

Each of these programs involve the problem of destroying apathy and stimulating action on the part of rank-and-file citizens of Maine. They are often described as "thankless' tasks, and, perhaps they are, in terms of the difficulty of achieving results. And yet, in terms of their immediate and potential impact upon the fortunes and lives of every one of us, they constitute a challenge which, I am sure, is a source of satisfaction to those who are giving of their time and energies to make them work.

In civil defense, the department should have additional personnel, including technical staff, to equip it to deal with the technological phases of civil

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

defense and to make a start toward development of area offices. Recommendations in this connection will be made in the budget message.

In highway safety, the Governor's Highway Safety Committee should be given formal legislative recognition and an operating budget. In addition, the Committee's legislative program, designed to improve our motor vehicle laws from a safety standpoint, deserves your earnest cooperation.

CONCLUSION

In closing, I would like to leave with you some thoughts expressed by Thomas Jefferson in 1816 in a discussion of the relationship between men and their governments:

"I am certainly not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions. I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with. But I know also that laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times."

Under divine guidance, and with confidence in the common sense of the people, we will find the wisdom to apply these principles to our own times and circumstances.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Governor.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Inaugural Address of Edmund S. Muskie

GOVERNOR OF MAINE TO THE NINETY-SEVENTH LEGISLATURE

STATE OF MAINE

January 6, 1955.

ADDRESS

Mr. President and Members of the 97th Legislature:

You and I have been sent here by our fellow citizens to participate as their representatives in the exercise of the functions of government. The work we do for them, if honestly and conscientiously done, can be a source of satisfaction to each of us. For this is the biennial renewal in Maine of that experiment begun more than 160 years ago—an experiment which has proven that man can be trusted with self-government. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, we exist "as standing proofs that a government, so modeled as to rest continually on the will of the whole society, is a practicable government." This, then, is, at the same time, the nature of our function and the measure of our responsibility.

As we meet together for the first time, it is customary and appropriate that we consider the scope of the problems which confront us. We must develop a plan for action if we are to proceed effectively and in an orderly fashion to deal with the work which must be done. The decisions to be made must be shared by the Governor, the Legislature, and the people. You and I are the instruments for recording the will of the people; and we can draw strength, wisdom, and inspiration from the fact that a well-informed citizenry can be trusted to support decisions which are in the best interests of all.

In our approach to our work, we can feel secure in the knowledge that our form of government, our traditions, and our democratic institutions give us a solid base on which to build for the future. We will be working not on quicksand but on solid rock. We should strive to make the structure which we build equally sound and enduring.

Our satisfaction in the recognition of this fact, however, should not dull our awareness of the need to take positive and constructive action in many areas of State government. The world does not stand still, and, we should adapt our concepts, our laws, and the functions of government to changing times and circumstances. To do otherwise would be to say that we lack the courage, the foresight, and the ability to use the tools which our ancestors so wisely provided. Only we the living can apply those tools to uses which will meet our needs today.

Let us not do ourselves the injustice of underestimating the resources which we have at our disposal. Not the least of these are the quality and character of Maine people—honest, hardworking, and resourceful—eager and willing to apply themselves to new endeavors. They ask only that their leaders point the way.

What, then, are the roads which we should travel? There are, broadly viewed, three such roads. One lies in the direction of developing our natural

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

and industrial resources, on which the social and economic well-being of our citizens must rest. The second road is that of development and conservation of our human resources, whether they be children in our school system, the aged in need of understanding care, or the inmates of our institutions who possess the rights not only of intelligent care but of rehabilitation and, if practicable, return to society. The third avenue which must be traveled if we are to live up to our responsibilities is that of improvement of the processes of government itself. To these three major ends of good State government let us here dedicate ourselves.

We must first of all do what we can to expand our capacity to produce a better life for ourselves and for our children. This calls for the progressive development and sound conservation of those God-given land and water resources which are available for our use. It is not a task for government alone. It is a task for government and free enterprise working in partnership to create an economic climate in which creative men can take risks and reap rewards. Such a partnership, working effectively, can produce that continuous flow of new ideas and new leadership which we must have to achieve increased employment and economic prosperity. Our progress in this direction will in large measure affect our capacity to expand our educational facilities, to improve our State institutions, to provide for the needy and unfortunate, to construct an adequate highway system, and, in general, to make government a more effective instrument for service to our people.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

We are, I think, more sensitive to the need for an aggressive program of industrial development than we have been for some time. It is appropriate to consider whether we have the most effective tools for that purpose.

We need an agency with strong executive direction, its efforts devoted full-time to this problem alone, and its organization geared to enlist maximum support and effort from various civic and municipal organizations. Community effort is the key factor in the process of creating new job opportunities. It must, however, have the guidance and leadership which can be supplied effectively by an integrated State agency, staffed with men who are expert in the fields of sales and promotion, research, planning and development.

The Maine Development Commission, with its divided responsibilities, does not meet these requirements. This is not to detract from its efforts in the field of recreational development where, within the limits of available funds, it has done its most effective work. It is also working with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries to do promotional work in those important areas of our economy. I am not suggesting that its jurisdiction in these fields be eliminated or restricted. Indeed, its funds for these purposes ought to be increased if it is to meet the ever growing competition from other states.

As merely one phase of the Commission's work, however, industrial development cannot receive the emphasis which it must have if we are to get the results we want.

I recommend, therefore, that a new Department of Industry and Commerce be created to take over this work. Its mission would be to assist in the strengthening and expansion of existing industries, the creation of new industries within the State, and the attracting of new industries to the State from other areas.

It is contemplated that the department be headed by a single commissioner supervising and directing the work of three divisions—research, planning, and development, each under its own director.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

The research division would be a constantly expanding source of data basic to the development of industry and commerce including labor, sites, space, equipment, housing, materials, transportation, markets, and other economic considerations; and its work and studies should be advanced by coordination of research with existing private and governmental agencies and educational institutions.

One of the most important areas of research should be in the field of geology. This type of research, which has long been carried on by the State, must be expanded in order fully to exploit our mineral resources. Suggestive of the importance of this type of program are the new discoveries of our own manganese deposits in Aroostook County and those immediately across the New Brunswick border and the hopes held for their commercial development.

Using the information supplied by the research division, the planning division would design plans for the coordinated and effective economic development of the State, with respect to its topography, resources, and its present needs and future possibilities: and, in advancing its work, it would advise, confer, and cooperate with municipal planning boards and civic organizations.

With the creation of a State planning division, we will be in a position to encourage and implement local and regional planning. For this purpose Federal funds are available and I recommend enactment of enabling legislation to qualify for such funds.

The development division, functioning through area offices and representatives working outside the State, would be the sales and promotional arm of the department, coordinating the efforts of public, private, and other agencies in cooperation with local government and civic groups. Additional details will be spelled out in the budget message and in the legislation to be submitted in support of this recommendation. It has been my purpose here merely to indicate that this is the kind of new approach which must be made if we are to do the job effectively.

PORT DEVELOPMENT

The work of the new department should be supplemented by recognition of the fact that the deep-water ports of our matchless coast-line are a State resource with an undeveloped potential important to our entire economy. The Maine Port Authority was created to develop the shipping and commerce in all Maine ports. The Authority cannot do this job without funds for promotion, solicitation of business, and engineering and port development. I recommend that such funds be provided.

STREAM IMPROVEMENT

No discussion of industrial development would be complete without reference to the problem of stream improvement. In the first place, solution of the problem has serious economic implications for existing industries which must not be disregarded. In the second place, an abundant supply of clean water has undoubted advantages as an inducement for new industries to locate in this State. These advantages will increase as the problem of water supply becomes more acute in other parts of the country; and we should improve our position in this respect as quickly as possible. The need for action becomes even clearer when we consider the subject of clean streams as a conservation measure important to our recreation industry and our shellfish industry.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The necessity for action is easier to spell out than is the solution. Patience, ingenuity, and cooperation on the part of all those interested will be required before the problem is brought under control if we are to avoid undue burdens for existing industries and our municipalities.

Consistent with these considerations, the following action is recommended at this time:

1. Completion of the work of classification of waters within 2 years, and appropriation of the necessary funds.

2. A tightening of the third highest classification, class "C," which, under present law, is too broad.

3. Reorganization of the Water Improvement Commission to give increased representation to "public" members having no direct connection with industry.

4. In addition, the Commission should be required to explore the possibilities of pollution abatement and to report its findings in 2 years, together with its recommendations relative to methods, costs, and the setting of a time limit for compliance. For this purpose, it should draw upon the experience of other States in so far as such experience is applicable to the pollution problems which the Commission's classification work discloses.

lt is essential that our policy in this field be firm and progressive while avoiding damage to our industrial structure. Industry has a responsibility to press constantly forward to a solution. The attack should be aimed at both industrial waste and municipal sewage, but progress against the one need not be made contingent upon progress against the other. A sober, objective approach, based on a solid foundation of fact and experience, is the key to a final and satisfactory solution.

WATER POWER DEVELOPMENT AND UTILITY RATES

It is in order at this point to discuss another water resource, the power potential of our streams and at Passamaquoddy Bay. Its development and use is important to the industrialization of Maine and to the fuller enjoyment by our citizens of those standards of living which electric power makes possible.

Whether or not the Quoddy development will be realized is a question which, at the moment, rests with Congress. Because of the promise which it holds for industrial expansion, the influence of State government and our Congressional delegation must be brought to bear to the end that a final determination of its feasibility may be made. The effort in this direction should be stripped of all partisan, political considerations.

It is timely to consider the wisdom of continuing on our statute books the Fernald Law which, since 1909, has prohibited the export from the State of any electric current generated by any water power in this State. It was apparently conceived on the theory that, by hoarding our water power for use only in Maine, industries would flock here to take advantage of it. The theory did not work out. As a matter of fact, there is some reason to believe that the law hampered maximum development of our hydro-electric power in a period when a large surplus of developed power would have attracted new industries.

There is no sound reason to continue this isolationist doctrine which prevents the integration of our power needs and resources with those of our natural economic partners—the neighboring New England States and Canada.

Repeal of the Fernald Law at this time would serve at least two useful purposes:

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

1. Integration of our power system with those of our neighbors would enable us to export surplus power in periods of good water flow and to draw on their systems when we are confronted with a deficiency. This could very well reduce the necessity for heavy investment in new installations to supplement existing facilities in the areas thus affected. As a result, the pressure for increases in rates to support such investments would be reduced.

2. The economic feasibility of developing such sites as the St. John River may well hinge on whether the power thus made available can be transported into the Canadian market. The importance of such a development to the economy of northern Maine seems obvious.

Our inquiry into the field of water power development ought to extend to the Public Utilities Commission and the sufficiency of its authority to protect the consumer with reference to all utility rates. Legislation bringing this matter to your attention will undoubtedly be introduced. I recommend that, in your deliberations, you inquire as to the following:

1. Whether the present law places an unfair burden on rate payers by stressing reproduction costs as a part of the rate base.

2. Whether the commission ought to be afforded additional trained staff to enable it to thoroughly analyze and evaluate the case made by any utility company for a rate increase.

The rate statute should provide the companies with sufficient revenues to cover legitimate operating expenses and to support the investment necessary to provide facilities which will meet consumer demand. It should not be so inflexible as to give the companies an unjustified return on investments which were never made. The problem of incorporating these two objectives in the statute merits your thoughtful consideration.

ATOMIC ENERGY

Your attention is called to the new frontiers which have been opened to Maine and the rest of New England by developments in the field of atomic energy. The New England committee on atomic energy was wisely created by the conference of New England governors on February 8, 1954. Its function is to inquire into ways and means of advancing the interests of New England in the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. Its interim report, recently issued, is a thoughtful and challenging exposition of the possibilities for stimulating industrial growth in this entire region.

The committee recommends that the legislatures of the six New England States consider enactment of legislation, patterned after a suggested draft, which will enable us to take advantage of new developments in the field as they arise. This is an opportunity to begin building for the future which should not be overlooked.

LABOR

Intelligent planning for a greater industrial future requires that we consider the legitimate interests of the men and women who work for a daily wage. For the most part they are a hard working and conscientious group, and their skills and versatility are recognized by industry and business, not only in this State, but also in other New England States.

Labor and management relations have been on a high plane of cooperation and mutual understanding. You can contribute to a continuation of that record by realistic and enlightened legislation. The following are suggested for your consideration:

1. Increases in unemployment compensation benefits and extension of the benefit period to at least the extent recommended by the President;

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

2. Increases in Workmen's Compensation benefits to bring them more in line with the cost of living;

3. A minimum wage law to implement the recommendations of both party platforms, and to supplement Federal legislation;

4. A fair labor relations law to operate in areas not covered by Federal law; and

5. Change the Department of Labor and Industry to a Department of Labor, coincident with the creation of a new Department of Industry and Commerce.

CONSERVATION

As we look to the future and plan for the development of Maine, we should give thought to the necessity for intelligent conservation of those resources with which nature has endowed us. This calls for attention in the fields of inland fisheries and game, sea and shore fisheries, forestry, and agriculture in addition to those which have already been considered.

They will be discussed in that order:

1. Inland Fisheries and Game: We must strengthen the operation of our Inland Fish and Game Department. The warden force needs additional manpower for a more adequate enforcement of the conservation laws. The role of the Fish and Game Advisory Council should be strengthened, and its views should play an ever greater part in the determination of policy for the department.

There is need to review our program relative to increasing the fish-life in our lakes and streams. The hatchery program undoubtedly performs a legitimate function. There is constructive work to be done, however, in the encouragement of natural reproduction of fish. This involves stream management, the construction and maintenance of fishways, and the protection of spawning beds.

There is increasing need for revision of our fish and game laws to provide simplified and uniform rules for the sportsman to follow.

2. Sea & Shore Fisheries: I recommend that this department be strengthened to serve the needs of a segment of our economy whose economic problems are particularly severe. An increase in the warden force and the institution of a shell-fish management program merit your consideration.

New markets, the processing of fish products in this State, the use of cooperatives in the marketing and processing of fish—these and other problems are subjects for continuing and intensified research.

3. Forestry: This is a resource which has contributed greatly to the economic growth of the State throughout our history. Forest management, involving intelligent cutting practices, reforestation and the control and eradication of disease, is a continuing need if we are to conserve our forests for our own needs and those of posterity. We should inquire into the exploitation and stripping of the forest lands near our borders by non-resident owners and move to control it.

Our conservation efforts in these three fields might well be strengthened by the creation of a new Department of Conservation. I will have more to say on this subject in a few moments.

4. Agriculture: Soil conservation is an accepted program designed to promote intelligent use of the soil and its maximum utilization for the growing of crops. The Federal program for soil and water conservation funnels about $1,000,000 per year into the State for this purpose. Effective continuation of this activity calls for a relatively modest increase in the State appropriation, and such increase is recommended.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

In addition, State government should assume leadership in the solution of technological problems which face some segments of our agricultural economy. There is also a place for State leadership working with the congressional delegation in placing the legitimate needs of our farmers before the Congress, and in seeking the assistance of Federal agencies in solving problems which are beyond the capacity of State agencies.

One of the problems most deserving of your attention is whether or not, in the light of experience both here and elsewhere, the price fixing of milk at the retail level is justified. The results of legislation in other States and the opinion of both producers and consumers of milk in this State indicate that abolition of retail price controls may result in greater consumption of milk and accordingly greater returns to the dealer and the farmer. You should consider the advisability of such action.

A strong agricultural economy is vital to the prosperity of the entire State. We must spare no effort within the reach of State government to serve our farm community.

STATE PARKS

A deservedly popular and worthwhile feature of our development program is the expansion and improvement of the State park facilities. Approximately 400,000 visitors, including nonresidents and Maine people, use these facilities annually. We should set our sights on providing recreational opportunities for a million visitors, annually. The various parks are revenue producing and should eventually pay much of their own way.

There is need for additional camping accommodations and parking areas, as well as bathhouses, roads, and other improvements. We should gradually provide these additions within the limits of available funds.

Not only are the parks visible and tangible evidence of our hospitality to out-of-State visitors, but they also create opportunities for many of our own people to enjoy the clean, Maine out-of-doors in pleasant surroundings.

EDUCATION

I have now discussed at some length ways and means of expanding our capacity to provide a better life for our people. As I have indicated, progress in that direction will increase the ability of State government to provide essential services. However, we cannot afford to wait for a full realization of our hopes and aspirations in that direction before we take constructive steps forward in the fields of education, institutions, health and welfare, highways, and other State functions. We must make at least a beginning now.

Improved educational facilities are essential if we are to equip our young people to meet the challenges of a highly competitive world. They are essential also if we are to develop the trained leadership of tomorrow which Maine needs to reach for an ever higher level of economic development and prosperity.

On all levels of education we face similar problems-teacher supply, teaching standards, adequate salaries, and physical plant and equipment. These problems are complicated by the prospect of a rising student population.

On the local level, the formula for educational subsidies in support of public schools should be reviewed. A determination must be made as to that proportion of the over-all cost which can be borne by the State within the limits of available funds, and whether or not the State's share should be increased. It should not be less than that which would be provided by the existing formula. Once that determination has been made, a formula for an equitable distribution of the funds to municipalities will be in order. It is

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

suggested that the formula might take into consideration the ability of a town or city to support its own schools and the effort which it makes to do so. Our aim should be to help the towns to help themselves in raising their educational standards.

The increase in teaching positions resulting from the rising student population, when added to the vacancies created each year by teachers leaving the profession and to the number of teachers serving on sub-standard credentials, indicates a teacher supply problem which will tax our ingenuity. It is estimated that the shortage for the single school year 1955–56 will reach 1,000. And in the face of this deficit, the number of persons preparing for teaching is declining.

One of the first steps which must be taken is to broaden the field of instruction and to raise teaching standards at the teachers colleges to make them more attractive to students inclined toward this profession. This requires additional teaching positions and a higher level of salaries.

Secondly, the physical plant and equipment at the teachers colleges should be improved and expanded to provide capacity for training an adequate supply of qualified and trained teachers.

Increased salaries and better training facilities are the inducements which must be offered if we are to solve the teacher supply problem.

We should provide the funds to strengthen and expand the faculty and to increase the capacity of the University of Maine. It would be unrealistic and shortsighted indeed not to provide advanced educational opportunities within the State for those young people we need in business, in industry, and in agriculture. We should plan on an increase in enrollment of at least 1,200 by 1960.

Three other recommendations in the field of education are submitted for your consideration:

1. The addition of a course in building trades and a course in heating and air conditioning at the Maine Vocational Technical Institute. The school has proven its worth to the economy of the State and should be gradually expanded.

2. An increase in the State's appropriation for vocational rehabilitation. Federal funds are available on such a generous scale that the State's contribution would be a relatively modest one. The expenditure would actually be an economy measure, for as trainees are returned to useful places in society they relieve the drain on other assistance programs. In addition, they become productive and, it is estimated, return to State and Federal government in taxes many times the cost of their rehabilitation.

3. The opportunity afforded Maine to participate with other States in the development of educational television is being explored by a citizens' committee. I recommend that the Governor be empowered to appoint proper public officials to cooperate with the committee in its work.

We cannot expect to correct all the weaknesses in our educational system at once. A constant review of our needs and intelligent planning is necessary as we reach for the standards we should meet.

INSTITUTIONS

The subject of institutions is one that is close to the hearts, minds, and consciences of Maine people as it hasn't been for many years. There are needs to be filled and weaknesses to be corrected. Our efforts should be based on and consistent with long-range planning in this field. We should avoid patch-work solutions which, in the last analysis, are the most expensive.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The immediate needs are greatest with respect to Augusta State Hospital, Pownal State School, the State School for Boys, and the Men's Reformatory. Overcrowding, improper housing, understaffing, inadequate provision for educational and vocational training facilities in the two schools, and lack of recreational opportunities are some of the conditions which need correction. These suggest new construction and an increase in appropriations to provide additional personnel, from attendants and nurses to professional staff. Recommendations along these lines will be included in the budget message next week.

Attention must also be given to requirements of the Maine State Prison. Maximum security as protection for the public requires additional personnel and improvements to plant.

The problem of tuberculosis care and cure is another which has received considerable public attention in past months. We do not at present have an informed and comprehensive evaluation of our present program in terms of the latest advances in medicine. Such an evaluation is in process and, when completed, should enable us to adapt our program to the latest concepts of tuberculosis control. We should not underestimate the need which is being met by our sanatoria and which will continue into the presently foreseeable future. We ought to provide additional facilities at our mental hospitals to meet the tuberculosis problem with which they are struggling.

As we review our entire institutional problem, we should strive to achieve a standard of care which will operate to rehabilitate those who are institutionalized to useful places in society. Not only is such a standard humane, it is also effective economy. It will require constant effort to improve supervision, organization and plant.

The Department of Institutions is large, growing, and complex. A deputy commissioner should be provided to make possible closer over-all supervision. Moreover, it is recommended that the department be analyzed and evaluated with reference to its organization and needs with a view to increasing its over-all effectiveness.

Early attention should be given to the problem of the new School for the Deaf. The thoughtful gift of former Governor Percival P. Baxter for construction of a new school on Mackworth Island was supplemented by a legislative appropriation 2 years ago. Since that time, construction of a causeway to the island was begun and is almost completed. Plans for the school have been drawn and some earth has been moved. Because the funds available proved to be obviously insufficient, however, the plans were not submitted for bids.

By its terms, Governor Baxter's gift was to be withdrawn if construction of the school and a bridge was not begun by January 1, 1955. He has very generously agreed that the work already done constitutes compliance with this condition. However, it is recommended that, in order to avoid further delay and to comply with the spirit of his gift, you should make it a first order of business to appropriate the necessary additional funds by emergency legislation. Further reference will be made on that point in the budget message.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

The needs of the aged, the blind, the disabled, and the children who are dependent upon State assistance deserve our sympathetic consideration.

There are two programs in process now which, it is hoped, will lift some of the burdens of some of these people. The department is putting into effect a liberalized program of old age assistance which will give relief to many of our older citizens who have been ineligible previously. The new program

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

for aid to the disabled also meets a need. Appropriations to support each of these new programs will be recommended in the budget document to be submitted.

I recommend a continuation of the Committee on Aging and commend its excellent report to your consideration.

I recommend, also, that the hospital aid program be adapted to purchase hospitalization for the recipients of these assistance programs. This can be done in such a way as to claim Federal funds to supplement the State's appropriation. It would involve creation of a pool, into which payments would be made in the name of each of the recipients under the department's assistance programs. Payments for hospitalization of recipients would be made from the pool. It is suggested one-half of the recommended appropriation for hospital aid be applied to this purpose.

Also, in connection with hospital aid, there are instances when smaller communities are confronted with hospital bills for relief cases which are staggering in the light of the community's valuation and revenues. Relief in such instances by the State could be given at a relatively modest cost. Legislation will be proposed to, in effect, insure towns against catastrophic hospital expenses of this kind which cannot be anticipated.

LONG-RANGE BUILDING PROGRAM

In the discussion of problems relative to education, institutions, State parks and other activities of State government, I have referred to the need for capital improvements. The need for such outlay also occurs from time to time in connection with State armories and office buildings. It is clear, as we consider available State funds, that all of the essential needs in this respect cannot be provided at this time.

This raises the question as to the need for a long-range view of the problem if we are to plan intelligently for the implementation of our programs in these fields. It is equally important, for example, to provide housing for patients in an overcrowded mental hospital as it is to provide food, clothing, and medical care.

An effective approach to this problem requires that we consider the following:

1. What buildings do we need now and in the foreseeable future;
2. What will they cost;
3. What reserves should we set aside annually to meet the problem.

In the past there has been little effort toward this type of effective planning. The building program has been keyed to the general fund surplus account. This account has been variable and unpredictable with no relation to the need. Furthermore, the surplus has been used from time to time for operational expenditures of a recurring nature.

As a result, we have not met the needs as they have occurred. Overcrowded conditions at such institutions as the Augusta State Hospital, the lack of educational, vocational, and recreational facilities at Pownal and the State School for Boys, the lack of dormitory and other essential facilities at the State Teachers' Colleges—these and other accumulated deficiencies attest to the weakness of our capital improvement program.

There has been no centralized nor uniform planning of the over-all program. There are obvious advantages in that respect with reference to such items as types of architecture, specifications, engineering, bidding procedures, and contracts. Such planning could, in my opinion, save the taxpayer thousands of dollars.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

I recommend, therefore, that we set up a permanent, long-range construction program, incorporated as a part of the budget division of the Department of Finance and Administration. It is anticipated that the initial report on the nature and scope of the problem will be presented to the 98th Legislature. The budgetary aspects of this program will be discussed in the budget message.

SURVEY OF STATE GOVERNMENT

We have considered two major areas of improvement in our State government: the development of our natural and industrial resources and the preservation of human values through our institutional and educational services. There is still a third field for progress: the machinery of government itself.

So far in these remarks, the ideas submitted to you can be fitted into the existing structure of our State government. Much good can be accomplished by their adoption. But I am convinced that the time has come when we need to take a long and deliberate look at a structure which is the result of the accumulated statutes of the 96 legislatures which have met since 1820. There is need to study this structure in the light of modern laws and practices and the experience not only of this State but of the remaining 47 States. In this way we can effectively evaluate our administrative organization and methods, to determine whether they are suited to carrying on State functions in the most effective manner and to getting the work of State government done in the most economical way.

Such a study is neither a new nor radical idea. It was suggested in 1929 by Governor Gardiner. In 1930 the National Institute of Public Administration submitted an exhaustive survey report covering every phase of State government. Unfortunately, this report was never as fully exploited as it deserved to be. Although recognized as both progressive and authoritative in other States, it remains in large part as an agenda of unfinished business. To bring such a survey up to date and then to carry into effect its most important recommendations are two of the most constructive objectives which any legislature and State administration can pursue. Accordingly, I urge that such a survey be undertaken and the necessary funds provided.

The survey should include an inquiry into the advisability of consolidating the conservation departments into a new Department of Conservation, the reorganization of the Department of Institutional Services, and other organizational problems. It ought also to evaluate the effectiveness of programs dealing with pollution, conservation, highways, and others. It can review our tax structure. The field of inquiry would be as broad as government itself.

In the course of such a survey it will be both helpful and necessary for committees of citizens and public officials to consult with the survey staff, so that the final recommendations will reflect proper solutions to our own problems.

In no area of State government will such a committee be more helpful than in that of Constitutional revision. For many years students of our State government have pointed out the need to winnow out the wheat from the chaff of our Constitution and its many amendments. Such a committee would study such proposals as a 4-year term for governor, annual sessions of the Legislature, reduction of the voting age, abolition or popular election of the Executive Council, the method of reapportionment, the proper procedure and agency for the consideration of petitions for pardons, and the appointment or election of various officials.

If a survey of our State government is authorized by the Legislature, I suggest that the Governor be empowered to appoint such necessary citizens'

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

committees, including a Committee on Constitutional Revision, to assist in this vast but fruitful project.

In all candor, however, I consider it my duty to suggest certain steps that should be taken immediately. Perhaps the foremost of these is the compliance by the Legislature with the existing mandate to reapportion in accordance with the Constitution. A second such project is the long discussed proposal to change the election date to conform with that of the other States of the Nation. A suggestion with much apparent merit is that Maine elect its Governor for a 4-year term, such election to be in November in a nonpresidential year, so that it would be possible for State and national issues to be more effectively distinguished by the electorate when they go to the polls.

A third step meriting your immediate attention is the revision of your own procedures with the objectives of expediting the transaction of legislative business.

In conjunction with these suggestions for the improvement of this all important business of government, it is my intention to expand the activities of the newly created judicial council to the end that our system of justice shall be made even more effective. Such matters as the review of rules of procedure, our practices in imposing sentences and in the administration of our probation and parole systems, and the creation of specialized courts are possible subjects of study and recommendation.

CIVIL DEFENSE

In these days of international tensions and cold war, I feel it is imperative to emphasize the need for strengthening and expanding our Civil Defense effort. Public apathy and indifference constitutes a threat to effective work in this respect. As public officials we must take it upon ourselves to promote widespread interest in and cooperation with the State, county and local organizations. Our planning for the future will not be complete nor realistic if we do not guard against the disasters which can strike suddenly and unexpectedly.

CONCLUSION

These, then, are the broad objectives as I see them. You will note that I have not discussed taxation and highway problems and policy. Inasmuch as these are largely financial matters, I have chosen to discuss them at length in the budget message which will be presented next week.

Progress and constructive achievement are possible only if we set our sights on high-minded objectives and work constantly toward them. I am sure we can agree that the people of Maine do not want to stand still while the rest of the country forges ahead. Someone has said, "The road that stretches before the feet of a man is a challenge to his heart long before it tests the strength of his legs."

Working together, with God's help, we can meet this challenge and start down the broad road to a brighter future for all our people.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Roosevelt Campobello Park Commission
Tribute To
Edmund Sixtus Muskie

On March 26, 1996, the Roosevelt Campobello International Park, the State of Maine, the United States, and the free world lost a wise and affectionate advocate, an intelligent spirit and a remarkable guiding light. State legislator, Governor, United States Senator, and United States Secretary of State, ED MUSKIE would have been 82 on his birthday 2 days later.

Born EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE on March 28, 1914, in Rumford, ME, his father was a Polish immigrant and his mother was from a Polish-American family in Buffalo, NY. In classical American success terms, ED worked his way through Bates College; elected to Phi Beta Kappa, he graduated cum laude. His budding political leadership and adroitness with the English language were evidenced by his being elected president of his class and spearheading the Bates debating team to victories around the country. ED MUSKIE went on to earn a law degree from Cornell University and he established a law practice in Waterville, ME, in 1940. During Word War II, he served on destroyer escorts in both the Atlantic and Pacific theaters. After the war, he returned to Waterville to practice law. From 1948 to 1951, he served in the Maine House of Representatives, and was Governor of Maine from 1955 to 1959, when he was elected to the United States Senate from Maine. He served in the Senate until 1980 when President Jimmy Carter appointed him Secretary of State.

Blessed with unusual intellectual capacity, voracious reading habits, a keen sense of humor, profound commitment to family, friends and community, and a love of and respect for public service, ED MUSKIE leaves many significant accomplishments that will change our lives for the better for generations to come. Known as "Mr. Clean" in Senate circles, he rightfully is honored for putting in place much of the United States' clean air and clean water legislation that has and will protect environmental health for the future. As Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee he brought to bear his fiscal conservatism and Down-East common sense to preserve the financial health of his government and country.

Without the skills, perseverance, persistence, political acumen and dreams of ED MUSKIE, it is unlikely that we would have a Roosevelt Campobello International Park today. The ultimate tribute to Canadian-U.S. friendship and the first truly joint international park, the original concept for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park was a tender spark that ED MUSKIE nurtured, cautiously breathed the breath of life upon, sensitively encouraged and eventually shepherded to reality through the halls of government. There were few things as close to his heart as Campobello, and throughout his life he kept an unusually devoted eye and ear on the fortunes of the Park, assuring its careful stewardship as its provident guardian.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Vice Chairman of the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission when he died, ED MUSKIE had served as the alternating Chairman/Vice Chairman of the Commission since its inception, except for a brief time when he was the U.S. Secretary of State. He took a clearly proprietary interest in the workings of the Park and deftly guided its development and growth as a father would guide the progress of a child. The Commission owes a debt of gratitude to ED MUSKIE, its last founding member, for the Park's strength and viability.

Often plain-spoken, and always with certain views, ED had an enviable efficiency with words born of his debating heritage. Renowned for his integrity, ED was outspoken on the subject of accountability. On the occasion of his 80th birthday celebration (which was actually celebrated some six or seven times so as to satisfy the many constituencies he served and which loved him) he said:

"I enjoyed executive responsibility as Governor and Secretary of State. You're more clearly accountable because you're more visible, and I liked that. I tend to do a better job if I'm visible and accountable. I may be grumpy, but I like the pressure."

ED loved the pressure and on many occasions intentionally created the pressure that helped us all to make better choices and decisions—usually along the lines of his values, principles and integrity. Each of us, our shared communities, our countries and the world at large are poorer for his passing, but by far richer for his having been with us. We will miss him.

Our deepest sympathies and condolences go to his devoted wife Jane Frances Gray Muskie and their five children and seven grandchildren. Thank you for sharing him with us.

January 22, 1964

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Room 221, O.S.O.B.,
Washington, 25, DC.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE (D–ME) and Congressman James Roosevelt (D–CA), today announced their intention to introduce legislation which would establish a Franklin D. Roosevelt Campobello International Memorial Park in line with the agreement reached by President Lyndon B. Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

In April 1961, Senator MUSKIE wrote President John F. Kennedy urging that a "living memorial" to President Roosevelt be established on Campobello Island, the scene of many of President Roosevelt's happiest days in his childhood and youth. It was at Campobello where the former President won his initial victory over the crippling illness of polio, as depicted in the hit play and movie, "Sunrise at Campobello."

In May 1963, President Kennedy and Prime Minister Pearson discussed the possibility of establishing a memorial to the late President. President Kennedy called Dr. Armand Hammer, then owner of the property who graciously agreed to donate the Roosevelt residence, as a symbol of Canadian-American friendship, subject to the conclusion of an agreement between the two countries. In the subsequent negotiations between the two governments, Congressman Roosevelt has played a major role in working out the details involved.

Campobello Island, 8 miles long and an average of 2 miles in width, is wholly located within the Canadian Province of New Brunswick. A bridge connecting the Island with the Town of Lubec on the U.S. mainland was

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

completed in 1962. Campobello is typical of coastal islands along the shore of Maine and New Brunswick and its geography is similar to that of Acadia National Park, 70 miles to the southwest. President Roosevelt's home is still standing in excellent condition. There is one small fishing village on the island and a few summer homes. Only a small portion of the island is in private hands. There are forest trails through most of the island.

From an introduction written by EDMUND S. MUSKIE to several articles on Cobscook Bay. Volume 9 of the Island Journal, the Annual Publication of the Island Institute:

". . . The governments of Canada and the United States created the Park to conserve the Roosevelt Cottage and the natural area around it as a symbol of international friendship. The Commission has devoted special attention to the island's cobble beaches, headlands, fog forests, bogs, ponds, and meadows, protecting them while making them accessible to visitors. In our work we have gained a sense of the complex relationships of seas, land, climate, flora, and fauna that make this area such a challenging and surprisingly rich environment. . . ."

From the article in the same volume, One Big Neighborhood, by David D. Platt:

". . . the Park is "Canadian soil which has become part of America's heritage and which is being preserved for the future through the commitment of the citizens and governments of both countries," according to former Maine Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE. . . .

Source unknown:

The fascination of Campobello is as much symbolic as it is physical . . . it is Canadian soil which has become part of America's heritage. . . . EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

From the introduction, by EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Alden Nowlans book Campobello, the Outer Island:

". . . When Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in whose memory the Park was created, came to Campobello as a child, it was to pursue the orderly summer adventures available to a well-to-do victorian family. When he came as a young husband, whose third son was born on the island, it was to taste the excitements of childhood from the perspective of manhood and to pass on to his children the same challenges and rewards he had known. And finally, when he came as President of the United States, it was to take new strength and composure from Campobello's air and land, from the sea around it, and from the memories of ease his 'beloved island' awoke in him."

". . . In the 2,600 acres of the Park at the southeast end of Campobello Island, more than a memory is preserved. The Roosevelt 'Cottage' is there, the simple wicker furniture and the knick-knacks of a summer home. But beyond the gardens are the bogs and the fog forests, the bays and shoals—all the natural beauties the Roosevelt family knew protected now for others to enjoy."

"Those who read this book—even if they were never to travel to Campobello—can catch in these pages the magic and the meaning of an island which is unlike any other! Although isolated by geography, it has entered the lives of two nations as a place to invite any soul to refresh any weariness with a sense of continuity and endeavor."

"Finally, the Commission dedicates this book to the people of Campobello Island. It is, after all, their island which we are privileged to share; and this is their story." United States Senate, Washington, DC, May 1, 1975, EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

ARTICLES AND EDITORIALS

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

[From The Washington Post, March 27, 1996]

EDMUND S. MUSKIE DIES AT 81; SENATOR AND SECRETARY OF STATE

(By Bart Barnes)

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, 81, who served 21 years in the U.S. Senate, where he became an influential member of the Democratic leadership, and then 10 months as Secretary of State during the final year of the Carter administration, died yesterday at Georgetown University Hospital after a heart attack.

MUSKIE, of Maine, was the 1968 Democratic nominee for Vice President on the ticket headed by then Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey. They lost that election to Richard M. Nixon and Maryland Governor Spiro T. Agnew, but MUSKIE emerged from the campaign as a politician of commanding national stature, with a reputation for straightforward thinking and level-headed judgment.

He sought the Democratic Presidential nomination for himself in 1972 and at one point was considered the leading contender. But he was unable to establish a clearly defined constituency, and he failed to strike the same responsive chords he had touched 4 years earlier as a Vice Presidential candidate. After 6 weeks of lackluster primary performances, he withdrew from the contest.

In the Senate, MUSKIE was known for a sharp and inquiring mind, limitless energy, a short temper and a contempt for sham and pretense. His political oratory was said to have been Lincolnesque, a mixture of pride and good-humored self-deprecation. But he was also blunt and determined, and he had a taste for combat in those campuses he espoused.

President Clinton praised MUSKIE yesterday as "a dedicated legislator and caring public servant" and said he was "a leader in the best sense. He spoke from his heart and acted with conviction. Generations to come will benefit from his steadfast commitment to protecting the land."

Before his election to the Senate in 1958, MUSKIE had served two terms as Governor of Maine, and his rugged 6-foot-4-inch frame and craggy features often were likened to the rocky Maine coast. As a boy he had fished in the clear, fresh streams of his native State and hunted in its forests, and from those experiences he acquired a love of nature that in later years would become the foundation for one of the major legislative efforts of his political career.

During the 1960s and 1970s, MUSKIE drafted most of the environmental legislation enacted by Congress, and many environmentalists considered him their most effective leader. He was author and manager of more than a dozen major environmental bills, beginning with the Clean Air Act of 1963 and the Water Quality Act of 1965.

He became the first Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee in 1974 and in this capacity established a process of careful and sophisticated monitoring of Federal spending totals. That often involved marshaling a fragile coalition of liberals and conservatives to limit spending in programs as diverse as Pentagon weapon systems and school lunches. In his role as committee chairman, MUSKIE became a voice for budgetary stability. "We cannot allow our policies to be guided by every small movement of the economic statistics," he once said.

President Carter named him Secretary of State in April 1980, following the resignation of Cyrus R. Vance in protest over the abortive attempt to use military force to free 52 U.S. hostages held in Iran. The President described him as a "man of vision . . . reason, conscience . . . great sensitiv-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ity and great knowledge about our Nation and people" at MUSKIE's swearing-in ceremony.

His stewardship at the State Department coincided with the continuing crisis over the holding of the American hostages and the U.S.-led effort to impose economic sanctions against Iran in retaliation. It also spanned a period of high tension between the United States and the Soviet Union after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979.

As Secretary of State, MUSKIE took the lead in calling for a Western nations boycott of the 1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow in protest of the invasion. Participation by Western athletes in the Moscow Games, MUSKIE said, would be seen by the Soviets as "confirmation of the rightness of their foreign policy . . . their system, their aggression in Afghanistan."

His public style as Secretary of State tended to be more direct and assertive than many of his predecessors. When he briefed the media, he often spoke on the record, and his quotes were for direct attribution instead of for background, in which the source is not identified. In describing his foreign policy objectives, he liked to use the blunt language of his years in the Senate rather than the caution of a diplomat.

Inevitably, there was rivalry and competition in the foreign policy arena between MUSKIE and Carter's national security affairs adviser, Zbigniew Brzezinski. Additionally, the Secretary was said to have been distressed over what he saw as a lack of coordination between the State and Defense Departments over foreign policy matters. But he denied media reports that he was unhappy in the job and that he did not plan to serve in a second Carter administration.

After Carter's defeat by Ronald Reagan in the 1980 Presidential election, MUSKIE returned to private life and practiced law in Washington. At a farewell dinner shortly before leaving office, MUSKIE said he would have enjoyed another 4 years as Secretary, had Carter been reelected. "I can't think of a job in public life that creates the global view more effectively than that of Secretary of State," he said.

EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE—his middle name was the name of five Popes—was born in the textile mill town of Rumford, ME. His father, Stephen Marciszewski, was a tailor and Polish immigrant who had come to the United States in 1903. Immigration officers at Ellis Island shortened the name to MUSKIE.

In high school, the young MUSKIE excelled as a debater and a basketball player, and he graduated as valedictorian of his class. He attended Bates College in Lewiston, ME, where he was a member of Phil Beta Kappa, president of his class for 2 years and also a debater. To pay his expenses, he waited tables at college and worked summers as a bellhop and dishwasher at a nearby resort.

He won a scholarship to law school at Cornell, then after graduating in 1939, returned to Maine, where he opened a law office in Waterville. During World War II, he served in the Navy aboard destroyer escorts in the Atlantic and the Pacific.

After the war, MUSKIE resumed his law practice in Waterville and began participating in Democratic politics. He was elected to the Maine House of Representatives in 1946 and reelected in 1948, serving as Democratic floor leader of the Maine House. In 1951, during his third term, MUSKIE resigned from the Maine Legislature to become the Office of Price Stabilization's district director for Maine. He left that job in 1952 to become Maine's Democratic national committeeman.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

This was a period when the fortunes of the Maine Democratic Party were at an unusually low ebb. Always in the minority in the rock-ribbed Republican State, the Maine Democratics had been further weakened by the 1952 election of Dwight D. Eisenhower as President and the Republican takeover of power in Washington, resulting in a loss of Federal patronage.

Consequently, many of the entrenched Democratic Party leaders began neglecting political affairs, leaving control of the party by default to MUSKIE and a generation of younger Democrats. They decided to challenge the Republican Governor Burton M. Cross in the 1954 gubernatorial campaign, and they chose MUSKIE as their standard-bearer.

Using a combination of handshaking visits at factory and mill gates, talks with local community organizations and a limited amount of radio and television advertising, MUSKIE won the election to become Maine's first Democratic Governor in 20 years. As Governor, he pursued a nonpartisan course, steering a program of economic and educational programs through a Republican-dominated legislature. He was easily reelected in 1956.

In 1958, he ran for the U.S. Senate, defeating Republican Senator Frederick G. Payne by 60,000 votes and becoming the first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history.

In the Senate, MUSKIE clashed initially with the powerful Democratic Majority Leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, over a rule change proposal to permit the cutting short of filibusters. When he refused to go along with Johnson's request to oppose the change, MUSKIE found himself excluded from the committee assignments he'd requested, including Foreign Affairs, which had been his first choice. Instead, he served on the Banking and Currency, Public Works and Government Operations committees. During that early period in the Senate, he said later, he was "frustrated, lonely, disillusioned and discontented."

But he was a hard worker, conscientious and thorough. In time, he became a master of the Senate's procedural intricacies, and he eventually won the respect of its inner circle, including Johnson, who after becoming President is said to have described MUSKIE as "a real powerhouse . . . one of the few liberals who's a match for the Southern legislative craftsmen."

On the divisive issue of the war in Vietnam, MUSKIE supported the President, although he is said to have expressed his doubts about the war to Johnson privately. In October 1969, after Johnson had left office, MUSKIE backed the anti-war protest Vietnam moratorium, and in 1970 he supported the McGovern-Hatfield resolution calling for a withdrawal of all U.S. troops by 1971.

He was not widely known outside the Senate when Humphrey tapped him as his running mate in the 1968 Presidential election, but by the end of the campaign his name had become a household word in American politics. At a time of dissension and disunity, he projected an image of reason and reconciliation.

Nor was he easily rattled. A high point in his campaign took place in Washington, PA, on the campus of Washington and Jefferson College, when a group of anti-war demonstrators disrupted one of his speeches. MUSKIE defused the situation by inviting one of the hecklers to join him on the platform. The incident drew nationwide publicity, and it cast MUSKIE in a role of champion of the principles of a free and robust exchange of views within the democratic process.

Despite his presence on a losing ticket, he was arguably one of the two or three top Democrats in the Nation after the 1968 election.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

His status was further enhanced by a nationwide election eve telecast in 1970.

In that speech, according to the account given by author Theodore H. White, MUSKIE followed President Nixon on the air, and in a quiet, self-possessed manner, accused Nixon and the Republicans of name-calling, slander and questioning the Democrat's patriotism.

He contrasted what he called Nixon's "politics of fear" with what he said was the Democrats' "politics of trust," and he urged the American people to cast their ballots for the Democrats, "for trusting your fellow citizens . . . and most of all for trust in yourself."

By late 1971, MUSKIE had become the dominant Democrat in public opinion polls and in the judgment of party professionals.

But he was unable to capitalize on this standing in the 1972 Democratic Presidential primaries, pursuing a "Trust MUSKIE" campaign theme and a middle-of-the-road approach on the issues that neither made enemies nor attracted zealous supporters.

The collapse of his Presidential campaign was symbolized by an incident in the New Hampshire primary when MUSKIE, speaking from a flatbed trailer outside the Manchester Union Leader newspaper, broke down in tears and angry emotion denouncing a story critical of his wife.

"It changed people's minds about me, of what kind of guy I was," he later told White. "They were looking for a strong, steady man, and here I was weak."

This outburst followed publication by the newspaper of a letter from someone claiming to have heard MUSKIE acquiescing in an aide's reference to New England's alleged problems with "Canucks," a derogatory term for French Canadians, an important part of the Democratic electorate. The letter turned out to be a product of the "dirty tricks" operation targeted at the opposition by Nixon reelection forces.

"Nixon's people put it out," Nixon biographer Stephen E. Ambrose said in an interview.

The newspaper also reprinted a Newsweek item concerning Muskie's wife's purported smoking, drinking and use of off-color language.

When he appeared in Manchester during a blizzard, the Senator attacked the newspaper's owner, William Loeb, and, while defending his wife, appeared to cry three times. Nationally televised pictures of him wiping away his tears suggested a sign of weakness that symbolized a campaign that never lived up to expectations.

MUSKIE retired from politics when his service as Secretary of State ended with Reagan's assumption of the Presidency in January 1981, but he remained in the Capital, where he practiced law with the firm of Chadbourne and Parke. In 1987, he served on the Tower Commission that investigated the Iran-Contra scandal, delivering a highly critical report of Iranian policy in the Reagan White House.

He was chairman of the Center for National Policy, an ideologically progressive think tank, and in that capacity led congressional delegations to Vietnam in support of normalization of U.S.-Vietnam relations.

Survivors include his wife, whom he married in 1948, Jane Frances Gray Muskie; five children, Stephen, Ellen, Melinda, Martha and Edmund Jr.; and seven grandchildren.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

[From the Boston Globe, March 27, 1996]

EDMUND MUSKIE DIES, SENATE STALWART WAS 81

(By Mark Feeney)

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, the four-term U.S. Senator from Maine who saw his 1972 Presidential hopes dashed amid falling snowflakes in New Hampshire and who, 8 years later as U.S. Secretary of State, oversaw the negotiations that brought home the 52 American hostages from Tehran, died yesterday in Georgetown University Hospital in Washington, DC.

Mr. MUSKIE, who was 81, had suffered a heart attack last Thursday following triple bypass surgery.

Mr. MUSKIE transformed Maine politics, almost singlehandedly making it a two-party State after decades of Republican domination. In 1954, he became Maine's first Democratic Governor in 20 years.

"In those days, winning the Republican nomination was tantamount to election," Eben Elwell, who campaigned for Mr. MUSKIE in that campaign, recalled at an 80th birthday celebration for the former Senator in 1994 at Bates College, his alma mater. "I told ED, 'You killed the tantamount.'"

In 1958, having won reelection as Governor 2 years earlier, he became the State's first popularly elected Democratic Senator. During his years in the Senate, Mr. MUSKIE championed environmental causes. Measures he helped pass include the Clean Air Act of 1963, the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Air Act of 1970. He was also the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, from 1975 to 1980.

His efforts to curb air and water pollution won him the nickname "Mr. Clean."

Yesterday, George J. Mitchell, former Senator from Maine, said, "This is a sad day for the people of Maine and the Nation. They have lost a great leader. I have lost a close and valued friend. Before it was a national cause, or even well known, environmental protection was ED MUSKIE's passion. To me he was a mentor and a hero as well as a close personal friend. Just about everything I know about government and politics I learned from ED MUSKIE.

President Clinton said, "He spoke from the heart and acted with conviction. Generations to come will benefit from his steadfast commitment to protecting the land."

Former President Jimmy Carter, under whom Mr. MUSKIE served as Secretary of State, said, "He was a fine statesman, a man of impeccable integrity, and remarkably knowledgeable about the domestic and foreign issues that affected our country. I have never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States."

Mr. MUSKIE initially came to national prominence as the Democratic Vice Presidential nominee with Hubert Humphrey in 1968. His impressive performance in the second spot on that ticket made him the early favorite for the party's 1972 Presidential nomination.

His front-runner status also made Mr. MUSKIE a focus of "dirty tricks" by the Nixon White House, and one of those tricks contributed to the event that came to symbolize the unraveling of Mr. MUSKIE's campaign. The Union Leader of Manchester, NH, printed a spurious letter accusing Mr. MUSKIE of laughing at a reference to French Canadians as "Canucks." In addition, the paper had attacked Mr. Muskie's wife, Jane.

Standing on a flatbed truck outside the Union Leader building, the candidate denounced the paper. Journalists present heard Mr. MUSKIE choke

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

up and some thought he started to cry. He later said what looked like tears were actually melting snowflakes. Regardless, there was the sense of a candidate helpless to turn around a floundering campaign. Though Mr. MUSKIE won the New Hampshire primary, he led the runner-up, U.S. Senator George McGovern (D–SD), by only 9 percentage points. Such a slim victory in a neighboring State was regarded as a setback. Mr. MUSKIE met with a series of primary defeats and withdrew from the race in April.

His failed candidacy did little to harm Mr. MUSKIE's stature in Congress, however. Thus when Secretary of State Cyrus Vance resigned in 1980 after the failed U.S. mission to rescue hostages in Iran, President Jimmy Carter turned to Mr. MUSKIE, hailing his "sound judgment and integrity . . . strength and wisdom."

Five months after taking over the State Department, Mr. MUSKIE was asked what had surprised him. "The biggest surprise is that I'm here. It's funny—of all the jobs I've been ambitious for, this is one that never crossed my mind."

Six years later, another President drew upon Mr. MUSKIE's stalwart reputation when Ronald Reagan appointed him to the three-member President's Special Review Board, popularly known as the "Tower Commission," to investigate the Iran-Contra scandal. By then, he had returned to private life, as a senior partner at the Washington law firm of Chadbourne & Parke, and had the satisfaction of seeing his seat taken over by a longtime protege, Mitchell.

EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE was born in Rumford, ME. In high school, he turned to debating to overcome his shyness. He was valedictorian and put his 6-foot-4-inch height to good use as center on the basketball team. That height, along with Mr. MUSKIE's craggy facial features, earned him the frequent description "Lincolnesque."

He worked his way through Bates College, where he was president of his class and, he later liked to joke, "the only Democrat on campus." Graduated cum laude in 1936, he won a scholarship to Cornell University Law School, from which he received an LLB degree in 1939.

Shortly after Mr. MUSKIE opened a law practice in Waterville, ME, the United States entered World War II. He served as an engineering and deck officer on destroyer escorts in the Atlantic and Pacific, rising to the rank of lieutenant and winning three battle stars.

Upon returning to Waterville, Mr. MUSKIE was urged to run for the Maine House of Representatives. "I thought it would be interesting to be in the Legislature once, while I was waiting for my law practice to build up." He won and, after winning reelection in 1948, was made Democratic floor leader.

In 1947, Mr. MUSKIE had run for mayor of Waterville and been defeated. That would prove his sole electoral setback for many years to come. He had decided on running for Congress in 1954 when he was prevailed upon to run for Governor. He won an upset victory by a margin of 22,000 votes. Two years later, he won the most votes ever for a Maine Governor. A prohibitive favorite for a third term in 1958, Mr. MUSKIE chose to run for the U.S. Senate and won his third statewide victory in 4 years.

Mr. MUSKIE earned the ire of then-Senate Majority Leader Lyndon B. Johnson (D–TX), by supporting a measure Johnson opposed that would have changed Senate rules so filibusters could be shortened. The majority leader saw to it that Mr. MUSKIE failed to receive the committee assignments he'd wanted (his first choice was Foreign Affairs). This proved to Mr. MUSKIE's advantage, however. One of his assignments was to the Public Works Com-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

mittee, which had responsibility for antipollution legislation, and Mr. MUSKIE became a leader in the budding environmental movement.

"I was very frustrated, lonely, disillusioned and disconsolate," Mr. MUSKIE later admitted of his first few years in the Senate. Soon enough, though, his steady, deliberate manner—and occasional outbursts of his fiery temper—made Mr. MUSKIE a fixture in that body. Even Johnson came to admire him as "a real powerhouse . . . one of the few liberals who's a match for the Southern legislative craftsmen."

Mr. MUSKIE, as Humphrey's running mate, was one of the few figures to emerge from the 1968 election with his reputation enhanced.

Looking back in 1994 he said, "If I hadn't run for Vice President, I'd probably have stepped down as Senator after two terms." He paused, then added, "I'm glad I didn't."

In 1981, Mr. MUSKIE received the Nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of Freedom. He was also recipient of the Laetare Medal of Notre Dame University and the Former Members of Congress Distinguished Service Award.

Mr. MUSKIE held honorary degrees from many colleges and belonged to numerous organizations. Mr. MUSKIE leaves his wife, the former Jane Gray; two sons, Steven of Peterborough, NH, and Edmund S. Jr., of Reston, VA; three daughters, Ellen Allen of Reston, VA, Melinda Stanton of Marshfield and Martha Muskie of Washington, DC; and seven grandchildren.

A funeral Mass will be said at 11 a.m. Saturday in the Church of the Little Flower in Bethesda, MD. Burial will be in Arlington National Cemetery.

[From the Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME), March 27, 1996]

EDMUND MUSKIE DIES AT 81, REVERED STATESMAN PERSONIFIED MAINE

(By John Ripley)

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, the son of a Polish immigrant who ascended from the hardscrabble mill town of Rumford to the marbled echelons of American government, died early Tuesday. He was 81.

The former Maine Governor, Senator, and Secretary of State, who would have turned 82 on Thursday, died at 4:06 a.m. at Georgetown University Medical Center in Washington, DC, after suffering from a heart attack last week.

MUSKIE had entered the hospital last Monday for surgery to clear a blocked artery in his leg. Although the surgery was successful, he had a heart attack early Thursday. Three days later, MUSKIE lost consciousness and was put on life-support systems.

He is survived by his wife of 47 years, Jane, five children and seven grandchildren.

On Tuesday, flags at buildings across Maine were at half-staff.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Saturday, March 30, at the Church of the Little Flower, 5607 Massachusetts Avenue, Bethesda, MD, followed by interment at Arlington National Cemetery. The family asks that in lieu of flowers, donations be sent to the Edmund S. Muskie Archives at Bates College in Lewiston, or the Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service at the University of Southern Maine in Portland.

MUSKIE, who was practicing law in Washington, DC, at the time of his death, served in more top government posts than any other Maine resident in the 20th century. During more than 30 years in politics, MUSKIE climbed

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

the political ladder from the Maine Legislature to the U.S. Department of State, earning a reputation as a solid legislator whose character was marked by candor, a sweeping personal view of politics and history, and an infamous temper.

Above all, he was Maine—hard-working, stubborn, unwavering in his beliefs, and honest beyond reproach. Years ago, someone at a Kansas City hotel asked MUSKIE if he "needed anything for the night," suggesting a liaison. "Well," he replied, "I am all out of toothpaste."

MUSKIE was born March 28, 1914, in Rumford to Stephen and Josephine Muskie, the second of six children. His mother was a native of Buffalo, NY, and his father, a tailor, moved to the United States from Poland in 1903 to avoid conscription into the czar's army. The original family name, Marciszewski, was shortened by harried immigration officials.

As a thin, awkward and introverted young man of modest means, MUSKIE worked his way through Bates College, graduating Phi Beta Kappa with a degree in history and government in 1936. Three years later, he graduated from Cornell Law School in Ithaca, NY.

Dressed in ill-fitting suits and clip-on bow ties, MUSKIE settled in Waterville to practice law. His struggling practice was interrupted by World War II, in which he served as a junior naval officer on destroyer escorts in the Atlantic and Pacific. After the war, MUSKIE returned to Waterville and the life of a small-town lawyer.

At the urging of local Democratic leaders, he ran for the Maine House of Representatives in 1946, igniting one of Maine's most storied political careers, and one for which he had prepared a decade earlier by taking debate courses at Bates.

As a freshman legislator, MUSKIE suffered a rare political defeat in 1947 when he lost the Waterville mayoral race. In May of the next year, he married the former Jane Gray of Waterville. They eventually would have two sons and three daughters: Stephen, Ellen, Melinda, Martha and Edmund Jr., known as Ned.

In 1951, MUSKIE resigned his seat in the Legislature to accept an appointment as State director of the Office of Price Stabilization. After a brief stint as Waterville's solicitor, MUSKIE became Maine's Democratic national committeeman in 1952, just as the Eisenhower era was ushered in.

Two years later, MUSKIE was nominated to make a bid for Governor. It was a time in which Maine was overwhelmingly Republican, and Democrats joked they could hold their State convention in a telephone booth.

After spending all of $14,000—some of it for spots on a newfangled invention called television—and touring Maine's potholed back roads in his battered 1949 Lincoln, MUSKIE defeated incumbent Governor Burton Cross. Besides being the State's first Democratic chief executive in 20 years, MUSKIE also was the first Polish-American Governor in any State.

"We sensed a dissatisfaction with the State government and it presented a challenge," MUSKIE once said.

Later, he would credit television in part for his election to the Blaine House, an innovation that allowed an underfinanced Democrat to bypass the bitterly partisan print press of the day. He had a simple time-for-a-change message that was delivered to an audience already entranced by the novel medium.

"You know," he once told a friend, Clyde MacDonald, "I was the first real live Democrat most of the people saw or listened to directly."

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE later won a second 2-year term and became known and respected for his nonpartisan politics, guiding economic and educational programs through the Republican legislature.

The Maine leader was fond of telling the story from his 1956 gubernatorial reelection campaign of how back-slapping and hand-shaking had become a subconscious ritual: Upon returning home from the campaign trail one night, he was greeted at the door by Mrs. Muskie. The Governor stuck out his hand and said, "How are all the folks up your way today?"

In 1958, he became the first popularly elected Democratic U.S. Senator in the State's history. Along with Republican Senator Margaret Chase Smith, the two formed one of the country's most influential senatorial delegations, though their relationship was marked as well by competition.

An avid outdoorsman, Senator MUSKIE took the lead in promoting environmental concerns and was at the forefront of the passage of the 1963 Clean Air Act and the 1965 Water Quality Act. Twenty years later it was his protege, Senate Majority Leader George J. Mitchell, who updated the measures.

When MUSKIE entered the Senate, Mitchell said, there were virtually no movements to protect the environment. "He essentially created them," Mitchell said.

At 6 feet 4 inches tall, MUSKIE was known as an imposing figure with an abundant intellect. Friends and former colleagues said MUSKIE's Senate tenure was marked by his thoughtful approach to legislation, and his ability to sway opponents to his side.

"He was the only person I saw in the Senate who could change votes to his cause," said former Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana. "They just didn't come any better than ED MUSKIE."

Over the years, thousands of words were written about MUSKIE's fabled temper and his hours of solitary contemplation. "I asked MUSKIE about his temper—and he lost his temper," went an old Washington saw.

But even this apparent short fuse, according to friends, often was more a product of political strategy than pure emotion. After once raising his voice during a Senate subcommittee meeting, MUSKIE turned to a young aide who seemed shocked by his outburst.

"You must understand, if you don't get angry and lose your temper, you don't control the situation," MUSKIE told the aide, John Martin, who went on to enjoy his own colorful career as Speaker of the Maine House.

MUSKIE, too, could show signs of impish humor. While running for reelection to the Blaine House, he once entered a cocktail party at a Waterville country club by sliding down a chute used to pass liquor to the bar.

"He slid down that thing when he came in," said William "Flash" Flaherty, a longtime Democratic campaign aide who first met MUSKIE as an aspiring Waterville lawyer. And no matter what the campaign, MUSKIE loved to hypnotize lobsters by stroking their tails, an old Yankee trick that startled the outsiders who shadowed him on the trail.

In 1966, when President Lyndon Johnson's Model Cities proposal faced steep legislative obstacles, MUSKIE explained to the President why the bill wouldn't work. He set out to draft his own, a substitute that passed with MUSKIE's parliamentary skill.

Two years later, MUSKIE came close to being second-in-command at the White House after Hubert H. Humphrey chose him to be his running mate. For months, the Senator crisscrossed the country in a rented Boeing 727, dubbed "The Downeast Yankee" for the campaign.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The Democratic ticket, though, lost to Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew by a scant half-million votes out of more than 63 million cast.

Still, in that tumultuous year of 1968, MUSKIE impressed political watchers by inviting hecklers to share the platform with him. Despite the loss, his stock continued to rise.

Although MUSKIE will go down in Maine history as one of the State's most influential and respected politicians, many outside the region are likely to remember him for the 1972 Presidential campaign, when his White House aspirations melted in the New Hampshire snow.

The Senator was the favorite to win the Democratic nomination to run against President Richard Nixon. Early polls showed him leading the President, and MUSKIE vowed not to allow his national ambition to alter his character.

"If I bend and twist to suit everyone, I'll be no more than a pretzel," MUSKIE once said. "I am what I am and that's how they'll have to take me."

MUSKIE's character was severely tested by the Nixon reelection campaign's dirty tricks, including the infamous "Canuck Letter" in which the Senator was supposed to have made racist remarks about French Canadians.

Campaigning in snowy New Hampshire, MUSKIE gave a speech on the back of a flatbed truck to rebut charges by the arch-conservative newspaper, the Manchester Union Leader, about his wife. All agree it was an emotional speech, but a few journalists reported that he had wept, thereby portraying him as too unstable and weak for the Presidency. MUSKIE always maintained that the "tears" were melting snowflakes.

The nomination was won by fellow Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, who went on to lose to President Nixon. It was the end of the Maine Senator's White House aspirations; the closest he would come was when he played the role of the chief executive for a 1983 "Nightline" program that portrayed a fictional international crisis.

Nixon, though, perceived MUSKIE as a potential political threat for 1976. Years before the election, the President's team began to spread word in Maine that the Senator had become too enamored of national ambitions and had lost touch with his constituency. After deciding in 1974 to run for reelection to the Senate in 1976, MUSKIE opened field offices in Portland and Bangor, the first Senator in Maine to do so.

Six years later, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance resigned in disagreement after President Jimmy Carter's failed attempt to rescue the 53 American hostages in Iran by military force. On April 29, 1980, the President turned to MUSKIE, who by then had tired of congressional duties after more than 20 years in the Senate. He entered the job with little experience in foreign affairs.

Always ambitious, MUSKIE nevertheless said he had never envisioned himself as leading the State Department.

"It's funny—of all the jobs I've been ambitious for, this one never crossed my mind, MUSKIE once said.

Carter tapped MUSKIE in part because the President's status with Congress was weak and the Senator had a centrist, credible reputation, said Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter's national security adviser and a summer resident of Northeast Harbor.

Because the President was in the midst of what would be a losing reelection battle, MUSKIE handled his new duties with caution and ruled out major changes. In fact, Carter's political clout was so low that there was talk he might even lose his party's nomination, and a number of people

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

began a MUSKIE-for-President movement. Though flattered, MUSKIE campaigned relentlessly for the Carter-Mondale ticket, which lost in a landslide to Ronald Reagan.

As Secretary, MUSKIE frenetically negotiated to win the release of the American hostages in Iran. They were set free, however, only after Carter had officially left power. "I have never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States," Carter said Tuesday. "His coolness under pressure and his sound judgment helped him play a crucial role in bringing all the American hostages home from Iran to safety and freedom, and he was always careful to give credit to others for this achievement."

In a Bangor Daily News interview after leaving the Government, MUSKIE said that Iran's refusal to release the U.S. hostages was the final blow to Carter's reelection hopes.

"It was like throwing a match onto a pile of dry leaves," MUSKIE said in November 1980. "Suddenly all of the frustrations of the hostage crisis brought to focus all of the frustrations of all of the other problems."

Coincidentally, it was a similar issue that brought MUSKIE back to the White House as a member of the Tower Commission in 1986, which investigated reports that the Reagan administration had traded arms for hostages in the Iran-Contra scandal.

Four days before Ronald Reagan took office in January 1981, President Carter presented MUSKIE with the Medal of Freedom. Soon afterward, MUSKIE returned to practice law at a high-powered firm in Washington, DC, Chadbourne & Parke, where he finally was able to become financially secure.

"If I ever knew one could make so much money in the private sector by doing so little," MUSKIE once joked to a friend, "I never would have got into politics."

But politics was his life's calling, and it was MUSKIE's relentless passion for people that kept him going. Former aides and friends told of how they would try to cancel campaign appearances for the exhausted Senator, only to be told by the candidate that he couldn't disappoint those who awaited him.

"He just had a tremendous sense of obligation to people," said Clyde MacDonald, who worked for both MUSKIE and Mitchell.

"If you come from a background like ED MUSKIE," echoed John Martin, "I think you know what poor and disadvantaged people are going through."

Long after leaving politics, MUSKIE continued his life of public service. In addition to his status as the elder statesman of Maine politics, the former Secretary spent considerable energy on improving access to the court system for the State's poor.

Besides lending the prestige of his name to the Maine Commission on Legal Needs by making speeches and talking with the media, MUSKIE also offered advice on the art of achieving political success.

"For me, he had a pretty good sense of how to move something along," said a colleague on the commission, Daniel Wathen, chief justice of the Maine Supreme Judicial Court.

At one point, Wathen said, MUSKIE invited members of the commission to his home in Kennebunk to talk strategy. "He was really passionate about those things," the judge said.

As is usually the case with titans, MUSKIE's name has been attached to numerous public buildings in his home State, including the Federal building in Augusta.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

But in 1982, when the city of Portland split over naming its airport after him, MUSKIE asked the city to overturn the honor.

Some residents complained about naming the airport after a Democrat, while others fought the name change because MUSKIE had closer ties to Waterville and Kennebunk. The change was never made.

In recent years, MUSKIE kept in touch with the Maine political scene and enjoyed gossiping about the coming congressional races.

Freshman U.S. Representative John Baldacci of Bangor, who first met MUSKIE as a boy, said he often turned to the former Secretary for advice during the past year or so.

Maine's two Republican U.S. Senators, Olympia Snowe and William Cohen, often sought advice from MUSKIE during their own careers. The remaining years of MUSKIE's life were devoted as well to ensuring the future well-being of his wife, 13 years his junior.

Just days after Carter lost the 1980 election, MUSKIE said he planned to remain near the Capital partly because "the one thing I have to bear in mind is that I must assume my wife is going to outlive me."

"She's much younger than me," MUSKIE told the Bangor Daily News. "I have to start building a life that she can continue."

[From the Portland Press Herald, March 27, 1996]

LOFTY TRIBUTES HONOR SOLID, HUMBLE MAN; FROM AROUND THE STATE, PEOPLE FONDLY RECALL MEMORIES OF ED MUSKIE, A MAN MOST OFTEN DESCRIBED AS LINCOLNESQUE

(By John Richardson)

Admirers from Presidents to college classmates offered lofty tributes Tuesday to the big, modest man from Maine known for restoring the State's Democratic Party and protecting the Nation's environment.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE's death early Tuesday stirred reminiscences about a political giant who helped shape the country as a longtime U.S. Senator and Secretary of State, and about the humble son of a Rumford immigrant who liked to swim in the Kennebunk surf, play golf and "hypnotize" lobsters.

Tall and lanky and armed with a dry wit, MUSKIE was often described as Lincolnesque.

"There are two kinds of people in public life—politicians and statesmen. And he was clearly a statesman," said Robert Shepherd, a former MUSKIE aide who lives in Brunswick.

Shepherd recalled MUSKIE's commanding presence, even when simply entering a room. "He could freeze people by just looking at them."

"I have never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States," former President Jimmy Carter said in a prepared statement. MUSKIE ran for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1972.

Carter said MUSKIE, as his Secretary of State in 1980, played a crucial role in bringing home the American hostages from Iran and "was always careful to give credit to others for this achievement."

Statements of praise and condolences were faxed to newspapers from public leaders around Maine and the rest of the United States.

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole called MUSKIE "a patriot who always answered the call of his country."

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Governor Angus King, in a press conference Tuesday, called MUSKIE an "awesome character. . . . His personality was too big to hide anything or be subtle. It sort of feels like one of our mountains has been moved."

Former U.S. Senator George J. Mitchell, MUSKIE's protege and friend, called him "one of the most effective legislators in our Nation's history and the greatest public official in Maine's history."

Mitchell and other admirers also offered some more personal reflections about the man Tuesday.

"He personified the solidness and dependability of Maine people, with understatement and common sense," said Charles Micoleau, a Portland lawyer who served during the 1970s as MUSKIE's chief of staff.

Micoleau recalled how the Rumford native taught his son how to hypnotize a lobster—a trick the Senator never tired of performing before dinner audiences.

"By stroking a lobster in a certain way, you can get it to sit up, and make it stationary in a vertical position," explained Mitchell, who had seen his mentor do it time and time again. "He accompanied it with a kind of humorous monologue, so it was quite entertaining."

Mitchell and former Senator William D. Hathaway agreed that MUSKIE's landmark legislation that heralded a new era in environmental protection was likely to be remembered as his greatest achievement, one that won him the nickname "Mr. Clean."

"Before it was a national cause or even well known, environmental protection was ED MUSKIE's passion," Mitchell said. "Any Maine citizen who wants to appreciate what ED MUSKIE did need only drive to the nearest river."

Part of MUSKIE's environmental awareness stemmed from his having grown up in a polluted, paper-mill town before the advent of clean air legislation. But it also reflected his enjoyment of fishing and bird hunting, although in his later years he was more apt to arm himself with a camera than a shotgun.

He also took up golf. "He did make a hole-in-one once in Kennebunk," said Donald Larrabee, a longtime reporter who covered MUSKIE's career and maintained a friendship in retirement. "He never got over telling people about it."

Severin Beliveau, an Augusta lawyer and longtime friend, said he witnessed MUSKIE's first attempt at downhill skiing at Saddleback.

"Obviously, he had never skied before. But he was undeterred and insisted on going to the top of the mountain," said Beliveau. "Any challenge—he was determined."

MUSKIE also won respect throughout his life for his integrity.

"Of all the people I can think about in politics, and no breath of scandal in all those years, that's a pretty good record," Larrabee said.

"He was a good guy. He made friends easily," said Milt Lindholm, a schoolmate at Bates College in the 1930s who later became dean of admissions at Bates. "He was a good citizen, very constructive in every way. He was very highly respected, probably one of the most-respected students in the college."

It also was at Bates where MUSKIE refined the debating skills that earned him the respect of fellow Senators. He took up debating in high school, in part to overcome his shyness, which was still evident when he started at Bates.

"He was sort of a lanky, shy guy from Rumford, and he worked very hard," said Ruth Wilson of Lewiston, who was a fellow member of the Bates

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

debating team. "He was a big man in stature and everything. He was genial, friendly and warm."

And he was a meticulous and convincing debater. Sometimes he won arguments with his dry humor. "His wit was wonderful, and that carried a point a long way sometimes," said Wilson.

MUSKIE had agreed to speak at the banquet during his class's upcoming 60th year reunion at Bates in June. Classmates were planning a tribute to MUSKIE.

As a television journalist in the 1980s, Governor King profiled MUSKIE and was awed by his achievements.

"What was it about this guy who was the son of a Polish immigrant tailor from Rumford that propelled him to the level that he reached?" King recalled Tuesday. He said it was the same question posed by the political success of former Senator Margaret Chase Smith, who died last year.

"And my conclusion was that they were both people who were quintessentially themselves," he said. "They didn't pay attention to polls. They said what they thought, and it happened to sync with what the people were thinking."

MUSKIE, said King, "was as authentic as they come."

Larrabee said he talked to MUSKIE a few months ago when the former Senator came to the funeral of Larrabee's wife. Larrabee and MUSKIE got talking about an autobiography.

"He said, 'I really have not pursued it the way I should,'" said Larrabee. MUSKIE did have an idea for a theme, however.

"It's how politics have changed and that it's not as much fun as it used to be," Larrabee recalled MUSKIE as saying. "He thought those were fun times."

[From the Baltimore Sun, March 27, 1996]

EDMUND MUSKIE DIES OF HEART FAILURE; DISTINGUISHED SENATOR BROUGHT ZEAL TO OFFICE

(By Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON—EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE, the Maine Democrat who ran unsuccessfully for Vice President in 1968 and for President in 1972 and then capped a 21-year Senate career as President Jimmy Carter's Secretary of State, died early yesterday. He was 81.

Mr. MUSKIE died of heart failure after undergoing surgery last week for a blocked artery in his leg.

"I have never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States," Mr. Carter said yesterday. "His coolness under pressure and his sound judgment helped him play a crucial role in bringing all the American hostages home from Iran to safety and freedom, and he was always careful to give credit to others for this achievements"

Mr. MUSKIE, who revitalized the Democratic Party in Maine and served as its Governor before entering the Senate in 1959, was a towering man of alternating moods of calm and tempest, but known more for the latter.

In 1968, Mr. MUSKIE's reasonable demeanor as Hubert H. Humphrey's running mate cast him in favorable contrast with his sharp-tongued Republican counterpart, Governor Spiro T. Agnew of Maryland. But he could not

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

save the Humphrey-MUSKIE ticket in a razor-thin loss to Richard M. Nixon and Mr. Agnew.

Four years later, Mr. MUSKIE ran for the Democratic Presidential nomination and was rated a front-runner until a flare of emotion marred an unimpressive victory in the New Hampshire primary and sent him down the road to defeat.

Standing on a flatbed truck amid a snowstorm outside the Manchester Union Leader newspaper, Mr. MUSKIE angrily condemned remarks about his wife, Jane, by the newspaper's publisher, William Loeb, and appeared to break down and weep. He called Mr. Loeb "a gutless coward," adding "it's fortunate for him he's not on this platform beside me."

Those at the scene differed over whether tears or melted snow slid down his face. But the impression spread that he had lost control, raising questions about his reliability under stress.

Although Mr. MUSKIE went on to win the New Hampshire primary, with 46 percent of the vote to 37 percent for Senator George McGovern, his showing fell short of the standard set by his New Hampshire campaign manager, who had said she would "eat my hat" if he failed to achieve 50 percent.

A week later, in the Florida primary, Mr. MUSKIE finished fourth, behind Governor George Wallace of Alabama, Mr. Humphrey and Senator Henry M. Jackson of Washington. He lashed out at Mr. Wallace as "a demagogue of the worst possible kind." Mr. MUSKIE finished fourth again in Wisconsin and in Pennsylvania, and effectively bowed out.

In the end, it was Mr. MUSKIE's ambivalence about the U.S. role in Vietnam, as much as any one emotional scene, that was his undoing. As Mr. Humphrey's running mate in 1968, he, along with Mr. Humphrey, defended President Lyndon B. Johnson's conduct of the war while privately, he said later, he held doubts.

But it was the performance outside the New Hampshire newspaper office that brought his touchy temperament to view.

COGENT PERSUADER

At other times, Mr. MUSKIE was a man of great good humor, judgment and decorum. He was, Senator Ernest F. Hollings, a South Carolina Democrat, said yesterday, "perhaps the most cogent persuader on the floor of the United States Senate."

Mr. MUSKIE returned to the Senate after his failed Presidential bid and served until April 1980, when Mr. Carter named him Secretary of State to replace Cyrus Vance, who had resigned after a failed attempt to rescue U.S. hostages in Iran.

Mr. MUSKIE took over the unpromising diplomatic attempts to win the hostages' release, which was not achieved until just as Mr. Carter's term expired and President Ronald Reagan took office.

He then entered private law practice in Washington and continued until just before his death.

Secretary of State Warren Christopher, who served under Mr. MUSKIE in the State Department, called him "one of the most distinguished American public servants of the past half century."

He hailed Mr. MUSKIE's work on economic sanctions against the former Soviet Union after its invasion of Afghanistan, on the release of the U.S. hostages in Iran, and on implementing the Camp David accords between Egypt and Israel.

It was Mr. MUSKIE's Vice Presidential candidacy in 1968 that put him on course for his own 1972 Presidential quest. His call for unity and a lowering

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

of voices won him acclaim, especially for his handling of anti-war protesters who heckled him.

While not breaking entirely with Mr. Johnson, he pledged efforts to end the Vietnam War and pointedly criticized both Chicago police and demonstrators during the disastrous Democratic Convention at which he and Mr. Humphrey were nominated.

In the 1970 congressional election campaign, with Vice President Agnew attacking Democratic "radical liberals" and Mr. Nixon sounding the theme of law and order, the Democrats turned to Mr. MUSKIE to deliver a calm reply.

"There are those who seek to turn our common distress to partisan advantage not by offering better solutions, but by empty threat and malicious slander," he said. "They imply that Democratic candidates for high office, men who have courageously pursued their convictions in the service of the republic in war and in peace, that these men actually favor violence and champion the wrongdoer. That is a lie, and the American people know it is a lie."

That speech propelled Mr. MUSKIE into position as the Democrats' frontrunner for the 1972 Presidential nomination, a position he retained into the fateful New Hampshire primary.

ZEAL FOR PUBLIC SERVICE

After Mr. MUSKIE's retirement, he often reflected on his 1972 campaign with regret and good humor, recalling his bantering with reporters but always denying, with a wry grin, that he ever lost his temper. Nevertheless, he could not deny the zeal for public service that marked his long career and made him one of his era's most distinguished, if mercurial, political figures.

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole said that he remembered Mr. MUSKIE saying in a speech: "You have the God-given right to kick the Government around—don't hesitate to do so." That remark was pure ED MUSKIE. Blunt. To the point. And leaving no doubt that Americans should expect the best of their public officials.

"And the best is just what the people of Maine and America received from ED MUSKIE during a public service career that spanned five decades."

In addition to his wife of 47 years, Mr. MUSKIE is survived by two sons, three daughters and seven grandchildren. Burial will be Saturday in Arlington National Cemetery after a funeral Mass in the Little Flower Church in Bethesda, MD.

[From the Portland Press Herald, March 27, 1996]

A LEADER IN THE BEST SENSE; EDMUND MUSKIE, U.S. SENATOR, STATESMAN, DIES AT 81

(By John Richardson)

THE RUMFORD NATIVE REVIVED MAINE'S DEMOCRATIC PARTY, CRAFTED NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAWS AND RAN FOR PRESIDENT

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, who began life in Rumford as the son of an immigrant tailor and rose to become a politician and statesman of international stature, died Tuesday morning in a hospital in Washington, DC.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE, who was 81, revived Maine's dormant Democratic Party, served as Maine Governor and, during 22 years as a U.S. Senator, crafted landmark Federal environmental laws. He ran for Vice President and President before serving President Jimmy Carter as Secretary of State.

Through his years of public service, MUSKIE earned a national reputation as a modest, honest statesman. His death brought statements of tribute from Presidents Clinton and Carter, as well as former colleagues from Capitol Hill and the Maine State House.

Clinton said MUSKIE was "a leader in the best sense. He spoke from his heart and acted with conviction."

He had a dry Maine humor and a temper that would become a stubborn legacy. And he had a distinct look, with a craggy face—compared by some to the Maine coast—and a lanky 6-foot-4-inch frame.

MUSKIE was admitted to Georgetown University Medical Center last week for surgery to bypass a blockage in an artery in his right leg. While recuperating from the surgery, he suffered a heart attack last Thursday and underwent triple bypass surgery the same day.

He would have celebrated his 82nd birthday on Thursday.

MUSKIE is survived by his wife of 47 years, Jane, three daughters and two sons.

The funeral will be held at 11 a.m. Saturday at the Church of the Little Flower in Bethesda, MD. Burial will follow at Arlington National Cemetery. Calling hours are scheduled for 2–4 p.m. and 7–9 p.m. Friday at Gawlers & Sons Funeral Home in Washington, DC.

POTENTIAL EVIDENT EARLY

EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE was born in Rumford on March 28, 1914. His father, Stephen, a respected tailor, arrived from Poland bearing the name Marciszewski. Immigration officials shortened it to Muskie. His mother, Josephine, was from Buffalo, NY.

MUSKIE's potential was evident early. A 1932 yearbook from Stephens High School in Rumford calls the gangly young man "a public man of light and leading." He competed in track and basketball but excelled at debating and academics—he graduated at the top of his class.

MUSKIE worked his way through Bates College as a waiter in the dining hall and a summer dishwasher and bellhop at Narragansett-by-the-Sea in Kennebunk. He graduated cum laude, then earned a law degree from Cornell University in 1939 and started his law practice in Waterville.

During World War II, he served as a junior officer on destroyer escorts in the Atlantic and Pacific. Afterward, he returned to Waterville to resume his law practice.

In 1946, a group of Democrats talked MUSKIE into running for the State legislature. He won three terms and became the minority leader of the party what there was of it. The party held few seats and was factionalized and impotent except for the political appointments dealt out by the local party bosses.

In 1948, he married Jane Gray of Waterville. They had five children.

In 1954, MUSKIE and other Democrats tried to line up a candidate to run against Governor Burton Cross.

It was considered a sacrificial effort, and when no one volunteered MUSKIE dutifully agreed to run.

Together with Frank M. Coffin, a Lewiston lawyer who later became a Congressman and judge, MUSKIE unified the party. They exploited a complacent and vulnerable Republican Party, introduced MUSKIE to voters as a

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

good, capable man and surprised all the experts. MUSKIE became the first Democratic Governor in 20 years.

His victory jump-started the party, and MUSKIE earned a reputation as determined and statesmanlike. He was reelected by a large majority in 1956 after another hard-fought grass-roots campaign.

MUSKIE said he went home one time during that race and was greeted at the door by his wife. He automatically stuck out his hand and asked her, "How are all the folks up your way today?"

As Governor, he learned how to steer bills through the Republican legislature, creating a department of economic development and boosting State subsidies for education.

In 1958, he became the first popularly elected Democratic Senator in Maine's history. He again used his personal warmth in a grass-roots campaign.

MUSKIE once reckoned he shook 30,000 hands and logged so much mileage through the Maine wilderness that "I'd be elected right now if pine trees could vote."

The win kindled his national prominence. A Look magazine article about him that year proclaimed MUSKIE the miracle man from Maine. The article described how a "band of brainy political amateurs have breathed new life into Maine's languishing Democrats" led by MUSKIE, a "6-foot-4, Lincoln-esque, small-town lawyer" who "has easily become the most popular politician" in Maine.

Praised for his "lofty and non-partisan approach" to politics, MUSKIE, one observer said, viewed political strife "the way Victorians regard sex as not quite proper."

WIT AND INDEPENDENCE

With his bow ties, warm down-home manner, intellectual gifts and growing eloquence, MUSKIE became a presence in the Senate.

In 1959, one story goes, the freshman Senator got some advice from Lyndon B. Johnson, the majority leader. And Johnson, who counseled MUSKIE on the difficulties facing a freshman, got a taste of MUSKIE's Yankee wit and independence.

"Many times, ED, you won't know how you're going to vote until the clerk who's calling the roll gets to the M's," Johnson said. Then Johnson described an upcoming bill that he clearly expected MUSKIE to support. "Well, ED, you don't seem to have much to say," Johnson prodded.

"Lyndon," responded MUSKIE, "the clerk hasn't gotten to the M's yet."

His independence apparently cost MUSKIE his top committee choices. Johnson later made him chairman of a new subcommittee on air and water pollution, where he made his mark crafting landmark environmental legislation, including the 1963 Clean Air Act and 1965 Water Quality Act.

His environmental concerns grew from a strong love of the outdoors, a feeling he shared with many Mainers whose home State had felt the effects of polluted air and water. He liked to fish in his State's streams, hunt in its woods and swim in its cold ocean.

Despite the early friction, MUSKIE soon earned the admiration of Johnson for his skill in the Senate.

In 1966, he helped redraft and push through Johnson's Model Cities program, offering an impassioned speech on its behalf that Senator Robert Kennedy called "the best speech I ever heard in the Senate."

"The pages of history are full of the tales of those who sought the promise of the city and found only despair," MUSKIE told the Senate. "From the book

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

of Job to Charles Dickens to James Baldwin, we have read of the ills of the cities. Our cities contain within themselves the flowers of man's genius and the nettles of his failures."

BROUGHT BALANCE TO TICKET

Having helped rebuild Maine's political system, MUSKIE helped build the State's political stature nationwide.

In 1968, Hubert Humphrey, Democratic nominee for President, chose MUSKIE as his Vice Presidential running mate. MUSKIE was as surprised as anyone.

"I just didn't think . . . it was likely that a Vice Presidential candidate from a small State in New England would add very much to Hubert's chances," he said years later.

Humphrey knew MUSKIE as a hard worker and "a senator's senator" who was respected by colleagues. He also brought balance to the ticket as a Polish-American Catholic from the East.

MUSKIE, who campaigned directly against the Republican Vice Presidential nominee, Maryland Governor Spiro Agnew, used his Maine-grown political skills to emerge as a popular national leader.

In September 1968, Maine's junior Senator was speaking to students in Washington, PA, when someone in the audience tried to interrupt him. MUSKIE invited the heckler to the platform.

Then—still alone and having the students' full attention—he warmed the audience with his story: son of a Polish immigrant tailor in Rumford, distinguished scholar, Waterville lawyer, Navy veteran, State representative, Governor, U.S. Senator.

And in that day of growing cynicism, MUSKIE lauded the political system's openness to anyone who chose to get involved.

"It's as simple as that," MUSKIE later explained about handling hecklers. "Let the other fellow speak first. What we need is two-way communication. A willingness to listen as well as talk."

MUSKIE was given much credit for the closeness of the Presidential race, which had been considered safe for Richard Nixon. Some maintained that the Democratic ticket might have won with one more week in the campaign.

Even Humphrey called MUSKIE the "real winner" of the campaign. "In politics, I've known people who were brilliant, clever, but he has qualities that are more important—intuition, judgment, wisdom," Humphrey said.

MUSKIE caught the public's imagination as a rugged man of integrity and was considered a top candidate for the party's 1972 Presidential nomination, especially after the Chappaquiddick affair shattered Edward Kennedy's fortunes.

MUSKIE won reelection to the Senate in 1970 with more than 60 percent of the vote.

He entered the 1972 race for the Presidential nomination as the odds-on-favorite.

But, while campaigning in New Hampshire, the legendary temper usually reserved for his staff and colleagues erupted in public.

Standing on a flatbed truck as snow fell outside the offices of the conservative Manchester Union Leader newspaper, MUSKIE shook with anger and blasted William Loeb, the publisher, for reprinting an unflattering article about Muskie's wife and for publishing a letter alleging that MUSKIE had made derogatory remarks about Americans of French-Canadian descent. (The letter later proved to be a forgery circulated by Nixon's reelection committee.)

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Some reporters wrote that MUSKIE cried, though he denied it. The incident was interpreted as a sign of weakness and marked the symbolic collapse of his hopes. The nomination ultimately went to Senator George McGovern of South Dakota.

"Going down in front of that Union Leader building was a mistake I vowed years earlier not to make," MUSKIE told the Press Herald when he turned eighty, 2 years ago. "It was a whopper."

Despite his long and distinguished career in the Senate, MUSKIE still is known to many for the famous loss of his composure and the collapse of his Presidential bid.

After he withdrew from the Presidential race, MUSKIE reportedly turned down an offer from McGovern to be his running mate. He said his family "had enough of that kind of burden to carry."

BECOMES BUDGET WATCHDOG

MUSKIE returned to the Senate, where, in 1974, he was picked to chair the Senate Budget Committee, a powerful new committee overseeing the congressional budget-making process. During the mid-1970s, he emerged as a champion of fiscal discipline.

In his new role as budget watchdog, he chastised his colleagues for budget-busting legislation and appealed for curbs on spending to control inflation and rein in the Federal deficit. On occasion, MUSKIE's battles to restrict veterans' benefits or school-lunch subsidies drew scorn from fellow liberals and unaccustomed praise from conservatives.

But MUSKIE, who viewed the budget process as his final Senate legacy, never flinched from a challenge that forced him into the role of legislative pinchpenny.

"Too often in the past," he said, "Members of Congress have won reelection with a two-part strategy: Talk like Scrooge on the campaign trail. Vote like Santa Claus on the Senate floor."

In 1979, he became chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The next year, he resigned from the Senate after 22 years to become Secretary of State.

President Carter chose MUSKIE to replace Cyrus Vance, who resigned in protest over the failed attempt to rescue American hostages in Iran. The Cabinet appointment culminated MUSKIE's political career. He later told friends it was his favorite job, even though it was one he never longed for.

After Carter lost the White House to Ronald Reagan in 1980, MUSKIE practiced law in Washington as a senior partner in the firm of Chadbourne & Parke. He united American investors and the governments of China, Russia, India and some South American countries interested in developing oil and other energy sources.

His Washington office was decorated with pictures of Abraham Lincoln and Hubert Humphrey.

In 1987, at the request of President Reagan, he co-authored the Tower Commission report on secret U.S. arms sales to Iran and the diversion of money to Nicaraguan rebels.

MUSKIE continued to be consulted by policy-makers, though perhaps not as much as he would have liked. "There's nothing as old as an old politician," he quipped last year.

A Mainer at heart, MUSKIE also maintained a home in Kennebunk. He also was a frequent visitor to the campus of Bates, where he served as a longtime member of the board of trustees.

MUSKIE didn't dwell on the losses in 1968 or 1972.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

But in 1992, with Democrats returning to the White House, MUSKIE may have felt a pang or two.

Tim Maga, a professor at Bentley College in Waltham, MA, interviewed MUSKIE in his office that year for a book about Carter. After a couple of hours of recounting world politics, Maga said, MUSKIE took him on a tour of his office.

"He takes me to his back window" that looked out on a corner of the White House. "He looks at me with kind of this tear in his eye and says, 'This is the closest I'll ever get to that place.'"

[From the Sun-Journal, Lewiston, ME, March 27, 1996]

PRESIDENTS, POLITICIANS REMEMBER 'LEGEND,' 'HERO'

(By the Associated Press)

Reaction to the death Tuesday of former Secretary of State and U.S. Senator EDMUND MUSKIE:

President Clinton: "A dedicated legislator and caring public servant, Senator MUSKIE was a leader in the best sense. He spoke from his heart and acted with conviction. Generations to come will benefit from his steadfast commitment to protecting the land."

Former President Carter: "I have never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States. His coolness under pressure and his sound judgment helped him play a crucial role in bringing all the American hostages home from Iran to safety and freedom, and he was always careful to give credit to others for this achievement."

Former Senator George Mitchell: "This is a sad day for the people of Maine and the Nation. They have lost a great leader. I have lost a close and valued friend. Before it was a national cause or even well known, environmental protection was ED MUSKIE's passion. To me he was a mentor and a hero as well as a close personal friend. Just about everything I know about government and politics I learned from ED MUSKIE."

Former Senator George McGovern (D–SD): "We have been cordial friends and mutual admirers over the last quarter of a century. I'm going to miss him keenly."

Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole: "During a speech in the 1968 Presidential campaign, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE who was the Democrat nominee for Vice-President, told his audience, 'You have the God-given right to kick the Government around—don't hesitate to do so.' That remark was pure ED MUSKIE. Blunt. To the point. And leaving no doubt that Americans should expect the best of their public officials."

Senator William Cohen (R–ME): "He was steady in a crisis. He was plain-spoken and honest. He was fair-minded and independent. He never forgot his humble origins. The respect I held for Senator MUSKIE was based in his intelligence, his intellectual integrity and his unflinching courage in taking on the toughest issues of the day."

Senator Olympia Snowe (R–ME): "With his passing, Maine and the Nation have lost another legend. Senator MUSKIE was one of Maine's most important historical figures of the 20th century, whose dynamic leadership dramatically reshaped the State's political landscape."

Maine Governor Angus King: "The shadow cast by ED MUSKIE will continue to stand watch and protect the quality of life for all Americans for the rest of my lifetime and beyond. Few people can honestly say they helped

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

shape history, that their work and their influence changed the course of their State and their country. But ED MUSKIE could."

Former Maine Governor Kenneth Curtis: "We've lost a great friend. MUSKIE has secured a position in history as one of the really great national leaders from the State of Maine."

U.S. Representative James Longley Jr. (R–ME): "There was nobody who had a higher reputation in the State for integrity."

U.S. Representative John Baldacci (D–ME): "ED MUSKIE was a leader for Maine and a statesman for the Nation. He was a person of great intellect and common sense. Senator MUSKIE's devotion to Maine and his dedication to improving the quality of life for all Americans will long be remembered and appreciated."

Jerry Plante, who served in the Maine House in 1957–58 while MUSKIE was Governor: "The one thing he used to teach us was the ultimate purpose of a political party was not to win elections, but to compete with ideas and solutions for those we serve."

Bob Monks, who lost the 1978 Senate election to MUSKIE, and is running for the Senate nomination this year: "MUSKIE is not only a great political figure in Maine's history, but he was an extraordinary man. He earned the respect of Maine people for his tireless and effective advocacy. His leadership on environmental legislation had a tremendous effect on the Nation."

[From the Bangor Daily News, March 27, 1996]

ED MUSKIE

(By A. Mark Woodward)

The trail is long from the back country of Maine to Washington, but the State has earned a reputation for producing political figures of national stature who follow the difficult but well-marked road to the Capital.

Today's candidates know the way thanks to the man who blazed that path in the modern era: EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE, Governor, Senator and Secretary of State.

Old school politically, a man of the party and the people, MUSKIE embodied loyalty and persistence. His 40-year political career taught lessons on the value of learning from defeat, the strength of sound instinct, and the enduring value of personal integrity.

It was there from the beginning. A young lawyer whose practice withered after he fell off a ladder painting his house, the future father of the Clean Air Act chose politics over corporate law because he wouldn't root his family in the mill odor in his native Rumford.

Champion of campaign-finance reform out of necessity and before its time, MUSKIE was the surprise victor in his 1954 contest for the governorship, but more stunning was the financial cost, just $14,000. Bringing his candidacy directly to the people, navigating it along back roads and bounding, through potholes in a 1949 Lincoln, this one-on-one approach set the style and tone for future campaigns.

A strong partner on the 1968 ticket with Hubert Humphrey, MUSKIE's own run for President 4 years later dissolved in the New Hampshire primary, in "tears" of snow melted by a heated exchange with the publisher of the Manchester Union Leader.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Fittingly, his greatest achievements grew out of adversity. MUSKIE's independence, his refusal to bend when he knew he was right put him in early conflict with Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson.

Consigned to oblivion on the Senate Public Works Committee, MUSKIE used it as the platform for his signature Clean Water and Clean Air Acts.

Confident but never arrogant, MUSKIE left the Senate to serve his President as Secretary of State. He did it without public reluctance, and later looked back with no regret. He knew it was time to relinquish the opportunity to a younger generation of leader. Giving up the seat was not without risk for his Democratic Party, but that only deepened the personal satisfaction when his 1972 Presidential campaign manager and longtime protege, George Mitchell, rose so splendidly to the occasion.

Appointed by Governor Joe Brennan to complete MUSKIE's term, Mitchell in 1982 maintained his mentor's record of large pluralities when he handily beat David Emery with just more than 60 percent of the vote. MUSKIE had broken the 60 percent barrier against Robert Monks in 1976, Neil Bishop in 1970 and Clifford McIntire in 1964.

Reflecting on the choice he made to abandon a long, prestigious Senate career to stand briefly with President Jimmy Carter, MUSKIE years later observed: "You live that part of your life and then when it comes time to do something else you do something else."

Before he left public life, ED MUSKIE did it all. He handled failure with dignity. He tried and succeeded in a political career that binds his State, his countrymen and their history.

[From the Portland Press Herald, March 27, 1996]

MUSKIE BROUGHT GLORY TO HIS STATE AND NATION; MAINE SHAPED HIS VOICE AND HIS CHARACTER AND NEVER LET GO

(Editorial)

Eighty-two years ago this Thursday a child was born in Rumford who was destined to grow into a man with a million-dollar smile and a priceless mind and heart.

It is the Nation's loss, not his, that EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE never served Americans as their President.

Fortunately, it can be our pride as a State that this man of integrity, wit, passion and temper served Maine and his country with distinction for half a century.

Such greatness does not come along very often.

America's air and water are cleaner because ED MUSKIE sponsored and astutely steered to passage the Nation's first major pollution control laws. They are the Clean Air Act of 1963 and the Water Quality Act of 1965. As President Clinton said, on hearing of MUSKIE's death Tuesday, "Generations to come will benefit from his steadfast commitment to protecting the land."

The Federal budget, too, is a more open, reflective and decipherable document because MUSKIE founded and shaped the Senate Committee on the Budget. He served as its initial chairman from 1974 to 1980.

U.S. credibility abroad is sounder because of the integrity MUSKIE brought to foreign policy. He did so through long years in the Senate and, in 1980 and early 1981, as Secretary of State, working to resolve the American hostage crisis in Iran, under President Jimmy Carter.

Yet these achievements almost didn't happen at all.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

A Waterville lawyer, MUSKIE first won election to the Maine House of Representatives in 1946. It was a time, the late Representative Louis Jalbert liked to say, when Democrats in the Legislature could caucus in a phone booth, with plenty of room left over.

Because of MUSKIE, that would not soon be the case again.

Elected Governor in 1954, the first Democrat to hold the office in 20 years, MUSKIE revitalized his party. Equally important, he provided the model on which succeeding generations interested in public service, such as George Mitchell, would mold themselves.

In 1958, however, Governor MUSKIE, then 43 years old, declined to run for a third term. Married, with a young family and limited means, MUSKIE stood at a personal crossroads.

"Either I decide to seek a life career in public office or I return to private pursuits," MUSKIE said. "I refrain from announcing a final choice at this time simply because I truly have not yet been able to assure myself as to whether I can continue in public life and also give responsible attention to the needs of my family."

Soon, however, he chose the riskier path. He went on to run for and win the first of four terms in the U.S. Senate. With that initial victory, in 1958, came an avalanche of national attention.

MUSKIE was a political oddity—the first Democrat Maine had ever sent to the U.S. Senate. He was also uniquely well-suited to a new, all-pervasive medium, television. Television conveyed the lanky, big-boned figure from Maine with the measured voice and gift for plain speaking to Americans eager to discover in their own time a greatness seen once in Abraham Lincoln.

In both public and private life, until the heart attack that ended his life, MUSKIE worked hard not to disappoint them. Few American statesmen would stand taller, or exhibit greater integrity when tested over time.

MUSKIE gave his best, whether it was to counsel restraint on U.S. involvement in Vietnam, to enact President Lyndon Johnson's Model Cities program or, more recently, to focus public attention on the legal needs of the poorest people in Maine.

Nor would MUSKIE disappoint his family.

Applauded as the Democratic Vice Presidential candidate under Hubert Humphrey in 1968, MUSKIE vigorously pursued the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1972. Four months into the campaign, he withdrew, after mounting an emotional defense of his beloved wife, Jane, in the bitter snow of New Hampshire.

Like a compass, his integrity held true to Maine, his magnetic north, throughout a long and public life.

[From the Sun-Journal, March 27, 1996]

MAINE MOURNS LOSS OF 'GIANT'

(By Liz Chapman)

STATESMAN EDMUND S. MUSKIE DEAD OF HEART ATTACK AT AGE 81

AUGUSTA—EDMUND S. MUSKIE died early Tuesday morning in a Washington DC, hospital, leaving behind a wife, five children and a remarkable record of public service to the people of Maine and America.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

A Democrat from start to finish, MUSKIE dedicated his political career to helping the poor and improving the environment. He was a visionary with a big heart and a healthy temper who, as a Presidential candidate in 1972, was criticized for spending too much time talking about the issues.

"The loss of Senator MUSKIE is the loss of a giant," said Governor Angus King." It sort of feels like one of Maine's mountains has been moved."

MUSKIE is credited with almost single-handedly resurrecting the Democratic Party in Maine when he defeated incumbent Republican Governor Burton Cross in 1954 by 22,000 votes, becoming the first Democratic Governor in 20 years.

After two terms in the Blaine House, MUSKIE was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1958 as the State's first ever popularly elected Democratic Senator.

He would remain Maine's Senator until 1980, when then President Jimmy Carter asked him to serve as Secretary of State.

"It's a sad day for a lot of Mainers," said longtime MUSKIE friend Joseph Brennan, a former Governor and Congressman.

"He's been an institution, truly, in the State of Maine," Brennan said.

President Bill Clinton remembered MUSKIE Tuesday in a statement calling him "a leader in the best sense. He spoke from his heart and acted with conviction. Generations to come will benefit from his steadfast commitment to protecting the land."

MUSKIE 81, died of a heart attack while recovering from surgery at Georgetown University Hospital in the Nation's Capital, where he continued to practice law after ending his distinguished political career in 1981.

MUSKIE will be buried Saturday in Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington VA, after a funeral Mass in the Little Flower Church in Bethesda, MD.

A HAPPY CHILDHOOD

MUSKIE was born on Knox Street in Rumford on March 28, 1914, the second of six children born to Stephen and Josephine "Josie" Muskie.

The son of an immigrant, EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE grew up in a mill town that didn't always appreciate his Polish ancestry (immigration officials shortened his father's name from Marciszewski). But he downplayed what was widely reported in the media as the "pain of prejudice" he suffered as a boy.

"I had as healthy and happy childhood and family life as a boy could wish," MUSKIE said years after his father died.

He recalled working in his father's tailor shop on Exchange Street and hearing spirited debates between the elder Muskie and some of his customers.

"His opinions were worth more to him than his income," MUSKIE said. "Pa wasn't cranky; he was just intense. I guess he and I were somewhat alike—he had a temper, but for the most part he controlled it."

MUSKIE admitted to being shy as a youngster, but recalled that his intense interest in high school helped him overcome his quiet ways. He found new friends and became "totally engaged with my courses." He aspired to attend college and found high school "an exciting time."

After graduating from Stephens High School in Rumford, MUSKIE attended Bates College in Lewiston, which he called his "first step in the outside world," graduating in 1936.

He studied law at Cornell University Law School in Ithaca, NY, graduating cum laude in 1939.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

He taught at Stephens as a substitute teacher while waiting to take his bar exams and, in 1940, established his law practice in Waterville.

He met and married his wife of 47 years, Jane, not long after being discharged from the U.S. Army where he served during World War II in the Atlantic and Asiatic-Pacific Theaters from 1942 to 1945.

A CAREER OF POLITICS

"It's a tough game they play in politics," MUSKIE told well-wishers during his 80th birthday party in March 1994.

And he knew the game well.

MUSKIE began his political career in the Maine House in 1946, when Republicans outnumbered Democrats 127–24. He served three terms before running for Governor in 1954.

In his inaugural address as Governor in 1955, MUSKIE called for creation of a new industrial development agency, increased education funding and money to improve Maine hospitals.

He was easily reelected Governor in 1956 and enjoyed broad support for his political agenda, getting 90 percent of his initiatives passed.

MUSKIE won election to the U.S. Senate in 1958 and would serve three-plus terms before resigning in May 1980 to accept the position of Secretary of State in the Carter administration.

Hardworking, opinionated, outspoken and fair, MUSKIE wasted little time building his reputation in Washington.

History has already judged him as the pioneer of environmental protection, a "Capitol Hill powerhouse" who used his large frame and high intelligence to push through the landmark water and air acts of the 1960s and 70s.

"He didn't wait for an issue to coalesce before leading. He was a true leader," said Severin Beliveau, another Rumford native who advised MUSKIE during his failed 1972 Presidential bid and who served as chairman of the Maine Democratic Party from 1968 to 1972.

"He would take a position and then worry about whether people would follow him or not," Beliveau said.

MUSKIE believed that to destroy the environment was to destroy the economy and future of the Nation.

But he was not a zealot about the environment. In October 1977, MUSKIE assailed Maine environmentalists for their opposition to the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project proposed for the St. John River at Fort Kent.

"I think it's time to provide some opportunities for people to work, not canoe, down the St. John," MUSKIE said to widespread criticism.

"Senator MUSKIE was terribly patient and terribly persistent in seeking to enact environmental legislation because he believed the legislation was in the public interest and in the interest of Maine," said longtime MUSKIE aide Estelle Lavoie, who remembers the intense opposition of industry to MUSKIE's trailblazing air and water laws.

Lavoie helped MUSKIE resolve problems for Maine constituents, working for him from 1973 until he resigned his Senate seat in 1980.

"I remember a man of great intelligence, an iron will and the kind of patience and persistence necessary to succeed in the legislative process," she said. "And a man who cared deeply about the people of Maine."

By 1968, when Hubert Humphrey tapped MUSKIE as his Vice Presidential nominee, the Maine Senator had cemented his reputation as a hardheaded and courageous lawmaker.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Beliveau recalled driving MUSKIE to the office of Chicago Mayor Richard Daley in 1968, just prior to the Democratic Convention in Chicago, and learning later that Daley told Humphrey if he wanted to carry Illinois, he would have to nominate MUSKIE as VP.

Beliveau confirmed MUSKIE had a temper—and used it. But he thinks it was one of MUSKIE's strengths, not foibles.

"He had very strong feelings and he wasn't reluctant to express himself," Beliveau said. "You challenged him at your peril. I think it was one of his strengths. He had strong convictions and he expressed them without worrying about the political repercussions."

MUSKIE championed major concerns other than environmental protection before they were politically correct; universal health care, for instance, and the need to balance the Federal budget.

"Some people didn't understand the foresight he had," said former Governor Kenneth Curtis.

MUSKIE spoke against tuition tax credits in August 1978 as chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, although the credits were popular on the Hill and within his own party.

"I think we underestimate the citizens we represent if we believe that what they really want is another big dose of deficits in the name of tuition assistance," MUSKIE argued.

In a speech before the National Conference of State Legislators in March 1979, when the Federal deficit was less than $30 billion, MUSKIE railed against spending money the country didn't have.

"For 43 of the past 50 years, our Federal budget has been in deficit," he said. "That is not a gratifying statistic. Though many of those deficits were caused by war—and most of the others by depression or economic downturn—some were provided by imprudent Federal spending policies and poor fiscal decision-making. There is no excuse for that."

But MUSKIE again bucked the popular tide of the day, speaking out against a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget, warning that an "abrupt move" to balance the Federal books would lead to a radical hike in taxes or a dramatic cut in spending.

"A harsh prescription of that nature is certain to aggravate the disease," he said.

THE 1972 CAMPAIGN

The story of MUSKIE's life is incomplete without remembering his bid for the Democratic nomination for President in 1972—the stuff of political legend.

The official announcement of his nomination was anti-climatic on January 4, when he spent $32,000 to buy the final 10 minutes of "The Glen Campbell Goodtime Hour" to declare his candidacy.

Anti-climatic because he was seen as the frontrunner for the nomination for months before the official declaration.

"I am seeking the Presidency . . . not merely to change Presidents, but to change the country," MUSKIE told Americans. "I intend to lead—to ask you to make America what it was to Abraham Lincoln—"The last best hope of mankind." I intend to ask you to try—and to be willing to try again if we fail. And I intend to ask everyone of you to pay a fair share of the costs of a decent society."

But what had started the previous summer as a gloriously bright and hopeful campaign steadily sagged under the weight of media criticism and, ultimately, alleged dirty tricks by the Nixon White House.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

"(It) still feels like a fairy tale that a humble man from a small mill town has risen to such heights," Josephine Muskie said of her son before his bright campaign dimmed and finally died.'

"MUSKIE seems to have nomination sewed" read a bold headline on January 27, 1972, just a few days before MUSKIE would travel to New Hampshire to defend his reputation—and his wife's—from attacks by the publisher of the Manchester Union Leader.

Standing in front of the newspaper office in a snow squall, MUSKIE castigated publisher William Loeb as "a gutless coward . . . who doesn't walk (but) crawls."

MUSKIE was livid that Loeb had printed the now infamous "Canuck letter," in which a Florida man named Paul Morrison claimed MUSKIE had insulted French Americans in New England during a speech in Florida.

Loeb had also reprinted unflattering comments from Newsweek magazine about Muskie's wife—comments Newsweek had picked up from yet another publication.

Beliveau, who met MUSKIE in Manchester that February morning, remembered that the candidate was angry and tense, but determined to challenge Loeb on his own turf.

Joining MUSKIE and Beliveau for a breakfast meeting that day was the late Louie Jalbert of Lewiston and George Mitchell, who would replace MUSKIE when he stepped down in 1980.

"He was determined he was going to challenge Loeb for his unkind and unfounded comments about his wife and also for being a demagogue, in effect," Beliveau said.

"He was very tense, very upset. He was determined to protect his wife's name and reputation and to do what no other politician had ever done in New Hampshire and that was to challenge Loeb in his back yard," Beliveau said.

MUSKIE, in a television interview many years later, would admit he made a mistake. For while some people appreciated his anger and desire to defend himself and his wife, others believed his outburst on the steps of the Union Leader office illustrated an inability to harness and control his temper.

Some people worried that if MUSKIE couldn't take the criticism of a newspaper owner, he wasn't a good candidate to run the country.

As he stood in the snow that morning, his voice cracked with emotion and journalists rushed to their typewriters to report that MUSKIE had cried.

His support continued to slip after the Manchester incident and he officially quite the race in July, though he pulled out of active campaigning in April.

"Obviously I feel a sense of disappointment," MUSKIE said. "I don't feel a sense of loss. It's been an opportunity to grow and I look forward with optimism."

In September of 1972, the Union Leader launched an investigation into the "Canuck letter," saying it had been unable to verify that Paul Morrison ever existed. Later investigations found that the letter had been written by Nixon's reelection staff.

MUSKIE continued his career after the 1972 race, earning continuing praise and respect from every quarter of Washington.

In May 1980, then President Jimmy Carter asked MUSKIE to serve as Secretary of State, just days after the failed negotiations to free the American hostages in Iran.

Brennan, Governor at that time, got a call from MUSKIE asking him to meet him at the Brunswick Naval Air Station.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The two men met the next day and MUSKIE told him the news. Brennan said MUSKIE had two concerns: that Maine people would be angry if he gave up his Senate seat early; and the fate of his Washington staff should he accept the President's offer.

Once Brennan assured him he thought Mainers would be proud that MUSKIE would be Secretary of State, MUSKIE asked the Governor for a favor.

"He asked that whoever I appointed (to fill the Senate seat) would keep his people on staff for 6 months," Brennan recalled. "He was concerned because they all had families and obligations and they thought (MUSKIE) had 3 more years" in his term.

Brennan promised MUSKIE did not have to worry about his employees. MUSKIE then turned from Brennan, picked up the phone and called Carter.

"He called the President and said 'the green light is flashing,'" Brennan remembered, saying he was struck that MUSKIE's two concerns, amid an international crisis and a call to service by the President, was first to Mainers and second to his employees.

"He was deeply concerned about his staff, to his great, great credit," Brennan said.

Senator William Cohen, Maine's current senior Senator who will retire this year after 24 years in Washington, was among the legions of people who remembered EDMUND MUSKIE Tuesday.

"I know of no one who shared more in the action and passion of his time," Cohen said. "He felt deeply, acted with integrity and served as a model for the best kind in public service."

[From the Des Moines Register, March 27, 1996]

MUSKIE REMEMBERED FOR SERVICE TO PUBLIC, EX-SECRETARY OF STATE DIES OF HEART FAILURE

(Associated Press)

Deck: Longtime Senator from Maine, a former Presidential candidate, is lauded for judgment and conviction.

Washington, DC—EDMUND MUSKIE operated at the highest reaches of American politics but he was remembered on the day he died for his intellect and honesty, not for the jobs he held.

"His brand of tireless public service is vanishing," said a former Senate colleague.

MUSKIE also will be recalled as the man who may have lost a Presidential nomination by choking up in public.

The former Secretary of State died of heart failure early Tuesday, 2 days shy of his 82nd birthday. He underwent surgery last week in Georgetown University Hospital for a blocked artery in his leg, then suffered a heart attack a few days later.

His was a life of public office: Three-term State legislator in his native Maine; twice Governor; U.S. Senator for 22 years; Democratic nominee for Vice President in 1968; candidate for President in 1972.

He left the Senate, where he had championed clean air and clean water legislation, to become Secretary of State in the Carter administration. As such, he helped oversee the successful efforts to free 52 Americans held hostage by Iran.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

"I have never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States," Carter said in tribute. "His coolness under pressure and his sound judgment helped him play a crucial role in bringing all the American hostages home from Iran."

President Clinton called MUSKIE "a leader in the best sense."

"He spoke from his heart and acted with conviction," Clinton said.

"ED MUSKIE was a patriot," said Senate leader Bob Dole (R–KS). "The State of Maine and America are better because of ED MUSKIE's life and career."

To Senator Fritz Hollings (D–SC), MUSKIE was "perhaps, the most cogent persuader on the floor of the United States Senate. . . . Time and again, he gave of himself. His brand of tireless public service is vanishing."

MUSKIE leaves Jane, his wife of 47 years, two sons, three daughters and seven grandchildren. Burial was scheduled for Arlington National Cemetery on Saturday, after a funeral Mass in the Little Flower Church in Bethesda, MD.

In his bid for the 1972 Democratic Presidential nomination, MUSKIE won the New Hampshire primary, as he had won preliminary caucuses in Arizona and Iowa, but in none was his margin as large as anticipated. His poll ratings began to drop after he choked up during an emotional speech, and problems began to plague his managers and fund-raisers.

George McGovern, a Senator from South Dakota, eventually won the nomination.

I never believed that . . . diminished him in the least," McGovern said Tuesday. "Indeed, it was an indication of his humanity and his essential decency."

McGovern lost in a landslide to incumbent Richard Nixon in the general election. MUSKIE returned to the Senate.

Years later, the Senate voted 94–2 to confirm him for Secretary of State. Even Jesse Helms (R–NC), who voted against MUSKIE as a protest against Carter's foreign policy, joined in the applause for him.

MUSKIE was Hubert Humphrey's 1968 running mate in the campaign against Nixon and Spiro Agnew.

Following his retirement from politics, MUSKIE became a partner in the Washington law firm Chadbourne and Parke, where he worked until he was hospitalized.

MUSKIE was born in Rumford, a western Maine paper mill town, on March 28, 1914, the son of Stephen and Josephine Muskie. His father was a tailor born in Poland.

MUSKIE worked his way through Bates College, went on to Cornell Law School and set up a law practice in Waterville, ME. He served in the Navy in World War II.

[From the Guardian Newspaper Limited, March 27, 1996]

IT ALL ENDED IN TEARS

(By Martin Walker)

EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE, who has died at age 81, was one of the tantalizing might-have-beens of U.S. Presidential politics. He will be remembered for a moment of public tears and as a veteran Democratic Senator who may have been the real victim of President Nixon's Watergate machinations.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The tears and Watergate went together. In 1971–72, Senator ED MUSKIE of Maine was by far the most serious Democratic challenger to Nixon's hopes of reelection. His campaign was accordingly targeted for an unpleasant form of guerrilla warfare by Nixon's dirty tricks division.

They forged letters in MUSKIE's name, spread foul rumors about his wife, disabled campaign cars, and rang conservative voters throughout the night, using exaggerated African-American accents to say "This is Harlem for MUSKIE and we wants yo' vote."

For the New Hampshire primary, where French-Canadians are an important voting minority, they distributed a forged MUSKIE letter which sneered at them as "dumb Canucks". MUSKIE, who had never faced anything this dirty in his political life, was most appalled by the attacks on his wife, who indeed had a drinking problem, particularly when they were published in the notoriously rightwing Manchester Union-Leader.

On the campaign trial, in the snow, he broke down in tears as he defended her against a heckler in a moment caught by television that doomed his campaign. From his bizarre behavior then and immediately afterwards, many on MUSKIE's campaign staff suspect to this day that LSD or some other drug was slipped into his coffee before he began speaking.

At least it provoked one of Harold Macmillan's better quips. Macmillan liked MUSKIE, thought he should have been President, and later commented that any British politician with experience of the House of Commons would have known how to deal with a heckler. "If somebody had shouted that my wife was a drunk, I'd have replied 'Yes, but you should have seen her mother'. That would have worked."

MUSKIE won the New Hampshire primary, but unconvincingly for a neighbor from Maine. Senator George McGovern, far more outspoken in his attacks on the Vietnam war, was able to ride his support among the students and the radical left all the way to the nomination—and to overwhelming defeat by Nixon.

MUSKIE might have done better. It is not easy to be sure. A man of craggy, slow-thinking and slow-talking integrity, he could be an impressive public speaker, but was not a gifted campaigner. In 1968, when he made his name as Vice-Presidential running mate to Hubert Humphrey, his plain virtues shone in contrast to the garrulous Humphrey, the tricky Nixon and the oleaginous crook Nixon chose as his running-mate, Spiro Agnew.

MUSKIE did not seriously consider running for the Presidency until disaster befell the party's heir apparent, Senator Edward Kennedy, when a female aide drowned after Kennedy drove his car off a bridge at Chappaquiddick in 1969. MUSKIE campaigned hard for his party in the 1970 mid-term Congressional election, and became the choice of the Democratic barons and the front-runner.

To the public, MUSKIE was a traditional Democratic centrist with a proud and pioneering record on environmental legislation. To party insiders, he had been Lyndon Johnson's loyal disciple since first being elected to the Senate in 1958. Although MUSKIE later claimed "private doubts" about the Vietnam war as early as 1966, in 1968 he stuck to the hawkish party platform.

MUSKIE, the son of Polish immigrants, was the first Roman Catholic to attend Bates College, a haven of the WASP aristocracy who could not get into Harvard or Yale. He then became the first Democrat to be elected Governor, and later Senator for the State of Maine, formerly so solidly Republican that it was one of only two States to vote against President Roosevelt in 1936.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE became an elder statesman, available to fill the gap as Secretary of State when Cyrus Vance resigned in protest in the last months of the Carter Presidency. When the Congress wanted a reliable hand to run the inquiry into the Iran-Contra affair, MUSKIE was the obvious candidate.

Always popular in Maine, MUSKIE suffered less than most defeated candidates after his Presidential bid foundered. His devoted aide, George Mitchell, inherited MUSKIE's Senate seat, and went on to become Senate majority leader, the post in which MUSKIE might have been most content. MUSKIE's foreign policy aide in the 1972 campaign, Tony Lake, is now national security adviser in the Clinton White House.

Martin Walker served on MUSKIE's Senate and 1971 campaign staff as a Congressional Fellow of the American Political Science Association.

EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE, politician, born March 28, 1914; died March 26, 1996.

[From the Washington Post, March 27, 1996]

EDMUND S. MUSKIE

(Editorial)

"It's as if one of our mountains has disappeared," said Maine's Governor Angus King upon learning of the death of EDMUND MUSKIE. The former Governor, U.S. Senator and Secretary of State died yesterday at Georgetown University Hospital 2 days short of his 82nd birthday. He had a distinguished career in public service in this city and was revered in his home State for his integrity, compassion and quiet humor.

Senator MUSKIE was of the generation that returned from World War II with a deep belief in the power of government to do good. He served in election office on the State and Federal levels for more than 30 years and was the first Democrat to be popularly elected to the Senate from Maine. When he arrived in Washington in 1959, his colleagues on the Hill included John Kennedy, Philip Hart, Hubert Humphrey, Eugene McCarthy and other progressives who rose to national prominence and put into place a panoply of laws that changed the Nation profoundly. In this company, he was a strong supporter of civil rights legislation, poverty programs, Medicare and Medicaid. He played a leadership role as the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee and the primary sponsor of the clean air and water states of the early '60. These statutes reflected not just his commitment to the environment but an ability to delineate State and Federal interests and responsibilities and provide a framework for cooperation.

His final months in public service, as Secretary of State in the closing days of the Carter administration, were devoted to working out the successful return of American hostages from Iran and plugging away on strategic arms control, which had been a primary interest of his in the Senate.

Former President Jimmy Carter said yesterday he had "never known any American leader who was more highly qualified to be President of the United States." Mr. MUSKIE, son of an immigrant tailor, never achieved that goal. He ran for Vice President on the Democratic ticket in 1968 and entered the Presidential primaries in 1972. As a candidate, he was straightforward, knowledgeable and principled, and he conveyed a belief that government could do much to ensure justice, make the average family's life a little better and protect the environment for future generations. He lived his public life working to make those convictions a reality.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

[From Newsday, March 27, 1996]

U.S. LOSES ITS 'MR. CLEAN'

(By Patrick J. Sloyan)

PUSHED KEY ENVIRONMENT LAWS, BUT LOST A CHANCE AT PRESIDENCY

WASHINGTON—In cleansing the Nation's air and making U.S. rivers and lakes safe for fish and swimmers, EDMUND MUSKIE used his intellect, political acumen and a terrible temper.

"Oh, he would start yelling," former Senator Howard Baker (R–TN), said yesterday, recalling a backroom debate with MUSKIE over emissions from smoke stacks. Baker, who stands 5 foot 8, was faced with 6 feet four inches of craggy anger.

"My voice would rise; then we both would be screaming," Baker said. "The staff would recoil. But we would always work it out. We had a lot of mutual respect."

When it was over, MUSKIE the Democratic Senator from Maine, had hammered out another agreement that became part of landmark environmental protection laws that changed the quality of American life.

MUSKIE, who died yesterday at 81 after undergoing surgery last week for a blocked artery and suffering a subsequent heart attack, also will be remembered for a public display of his temper. Choking on his anger in public may have cost him a chance to challenge President Richard Nixon for the White House in the 1972 Presidential campaign.

But as chairman of an obscure Senate Public Works subcommittee, MUSKIE made a mark on the Nation that can elude some Presidents.

"ED MUSKIE has earned his place in American history," said Sierra Club director Carl Pope, who called him the architect of environmental protection programs. "Thanks to Senator MUSKIE, our country is a safer, healthier place to live."

For 21 years in the Senate, he was the driving force behind legislation that identified toxic pollution in air and water and prescribed a timetable and a gameplan for an industry-by-industry cleanup. He was the author of the 1963 Clean Air Act and the 1965 Water Quality Act and subsequent amendments dealing with conservation and safe drinking water.

MUSKIE became "Mr. Clean," sponsor of landmark laws that created the Environmental Protection Agency and regulations curbing pollution in a variety of ways. Lead, once a gasoline additive, was banned and carmakers were forced to reduce emissions of carbon monoxide, grit and oxides.

"If you think about what's happening to the air in Mexico City or the rivers in Russia, it's really terrifying to think what would have happened if it wasn't for ED MUSKIE," said Leon Billings, who served as MUSKIE's chief of staff in the Senate.

MUSKIE was an avid hunter and fisherman, part of the outdoor crowd that always was concerned with the land. But it was as Governor of Maine that he became convinced government action was needed. Corporate leaders, citing the pollution in Maine's streams and rivers, repeatedly refused MUSKIE's appeal to build new plants in Maine if the water supplies were vital.

In later years, MUSKIE would delight in recounting the return of Atlantic salmon to what had been the dirtiest rivers in the State at the beginning of his political career. "The salmon are back in the Allagash," MUSKIE boasted.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Baker, who served as Senate Republican leader, also acknowledged MUSKIE's outsized role in the anti-pollution movement that spread from the United States to nations in Europe and Asia.

"ED was one of the big ones," said Baker, who saw protection of the environment become a bipartisan issue. "It was heady stuff: Some of that legislation decreed that the water be made more swimmable and more fishable. You don't see such sweeping legislation today."

It was MUSKIE's leadership on environmental issues that propelled him into the national limelight. In 1968, MUSKIE was picked as Hubert Humphrey's running mate when the Democratic ticket lost narrowly to Nixon.

While MUSKIE won plaudits as a Vice Presidential candidate, his image as the inevitable Presidential candidate began in 1971 when he offered the Democratic reply to Nixon's State of the Union address. "To him, the Presidency was the ultimate position for pressing his agenda," Billings said.

As the front-runner in the Democratic race in 1972, MUSKIE was even with Nixon in voter surveys as the campaign moved into New Hampshire. Years later, it was revealed that Nixon also viewed MUSKIE as the strongest opponent. Nixon's aides financed a dirty-tricks campaign against MUSKIE, including planting a letter that quoted MUSKIE as calling a French-American a "canuck."

MUSKIE staged a dramatic rebuttal to the "canuck" charge and allegations against his wife, Jane, by The Manchester Union Leader, during a news conference in front of the newspaper's office.

Instead of an indignant MUSKIE, reporters saw a man so choked with emotion that he could barely speak. Some reported he was crying; others saw him tearless but overwhelmed by anger. But the media joined in portraying the front-runner as flawed and weak.

One upshot was that even when he won the primary March 7 by 9 percentage points, some political reporters portrayed it as a disappointing showing against Senator George McGovern.

Instead of taking it in stride, MUSKIE's fury reached new heights. Enroute from New Hampshire to the next primary in Wisconsin, MUSKIE lashed out in a rear-of-the-plane interview.

"I win the [expletive] primary and you [expletive] say I [expletive] lost the [expletive] primary," MUSKIE shouted. "I never cried that day," he said, pounding his armrest.

Despite the endorsements of party leaders around the Nation, MUSKIE lost to McGovern, who was buried in a Nixon landslide. MUSKIE returned to the Senate, where he became a leader in the fight to reduce the Federal budget deficit.

MUSKIE's was the Senate's first Budget Committee chairman, a post he left in 1980 to serve as Secretary of State for President Jimmy Carter.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, March 28, 1996]

MUSKIE'S LEGACY: CLEAN AIR, WATER

(By Christopher Matthews)

WASHINGTON—EDMUND MUSKIE was a great thinker, statesman and legislator.

He was the only man I knew who, if required by circumstance, could take his listener on an insightful tour d'horizon of this country's predicaments, both foreign and domestic.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

His rival Richard Nixon could do the same, of course, but with far more calculation on the global scene and much less understanding of the domestic.

What made Senator MUSKIE's ability to grasp and sketch the big picture so impressive was his even more fabled ability to hunker down and get a specific piece of national work done.

He was the son of a Polish immigrant, a tailor, and he knew that even the highest profession requires, most of all, toil.

I remember the Senate Budget Committee chairman at work during the years I served that panel a generation ago.

Senator MUSKIE would arrive a few minutes before 10 a.m. and take his seat at the head of the table. One at a time, his fellow committee members would arrive, exchange pleasantries, have their pictures taken by the news photographers.

"Are there any statements?" the chairman would ask.

At this, the Maine lawmaker's colleagues would offer their quotes for the next morning's papers, their sound-bites for the TV cameras.

After the camera tripods had been folded and the Senators had begun to drift off to other appointments, the chairman would move toward the task at hand: lawmaking.

ED MUSKIE did not enter politics to have his sentences appear in the newspaper, his phrases bit for the evening news. He sought election to make the country better.

This Senator's senator did it by winning the confidence of fellow lawmakers.

As he collected yet another proxy slip from a Senator heading toward the door, he would ask: "Does anyone else have anything to say?"

The man who earned the nickname "Iron Pants", holding dozens of markups and House-Senate conference meetings on the Clean Water bill, could be as tough as he was patient.

Once, in a stand-off with House counterpart John Dingell of Michigan over the Clean Air Act, Senator MUSKIE was told that failure to reach a quick, and, to him, unacceptable, agreement would cause a shutdown in automobile production.

His hard-as-nails response: "There aren't any auto works in Maine."

Because Senator MUSKIE was patient, because he was tough, the rivers of America were made clean again in the 1970s. Because of his willingness to put his head down and work, rivers no longer catch fire.

Because of the Clean Air Act, America does not suffer day after day from the hell that rains even now on cities from Eastern Europe to the Far East.

No, EDMUND S. MUSKIE did not win his once-in-a-lifetime race for the Presidency in 1972. He was too temperamental, too prone to tantrum, it was said.

When a New Hampshire newspaper publisher spoke nastily of his wife, he let his emotions show.

But with this noble man's death Tuesday, we are reminded again how better off we've been for having had a few Senators who knew the job was more important than the office, who possessed the inner rage to do the great, hard work of keeping this country as close as humanly possible to the dream that led our parents here.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

[From the Bangor Daily News, March 28, 1996]

MCGOVERN, MUSKIE BONDED BY NEW HAMPSHIRE

(By John S. Day)

History defines its heroes by the wars they fought.

Often, the losers come off as good as the winners.

Ulysses S. Grant defeated Robert E. Lee, but Lee became the more revered figure.

George Bush won the Gulf War, only to be rejected by American voters. Saddam Hussein ruined his country. He still rules.

George McGovern ended EDMUND MUSKIE's quest for the Presidency. It was McGovern, though, who became the object of derision for losing every State but Massachusetts to Richard Nixon in the subsequent national election.

The gods were kinder to MUSKIE than McGovern after 1972. Maine' Senator continued as a trailblazer on environmental issues. With his Presidency on the line, Jimmy Carter named MUSKIE to head the U.S. State Department after Secretary Cyrus Vance resigned to protest the failed military mission to rescue the hostages in Iran.

After he left the Senate, McGovern moved to Connecticut and opened a bed and breakfast inn.

"The place never made a dollar," McGovern said Wednesday. It ended up in Chapter 11 bankruptcy. McGovern blamed government red tape and local business regulations. Rush Limbaugh seized on the incident to ridicule all liberals as buffoons when it comes to business matters.

The cruelest blow was McGovern's daughter, Theresa, who campaigned with her father during the glorious victory over MUSKIE and through the 49-State defeat to Nixon and the Watergate plumbers.

"She died of alcoholism," McGovern said. "It was a terrible problem."

Theresa McGovern, unable to find her way home, was discovered frozen to death in a snow-bank. McGovern has written a book about the tragedy that will be released this summer.

Because the two men will be forever linked by New Hampshire—victor and loser—the media sought out George McGovern Tuesday to talk about ED MUSKIE.

"He was the first one who offered to go out on the campaign trail with me against Nixon. It was some of the most effective work that anybody did for me that year. We became close friends," McGovern said.

On most Sundays during the football season, when the Washington Redskins were playing home at RFK, ED and Jane Muskie and George and Eleanor McGovern were fixtures in Jack Kent Cooke's owner's box.

"You know, one of the great myths about New Hampshire was that the crying incident crippled ED's campaign. I don't think it hurt him a bit. I talked to thousands of people in New Hampshire and never came across a single voter who said he didn't like ED because he saw him shedding tears in public," McGovern said.

"Our door-to-door canvassers said MUSKIE was in decline before the Union-Leader episode, but picked up two or three percentage points after it," the former South Dakota Senator said.

"I think it was an excuse by the pundits. They wrote that ED was going to have an easy time winning the nomination. When that didn't happen, the writers had to manufacture a reason," he said.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE actually outpolled McGovern in New Hampshire, 46 percent to 37 percent.

[From the Dallas Morning News, March 29, 1996]

MUSKIE'S TEARS WERE AHEAD OF THEIR TIME

(By Deborah Mathis)

EDMUND MUSKIE's death brings to mind the famous New Hampshire incident of 1972 where the Democratic Senator from Maine, vying for the White House, stood before the snow-blown press corps and unwittingly crashed his candidacy.

Throughout the primary season that year, the Manchester Union Leader had led an assault on Mr. MUSKIE's character, even publishing an outright lie furnished by one of Richard Nixon's dirty tricks specialists.

But when the newspaper attacked Jane Muskie for smoking, drinking, cursing and other "unladylike" behavior, the affront was more than Mr. MUSKIE could stand. In a retort to the newspaper's nastiness, he lost it.

The words got stuck in his throat. Tremors rippled across his mouth and chin. His head dropped. And, according to legend, drops of water rolled down his checks.

No reporter on the scene that fateful day doubts that Mr. MUSKIE was shaken, but some insist he didn't cry. Others are just as adamant that he did.

For a while, Mr. MUSKIE fudged. What the reporters saw on his face may have been melted snowflakes instead of tears, he allowed.

However, he eventually admitted his emotions had gotten the best of him on that occasion and conceded the episode had finished his Presidential campaign.

"They were looking for a strong, steady man," he said later, "and here I was weak."

Actually, Mr. MUSKIE was a man ahead of his time.

Had it been 1988 rather than 1972, Mr. MUSKIE might have been the one standing opposite Republican nominee George Bush, listening to a TV anchorman's brutal, hypothetical question about the rape and murder of the candidate's wife.

Instead, there was someone else at the microphone pondering the wrenching scenario that evening, and it is well known that that man didn't cry. Nor did he wince. In fact, he barely even blinked.

In 1988, Michael Dukakis responded with the cool detachment of a forensic scientist. Unfortunately for him, voters wanted to hear from the good husband. We were looking for just a sliver of indignation or grief over the mere thought of his wife's suffering.

But tears for the beloved had trickled 16 years too early, in another place, when the country had a more primitive mind-set.

It was unacceptable back then for a man to weep in public for most reasons, even for a dear wife's sake. Weeping men with Presidential ambitions could forget it.

No longer.

We still can't take sobbing collapse scenes a la Jim Bakker, but healthy tear ducts are required among viable Presidential candidates these days. If a guy can't at least well up every now and then, we wonder if he gives a damn.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

To the extent that this loosening of the rule helps humanize the powerful, thus narrowing the gap between the leading and the led and erasing another arbitrary line between male and female, it is progress, which is about all we ask from time.

Had we evolved to this place sooner, a man like EDMUND MUSKIE would have had a chance. Because we didn't, a capable, decent man had to forfeit the dream he was entitled to.

For that sad fact alone, there should be tears aplenty.

[From the Baltimore Sun, March 29, 1996]

THE MAN WHO SHOWED HIS EMOTION TOO SOON

(Jack W. Germond and Jules Witcover)

WASHINGTON—For all of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE's considerable accomplishments, his death brought renewed reminiscences of his unsuccessful Presidential bid in 1972 and the single incident to which its outcome was often attributed.

News reports captured Mr. MUSKIE standing outside the Manchester Union Leader in a snowstorm during the 1972 New Hampshire primary and momentarily losing his composure over personal attacks in the newspaper on his wife, Jane. Debatable even today is whether, as many wrote, Mr. MUSKIE had wept, or whether it was melted snow rather than tears that trickled down his cheek as he spoke in mixed anger and sorrow.

The Senator told author Theodore H. White that the episode "changed people's minds about me. . . . They were looking for a strong, steady man, and here I was weak." If ever there was a misreading of a man, that was it.

Mr. MUSKIE was figuratively as well as physically a tower of strength, a man of dogged convictions whose resolution was generally so firm that any suggestion that he might be indecisive could draw from his usually reserved demeanor a paroxysm of denial and protest.

Political reporters interrogated Mr. MUSKIE relentlessly on the one issue about which he was uncharacteristically indecisive—the Vietnam war. He had publicly supported President Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam policy when he was Hubert Humphrey's running mate in 1968, but he eventually turned critic. Still he had difficulty as a Presidential candidate in 1972 articulating what he would do about the war.

This problem—as much as or more than the famous scene outside the newspaper—persuaded voters to abandon him. After a winning but disappointing showing in New Hampshire, he plunged to fourth place in the Florida and Wisconsin primaries as Senator George McGovern swept to the Democratic nomination.

Senator MUSKIE's lack of clear articulation on Vietnam was particularly damaging to him because the war at that time was at the center of American politics. Democratic liberals were leading anti-war demonstrations, and new nomination procedures were giving greater influence to their voices and votes. Mr. MUSKIE's late enlistment in the anti-war cause, as opposed to Mr. McGovern's long history in it, eventually undid Senator MUSKIE.

CRYING IN THE SNOW

Yet his "crying in the snow" likely will remain the one image most Americans of the time will remember of the man. This is a considerable irony in

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

light of the experience 16 years later of another Democratic Presidential candidate, Governor Michael Dukakis.

Asked in a debate whether, if his wife Kitty were "raped and murdered," he would "favor an irrevocable death penalty for the killer," Mr. Dukakis replied with a stone-cold lack of emotion. His answer that he had always been against the death penalty was widely criticized for its blandness and impersonal quality.

Perhaps the difference was that Governor Dukakis already had a reputation as a mechanical man of little emotion. His response missed a golden political opportunity to demonstrate an understandable human reaction. But more than that probably was the attitude of the time toward people in public life.

As his friend, former Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, said the other day, Mr. MUSKIE ran at a time when reserve was expected of candidates. Had the New Hampshire episode occurred today, Mr. MUSKIE might have been widely commended for his behavior.

Four years ago, nominee Bill Clinton in debate with the more reserved President Bush won many voters by letting a questioner know that he "felt her pain." When she asked "how you can honestly find a cure for the economic problems of the common people if you have no experience in what's ailing them," Mr. Bush was nonplused but Mr. Clinton was ready with a reply based on what he had seen happen to real people in Arkansas.

If ED MUSKIE had been running for President today wearing his heart on his sleeve, it would probably have helped him. But that was a different time.

[From the News & Record (Greensboro, NC), March 30, 1996]

ED MUSKIE OF MAINE GAVE POLITICS A GOOD NAME

(Editorial)

ED MUSKIE of Maine gave politics a good name. What happened to him in New Hampshire did not.

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, who died earlier this week in Washington just 2 days short of his 82nd birthday, was a man who might have been President—and almost certainly would have been the Democratic Presidential nominee—except for dirty politics. Sleazy political tricks cost him his chance at the White House, but not his record of service or reputation as a person of character.

MUSKIE was in the public spotlight for 30 years as Governor of Maine, U.S. Senator, Secretary of State, Hubert Humphrey's Vice Presidential candidate and, briefly, the Democratic front-runner for President in 1972. He cared deeply for his country and its people. He was years ahead of most public officials in speaking out on environmental issues. While his quick temper sometimes caused him problems, he debated issues instead of personalities. He was also a charmer who could win opponents over with good will and the passion of his convictions.

MUSKIE never really got over what happened to him in the snows of New Hampshire 25 years ago. His firm belief in the essential goodness of man made it hard for him to grasp the political amorality that cost him his chance at the White House. But he never gave up his desire to make this country better.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE's bid for the 1972 Democratic Presidential nomination was destroyed by a political character assassin in the employ of Richard Nixon, the Republican President. During the New Hampshire Democratic Presidential primary in 1972 with MUSKIE clearly the leading candidate, an anonymous letter—based on a bald-faced lie—was printed in the Manchester Union Leader. The letter accused MUSKIE of using the derogatory term "Canuck" in reference to the region's many French Canadians. The letter turned out to have been written and sent to the newspaper by Kenneth Clawson, a political aide to Nixon. The newspaper also printed critical stories about MUSKIE's wife, accusing her of "smoking, drinking and cursing," in a day when that kind of insult carried enormous weight.

At that point, MUSKIE's temper got the better of his judgment. Out of patience with the newspaper over the "Canuck" letter and stories about his wife, MUSKIE lashed out at his critics in a snowstorm speech and, according to reporters watching him, shed tears. MUSKIE later said he wasn't crying, but was bothered by snow blowing into his eyes. It doesn't matter; the indignity gave him ample reason for tears. In any case, that episode began the rapid disintegration of his Presidential campaign. His support eroded and 6 weeks later he dropped out of the race.

MUSKIE returned to private life for awhile, but returned to government briefly as Secretary of State under President Jimmy Carter.

ED MUSKIE was a politician in the best sense, a conciliator and a peacemaker, who used persuasion to bring differing sides together for the common good. His style was nothing like the combativeness that prevails today. It was a lot better.

[From the Economist, March 30, 1996]

EDMUND MUSKIE

(Editorial)

With his huge frame and almost geological features, EDMUND MUSKIE always seemed cut out, in one sense, for immortalization on Mount Rushmore. That his profile is not in fact to be chiseled beside those of the greatest of American statesmen is a reflection of the fact that, for all his many successes in public life, his political stature never quite matched his physical proportions.

All this became plain in one of those famous moments of elucidation that, every 4 years, the long and arduous American Presidential campaign is meant to produce. Instantly forgotten are the carefully considered, sage pronouncements that the candidates offer on detailed matters of policy. Ever remembered are the spontaneous risings to the occasion (Ronald Reagan's put-down to the moderator of a debate in Nashua, New Hampshire in 1980 with the words: "I am paying for this microphone, Mr. Breen!") and the inevitable sinkings.

For Mr. MUSKIE, it was a sinking. With the opinion polls showing him clear favorite to win the New Hampshire primary in 1972, and pretty evenly matched against the incumbent President, Richard Nixon, Mr. MUSKIE broke down before the cameras, while defending his wife's honor on a flatbed truck in New Hampshire. The defense was necessary, in his view, because an attack had appeared in the ferociously right-wing Manchester Union Leader accusing Mrs. Muskie of drunkenness and unladylike behav-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ior, and Mr. MUSKIE of using the word "Canucks", a derogatory term for French Canadians.

Both charges, it was later learned, had emanated from the dirty-tricks department of the Nixon campaign. Never mind: Mr. MUSKIE responded emotionally, though whether or not with tears (he always maintained they were just snowflakes in his eyes) was in the end unimportant. Though he won the primary, it was not by the margin advertised, and by April he was out of the race. As he himself said, "It changed people's minds about me, of what kind of guy I was. They were looking for a strong, steady man, and here I was weak."

A TOUCH OF LINCOLN

Though the Manchester incident proved a defining moment, it did not do justice to Mr. MUSKIE, who was just as capable of the grand gesture as of the weak. On one occasion in 1968, for instance, when he was campaigning for the Vice Presidency as Hubert Humphrey's running mate, protesters opposed to the war in Vietnam disrupted his speech; their thunder was muted, if not stolen, when he invited them to send one of their number up to the platform for a more decorous debate.

Mr. MUSKIE's great strength was not his conscientiousness, though it was notable, nor his oratory, though it was often likened, as was his demeanor, to Abraham Lincoln's. Rather it was his plain honesty, all the more striking in the 1960s and 1970s when politicians were coming to be viewed as devious and deceitful. ED MUSKIE "had a slow, honest bottom-of-the-barrel integrity on tough issues," wrote Norman Mailer, and the voters evidently agreed.

Certainly, Mr. MUSKIE was a formidable vote-getter. His political career was based in Maine, a State so Republican that it had never had a popularly elected Democratic Senator until he won that office in 1958, having captured the governorship 4 years earlier as the first Democrat to do so for 20 years. The people of Maine liked Mr. MUSKIE's independence: early on, he showed he was ready to defy the might of the Senate majority leader, Lyndon Johnson, even though that cost him committee positions he wanted. The voters also liked his attacks on pollution and his defense of the environment, a cause on which he was an early campaigner.

But Mr. MUSKIE had weaknesses too. His temper, which flared like Maine's autumn foliage, was one. His lack of élan, that indefinable quality so necessary in politics, was another. A third was his judgment, which too often let him down; the remark in 1971 to a group of black leaders that the American electorate was not yet ready for a black on the national ticket, the pitiful effort to outmaneuver George McGovern at the 1972 Democratic convention. And in the end there was the sense, which somehow communicated itself to others, that Mr. MUSKIE did not really mind that much about the top job—hence perhaps his failure to secure it.

After 21 years in the Senate, Mr. MUSKIE was called by President Jimmy Carter in 1980 to become his Secretary of State. In his 10 months in the job, Mr. MUSKIE showed all his best qualities; his thoroughness, his straightforwardness (despite the potential for rivalry with Zbigniew Brzezinski, the President's ambitious national security adviser and Mr. MUSKIE's fellow Polish-American), and his bluntness. Not for Mr. MUSKIE too much diplomatic language; he was, after all, the man who had told the New York Liberal Party, "The blunt truth is that liberals have achieved virtually no fundamental change in our society since the end of the New Deal." Mr. MUSKIE was famous for responding to Nixon's victory in 1968 with the

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

words, "In Maine we have a saying that you don't say anything that doesn't improve on silence." But he also knew how to speak out.

[From the Portland Press Herald, March 30, 1996]

TO SENATORS AND CLERK, MUSKIE SPECIAL PERSON

(By John Richardson)

Nearly 300 visitors—from U.S. Senators to a neighborhood grocery-store clerk—paid respects Friday to the family of EDMUND S. MUSKIE at a funeral home that has buried many of the Nation's most important statesmen.

MUSKIE—a former Maine Governor, longtime U.S. Senator, U.S. Secretary of State and Presidential candidate—died Tuesday after a heart attack last week. He would have been 82 on Thursday. He will be buried today at Arlington National Cemetery after a funeral Mass in Bethesda, MD.

Called the most prominent man in Maine political history, MUSKIE was also remembered Friday as a neighbor, a faithful parishioner, even a gracious customer.

Victor S. Wilson came to admire the Muskie family through his job as a part-time cashier at the Giant grocery store near the Muskies' Bethesda home since 1968, the year MUSKIE ran for Vice President.

"I watched their children grow up," said Wilson. "They were just a very pleasant family, down to earth, gracious. . . . They're just good, solid people."

Wilson knew who MUSKIE was the first time he came in—"a man of character," he said.

"I think he acted on his values," Wilson said. "I think he was cut from a different piece of fabric than the current politicians, with certain exceptions. It was a different era. He was concerned for the common man. I wish there were 100 of him in the Senate."

On Friday, MUSKIE's body lay in a closed casket draped with an American flag and surrounded by colorful bouquets. His wife of 47 years, Jane, his two sons and three daughters and their spouses greeted admirers, occasionally sharing an emotional hug with an old friend.

Framed photographs of a smiling MUSKIE—the husband, the father, the Senator, and the Vice Presidential and Presidential candidate—decorated the stately rooms of the prestigious Joseph Gawler's Sons funeral home. The funeral home has buried a long list of prominent Americans, including Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey, who chose MUSKIE as his running mate in 1968.

Next to the guest registry was a recent photograph of MUSKIE relaxing on his front lawn signed, "To Jane, with all my love, and thanks for all the good years, ED."

Muskie's family chatted with visitors, while grandchildren entertained themselves in the labyrinth of sitting rooms.

Several family members wore old political lapel buttons—"Draft MUSKIE" and "McGovern-MUSKIE." Stephen Muskie, tall and lanky like his father, wore a stars-and-stripes tie with his navy suit.

The visitors included Senators William Cohen (R–ME); Fritz Hollings (D–SC), and Sam Nunn (D–GA); Representative John Baldacci (D–ME); John McLaughlin, a political commentator and Secretary of State Warren Christopher, who was a deputy to MUSKIE when he was Secretary of State in 1980.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Former Maine Governor Joseph E. Brennan and State Representative John Martin (D), Eagle Lake, came, as did others from MUSKIE's native State.

MUSKIE, the son of an immigrant tailor in Rumford, was a State legislator, a two-term Governor and a Senator for 22 years. He is considered a mentor by countless Maine Democrats who credit him with rebuilding the party and symbolizing dedicated public service.

"He never forgot who he was," said Martin, who worked as a political aide to MUSKIE in the 1960s.

MUSKIE's most permanent legacy may be the landmark laws to protect air and water that he crafted as a Senator during the 1960s.

"I don't think there's anyone in Maine history who will have as long-term an impact on Maine as ED MUSKIE," said Martin. "I mean in terms of doing things for Maine that will be forever lasting."

Many of those who came to pay respects were friends from metropolitan Washington, which had been MUSKIE's primary home since his first election to the U.S. Senate 37 years ago. He and Jane Muskie continued to visit their Kennebunk home during the summers.

Monsignor William J. Kane, pastor of the Church of the Little Flower in Bethesda, came to pay respects to "a man of great faith." The Muskies have been faithful parishioners at the church for 37 years, he said.

Kane will deliver a homily at the funeral Mass at 11 a.m. today. MUSKIE's two sons, Stephen and Edmund Jr., are expected to speak, as is former President Jimmy Carter.

MUSKIE, who served as Carter's Secretary of State and was a World War II veteran, will be buried at 1 p.m. today in Arlington National Cemetery. The ceremonies are scheduled to be broadcast on C–Span.

[From the Washington Post, March 30, 1996]

MUSKIE'S GIFT

(By Mark Shields)

Before he began his work, there were no national laws and no international agreements governing the quality of the country's air and water. None. When he began his work, nearly three-quarters of the Nation's rivers were unswimmable and unfishable. The Great Lakes were dying. In too many places, the air was a threat to a child's lungs and even to a community's life.

In no small measure because of the laws, he wrote, 20 years later three-quarters of the Nation's rivers were both swimmable and fishable. The Great Lakes were alive—recreationally, economically and spiritually. More than 95 percent of the lead had been removed from the Nation's air.

But more than the landmark environmental laws he crafted, the legacy of Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine is a truly healthier, safer and more responsible country. Of how many American Presidents can the same be said?

In compliance with current full-disclosure rules, let the reader know that I served as political director in MUSKIE's 1972 Presidential campaign. (Yes, during my tenure, MUSKIE went from dominant front-runner to disappointed also-ran.)

MUSKIE made permanent an environmental revolution. As his friend, protege and Senate successor, George Mitchell, put it on "The NewsHour With

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Jim Lehrer": "He changed the way Americans think and the way they live. It would be unthinkable now for someone to suggest that we suddenly let factories and municipalities start dumping all their sewage into rivers—which we did for almost all of American history until he changed laws and changed minds and changed attitudes."

Nearly as important as what ED MUSKIE did was how he did it. With a combination of perseverance, intelligence and integrity, he forged a legislative consensus in support of revolutionary and potentially divisive initiatives. He was able to enlist as his allies respected Republican Senate colleagues, including Howard Baker of Tennessee, John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky and James Buckley of New York. More often than not, MUSKIE won unanimous committee backing for his clean-air and clean-water proposals.

MUSKIE's leadership helped transform that consensus in Congress on the environment to a consensus in the Nation that strongly endures to this moment. The remarkable 1995 comeback from political limbo by President Clinton was made possible by Clinton's effectively casting himself against the new Republican majority as the protector of the environment and defender of many of the laws ED MUSKIE had written.

So why did such a leader fail when seeking his party's Presidential nomination? There are two explanations—one personal, the other political. The qualities of open-mindedness, patience and deliberation so critical to winning legislative support can be liabilities in the drive-by, sound-bite atmosphere of a multi-candidate Presidential primary, where the premium is often on a candidate's talent for confrontation rather than for consensus.

Politically, MUSKIE, along with former representative and Federal Judge Frank Coffin, was the founder of the modern Democratic Party in his home State. So dependably Republican had Maine been that the year MUSKIE graduated from college, it was one of only two States to support Alf Landon, the GOP nominee against Franklin Roosevelt. After two terms as Governor, MUSKIE in 1958 became the first Democrat in Maine history ever popularly elected to the U.S. Senate.

As a minority Democrat in a very Republican State, candidate MUSKIE's first task was to reassure the majority that he harbored no plans for nationalizing the banks or confiscating the country club. To win, the majority-party candidate must shrewdly submerge philosophical differences and emphasize instead personal qualities and shared values. Prior to his 1972 Presidential campaign, MUSKIE had never contested in a party primary against another Democrat.

I shall always remember that wonderful MUSKIE voice and the eloquence of his 1970 election-eve rebuttal to a strident President Richard Nixon: "There are only two kinds of politics . . . the politics of fear and the politics of trust. One says: You are encircled by monstrous dangers. . . . The other says: The world is a baffling and hazardous place, but it can be shaped to the will of men."

ED MUSKIE was, himself, that reasonable and decent man who trusted in the decency and reason of his fellow citizens.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

[From the Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME), March 30, 1996]

MUSKIE COVETED THE TRUST OF MAINERS

(By Kent Ward)

In a moving ceremony not unlike those that have occurred at Arlington National Cemetery since the first soldier was buried there in 1864, another good man who served his country well will be laid to eternal rest today in that hallowed ground not far from our Nation's Capital.

This service will strike a little closer to home than most of those past, however, since the bell will toll and the trumpet will sound for EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE, a distinguished son of Maine who died at a Washington hospital earlier this week just days short of his 82nd birthday.

Small-town lawyer, legislator, Governor of Maine and United States Senator, as well as Secretary of State for President Jimmy Carter during the latter bittersweet days of the Iran hostage crisis, MUSKIE cast a long shadow over the national political landscape. Yet he never forgot his blue-collar milltown beginning, nor did he forsake the Maine people who ultimately were responsible for thrusting him on to the world stage.

He knew, better than anyone, that he could never have been elected Governor in 1954 without the help of legions of so-called "MUSKIE Republicans" who crossed the party line to vote for him at the expense of their own candidate. Where others might damn the man with faint praise, Republicans would praise the man with faint damns. "He's a good man. Even if he is a Democrat," they'd explain, and in this neck of the woods most people had been programmed to understand the distinction.

Before long, fellow Democratic candidates for higher office had ridden the coattails of MUSKIE's success, provoking a sea change in the State's political makeup. Still, many a Republican continued to stick with MUSKIE in the privacy of the voting booth, jumping back to the other side of the ballot to support the Grand Old Party.

(There was, after all, no point in going to hell with the joke.)

Once, while reporting on politics for this fine newspaper and chasing him around the State as he campaigned for the U.S. Senate, I asked MUSKIE about the basis for such bipartisan support. "I'd like to think it's because I've earned their trust," he said, or words to that effect, and I remembered suspecting that he had undoubtedly pretty much hit the nail on the head with one succinct down-home Yankee sentence.

But woe to anyone who might question whether that trust might be misplaced. A fellow BDN reporter found this out the hard way during another MUSKIE campaign for re-election to the Senate. At a press conference where MUSKIE had gone into quite some detail about the various things he was hard at work on for the national good, she threw caution to the wind. "That's all very fine, Senator. But what are you doing for the State of Maine?" she wanted to know.

As your basic spontaneous heartfelt reactions go, this one was a doozy. The reporter said later that she had never seen steam come out of a guy's ears before, nor until then had she actually witnessed a living definition of the word "apoplexy." That exhibition of the infamous MUSKIE temper became the stuff of legend in the newsroom, and among old hands at the newspaper the story still inspires serious bouts of hilarity some 20 years after the fact.

Down in York County one night, MUSKIE addressed a local service club after a long, hard day of campaigning. Something—long since forgotten—

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

was said that set him off and he countered with a swift, clean surgical strike on the enemy's position. As I scribbled furiously from my vantage point in the back of the room he told the gathering, in essence, that he didn't know why he was wasting his time with them, anyway, since he had better things to do and, bottom line, he could most likely troll till Hell froze over and still not land a single vote out of the sorry Republican place. I don't know if his hosts were all that impressed with the tongue-lashing, but I certainly was.

My story got a good play in the morning paper, and a few days later a letter from MUSKIE arrived. Uh-oh, I thought, I've become persona non grata in the MUSKIE camp. But that turned out to be hardly the case. The newspaper story had been the most accurate reporting of his campaign he had seen in quite some time, MUSKIE wrote, and he wished to thank me for telling it like it was.

For The Man From Maine, interred today in the gentle Virginia countryside among the generals, Presidents, astronauts and heroes of the Nation's wars, "telling it like it was" was as important as earning the public's trust and not forgetting your roots.

Rest in peace, EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE. A grateful State will not soon forget you.

[From the Washington Post, March 31, 1996]

MUSKIE BURIED AMID TRIBUTES TO ENVIRONMENTALISM

(By Karl Vick)

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, of Maine, was laid to rest yesterday, on a cool, still day that carried both the promise of spring and a rich sense of how much one life can achieve, even if not every promise is realized.

"Of all the people I've known, no one was better qualified to be President of the United States," said Jimmy Carter, under whom MUSKIE served in 1980 as Secretary of State, his highest office.

Yet, Carter added, "I don't believe anyone has contributed as much to Americans' quality of life."

MUSKIE, 81, who died Tuesday was eulogized at a heavily attended Bethesda funeral Mass as a passionate, erudite and deeply feeling politician, a mischievous grandfather and an inspiration to staff members more accustomed to making do.

But the deepest tribute in a day of praise arrived backhandedly. It began with the acknowledgment that early in a 21-year U.S. Senate career, MUSKIE ushered through the first Federal laws mandating clean air and clean water.

He was "this Nation's most important environmental leader," said former Chief of Staff Leon G. Billings (D), now a State lawmaker from Montgomery County.

"Nothing surpassed what he did for the Nation's environment," said George Mitchell, the MUSKIE protégé who succeeded him in the Senate. "Anyone who wants to know ED MUSKIE's legacy need only go to the nearest river."

Yet the personal qualities that so many saw in the man—integrity, compassion and a bearing so statesmanlike it made a cliche of the adjective "Lincolnesque"—proved so compelling that the father of the environmental movement may well be remembered best for never becoming President.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

He ran only once.

"He was the ideal in public service," Mitchell said. "Integrity was more important than winning. Real intelligence meant more than sound bites."

MUSKIE served two terms as Governor of his native Maine before going to the U.S. Senate. He ventured into national electoral politics by accepting the second spot on the 1968 Democratic Presidential ticket with Hubert H. Humphrey, who later said he chose "the quiet one" to balance his own volubility. But in personal appearances, MUSKIE often was received more warmly.

His prominence grew in 1970, when MUSKIE voiced an impassioned plea for trust as an antidote to President Richard Nixon's "politics of fear." He entered the 1972 Democratic primaries as the presumptive front-runner, and before dropping out in April, he played the protagonist in one of the most dramatic scenes in modern political history.

From the bed of a truck backed up to the Manchester Union Leader, MUSKIE appeared to weep as he railed against a newspaper that had called his wife unladylike and printed a letter falsely accusing him of tolerating an aide calling French-Canadians "Canucks." The letter turned out to be one of the "dirty tricks" perpetrated by the Nixon White House, which did not savor facing MUSKIE in November.

The provocation was aimed at a "model moderate" who, as a Democrat from a squarely Republican state, always steered for the middle of the road. In the three rows of pews reserved for Senators at his funeral, Republicans, including Orrin Hatch of Utah and Nancy Landon Kassebaum, of Kansas joined the sizable Democratic delegation.

MUSKIE was also famous for his temper. To appreciative laughter, Mitchell recalled that the first time the 6-foot-4 Senator loomed over him, shaking a finger and bellowing about what he considered sub-par work, "I couldn't control the shaking of my legs, even though I was sitting down."

And MUSKIE was "more imposing intellectually than he was physically," Mitchell said. "He was the smartest person I ever met."

United Nations Ambassador Madeleine K. Albright, another former Muskie aide, said her old boss also was ahead of the times in terms of fairness to women. "The truth is this man was my role model," Albright said.

Albright, who represented President Clinton at the funeral, read a letter from the President to Muskie's widow: "Dearest Jane," it concluded, "thank you for sharing this great man with us."

Each of Muskie's five children took part in the Catholic service, held at Bethesda's Church of the Little Flower, before burial with military honors at Arlington National Cemetery. A World War II Navy veteran, MUSKIE was assigned to destroyer escorts in the Pacific and Atlantic fleets.

He died 2 days before his 82th birthday, but son Stephen O. Muskie said the family had a party Thursday night anyway. There were sixteen at the table, he said. They drank a toast and sang "Happy Birthday." Then the youngest of the Senator's seven grandchildren blew out the candles on not one but two cakes.

"Dad was not visibly present," his son said. "He was present in spirit."

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

[From the Dallas Morning News, March 31, 1996]

EDMUND MUSKIE, OUR ENGINEERING OFFICER

(By Bill Roberts)

He was our Abraham Lincoln, this tall drink of water from Maine who came aboard the U.S.S. Brackett DE–41 in the Pacific in early 1944. Our engineering officer, Mr. Tate, had been transferred to other duties. Like all crew members, the black gang wondered what was this guy going to be like? We were surprised that he didn't call us all together and make the "rah-rah" speech we had seen others make and then go to the wardroom, with little concern thereafter for what their division did or what the men under them were all about. We waited.

It was about 4 days later that he started to visit the engine spaces, introducing himself to each of the men on watch, asking them about their life aboard the ship, what was their life like before they joined the Navy. We sort of liked the down-to-earth approach he took. We appreciated his concern, and we liked the idea that we were teaching him about the idiosyncrasies of the ship. In the meanwhile, he was charting another course that would involve us, not only now, but in the years to come. He started bringing down the Navy's study books. Whatever rate you held you sure were to be visited by him and be the recipient of the book that would steer you toward the next higher rate.

"I'd like you to take this with you and read it. If you have any questions on the material ask me the next time you see me. If I don't know the answer, we will both find it together." It was like having your own personal teacher. Before we had any inkling of what was going on, the black gang was, no matter what the deck hands thought, getting educated. Once the black gang started to be promoted and elevated to the next pay scale, others on the ship started to wonder. The tedium and boredom of escorting baby carriers, troop ships and cargo vessels were over. We had something that kept our minds busy and a funny thing happened. Those with higher rates took time to help those aspiring crew members who found it difficult to understand some of the formulas and meanings of some of the words.

When part of the black gang got into trouble, he took care of the discipline himself, rather than have one go in front of Captain's Mast. He was an educator who cared for his men. He was the one with the keenest ear, whether it was listening to a sonar doppler sound when he had the conn on the bridge, or to the wavering voice of one of the black gang who got a bad news letter from home. He was your priest, your rabbi where there were none. He was a stalwart man.

We will miss you, EDMUND SIXTUS MUSKIE.

[From the Portland Press Herald, March 31, 1996]

'GREAT MAN' LAID TO REST; MUSKIE'S INTEGRITY, LEGACY HONORED

(By John Richardson)

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, remembered for changing the course of Maine and the Nation during five decades of public service, was buried Saturday afternoon with military honors at Arlington National Cemetery.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The burial followed a moving Roman Catholic funeral Mass and a series of eloquent eulogies from his family and from such figures as former President Jimmy Carter and former Maine Senator George Mitchell.

Their stories about MUSKIE—Maine's best-known political figure—more often led the hundreds of mourners to hearty laughter than to tears.

They reminisced about the wise, witty and humble son of a tailor whose efforts to protect the environment and promote dignity in public service will have a lasting impact.

"I don't believe many Presidents in history ever contributed so much to the quality of life in America," Carter told Muskie's widow, Jane.

MUSKIE grew up in Rumford and served two terms as Governor of Maine before moving to the U.S. Senate, where he represented the State for 22 years. He ran for Vice President in 1968 and President in 1972, and served as Carter's Secretary of State in 1980.

MUSKIE died Tuesday of a heart attack at age 81.

In a testament to his impact, the funeral Mass drew hundreds of mourners to the family's suburban Washington church, including Maine Governor Angus King, three former Maine Governors, three members of Maine's Congressional delegation and a legion of Senators and Congressional Representatives.

Police stopped traffic for the long processional as it followed the hearse from the church in Bethesda, MD, across the Potomac River and into Arlington.

There, seven members of the U.S. Navy Ceremonial Honor Guard stood rigid in black uniforms on the green hill overlooking MUSKIE's casket and a crowd of mourners.

The sailors fired three sharp volleys into the air. A lone bugler played Taps before members of the guard folded the American flag draped over the coffin and handed it to Muskie's widow.

In his eulogy, former Senator Mitchell called MUSKIE "my hero, my mentor, my friend" and the "greatest public official in Maine's history."

"He was loved and trusted by the people of Maine," said Mitchell, who retired from the Senate last year. "He was the ideal in public service, a man who accomplished much without compromising his dignity or ideals. He taught us that integrity was more important than winning."

Paraphrasing Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, Mitchell said, "A great man has died and for years his light will shine upon our paths."

Madeleine Albright, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and a former aide to MUSKIE, read a message from President Clinton, who did not attend the funeral.

"Our Nation was blessed to have ED MUSKIE in public service so long," Clinton's message said. "He was a leader of conscience and conviction. . . . Citizens across our country and around the world are lowering their flags to half staff today."

Like Mitchell, Carter called MUSKIE his hero.

Carter, the former Governor of Georgia, recalled that when MUSKIE was a frontrunner for the Presidential nomination in 1972, he invited the Senator to the Governor's mansion to try to impress him and, possibly, get the second spot on the ticket.

MUSKIE's candidacy never got that far. His quest for the Presidency was cut short when the Senator denounced a newspaper report that was critical of his wife. Some said MUSKIE cried at the press conference; it effectively ended his campaign.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

In later years, said Carter, he came to rely on the Senator's judgment: "I turned to him often."

With his administration in trouble in 1980, the former President asked MUSKIE to serve as his Secretary of State. Carter said MUSKIE made it possible for the American hostages held in Iran to come home. "Typically, ED did not seek any credit for that achievement," said Carter.

Stephen Muskie, the oldest of the five Muskie children, told the mourners about another side of Maine's elder statesman. He remembered crawling into his father's lap in front of the fireplace at their cottage next to China Lake and listening to a story.

"The story was replete with the kind of sound effects the public never heard from Dad," he said.

Albright, who worked on MUSKIE's Senate staff, offered her own memories and credited MUSKIE for her success. "I do love Eleanor Roosevelt, but the truth is this man was my role model," she said.

Many former MUSKIE staff members—some of them former Governors and Senators themselves—were among those who filled the Church of the Little Flower. One man, an aide from MUSKIE's 1968 campaign for Vice President, drove from New Jersey with his young son. Both wore MUSKIE lapel buttons.

Like other former staffers, Albright joked about MUSKIE's legendary temper, his endless questioning and his use of "incorrect vocabulary."

"Sometimes working for you wasn't a day at the beach," Leon Billings said in his eulogy to MUSKIE, drawing laughter. Billings was MUSKIE's former chief of staff, and often the target of his volatile temper. But, said Billings, staffers "had complete faith in his intellect, commitment and integrity."

Mitchell and others said MUSKIE's most lasting legacy is his effort to protect water and air quality. MUSKIE was the architect of landmark environmental protection laws in the 1960s.

"Nothing surpasses what he did to protect America's natural environment," said Mitchell. "It's one thing to write and pass a law. It's another thing to change the way people live. It's yet another and quite difficult thing to change how people think. ED MUSKIE did that."

Added Billings: "We came here to say thank you for five decades of public service and friendship, and most of all we came here to thank you for being the first steward of the planet earth."

Speaking again to MUSKIE, Billings said that environmental protection was "a concept you invented, a concept you institutionalized and a concept you internationalized. You changed the way the world acts toward the environment. That legacy will endure as long as people breathe on this earth."

[From the Washington Times, March 31, 1996]

MUSKIE EULOGIZED AS ENVIRONMENTALIST, NEGOTIATOR; CARTER, MITCHELL SPEAK AT FUNERAL

(By Andy Thibault)

Two days after EDMUND S. MUSKIE died, his family had a birthday party for him.

"We drank a toast to him and sang 'Happy birthday,'" the late Senator's son, Stephen, told more than 1,000 mourners at the Church of the Little Flower in Bethesda yesterday. "Of course, the celebration was bittersweet, because Dad was not physically present."

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Yet, Stephen Muskie said, his father's spirit was evidenced by the vocal inflections, witty puns, hearty laughs and quiet contemplation of the sixteen family members at the dinner.

The church fell silent as the son recalled sitting on his father's lap 40 years ago by a crackling fire in a cold Maine cabin, listening to his favorite story about a bear who took his youngsters fishing in a motorboat.

"The story was replete with sound effects the public never heard from Dad," Stephen Muskie said, eliciting laughter that rang out regularly during five other eulogies, including one from former President Jimmy Carter.

Mr. MUSKIE died Tuesday at Georgetown University Medical Center, 2 days before his 82nd birthday. He had suffered a heart attack March 21.

He was buried with military honors yesterday at Arlington National Cemetery. As Secretary of State in the waning months of the Carter administration, Mr. MUSKIE supervised negotiations that brought the 52 American hostages home from Tehran.

"In the last few days of our administration, it was ED MUSKIE's integrity, his sound judgment, that made it possible to bring every hostage home, Mr. Carter said at the service. "Typically, ED MUSKIE didn't receive any credit for that achievement."

A four-term Maine Senator, Mr. MUSKIE gave up a safe seat to serve Mr. Carter after a failed hostage-rescue mission in April 1980. Mr. Carter, former Maine Senator George J. Mitchell and other mourners cited environmental measures such as the Clean Water Act of 1972 and the Clean Air Act of 1977 as among Mr. MUSKIE's most important legacies.

Industries routinely dumped waste into rivers and spewed dangerous chemicals into the air before Mr. MUSKIE was able to spur Federal legislation on the environment, the speakers said.

"He helped us be better stewards of God's creation," said the Reverend William Kane, celebrant of the Mass.

"Any American who wants to know what ED MUSKIE's legacy is need only go to the nearest river," Mr. Mitchell said. "Before ED MUSKIE, it was almost surely not fit to drink or to swim or to fish in. Because of ED MUSKIE, it is now almost surely clean."

Mr. Mitchell, who started his career as a Senate aide to Mr. MUSKIE, said fellow Mainers loved and trusted him because he exhibited qualities they admired—independence, fairness, lack of pretense, plain speaking and a willingness to tell the truth no matter what the consequences.

Leon Billings, a former chief of staff for Mr. MUSKIE, recalled pressing his boss about a poor showing during a fishing trip in Alaska with Mr. Carter.

"It's easy to catch them if the Secret Service ties them down," Mr. Billings said Mr. MUSKIE had told him to explain the President's success.

Mr. Carter disputed that point later in the service, saying the Secret Service really wasn't that close to the action.

Also speaking at the service was U.N. Ambassador Madeleine K. Albright, who read a message of condolence from President Clinton.

Mr. MUSKIE became a nationally known political figure in 1968, when Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, the Democratic Presidential nominee, selected him as his running mate. They narrowly lost to Richard M. Nixon and Spiro T. Agnew.

Among the mourners yesterday were many Senators and Congressmen, including Democratic Senators Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York, Christopher J. Dodd of Connecticut and Paul Simon of Illinois.

Mr. MUSKIE is survived by his wife, the former Jane Gray; two sons, Stephen of Peterborough, NH, and Edmund S. Jr. of Reston; three daughters,

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

Ellen Allen of Reston, Melinda Stanton of Marshfield, ME, and Martha Muskie of Washington; and seven grandchildren.

[From the Washington Post, March 31, 1996]

MUSKIE: REASON TO WEEP

(By David S. Broder)

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, the former Governor of Maine, Senator and Secretary of State, who died last week at the age of 81, was an apostle of civility and a politician of rare vision, who battled constantly with his own temperament and the temper of his times.

He was the No. 2 man with Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota on the 1968 Democratic ticket—perhaps the only ticket in my time on which both men clearly could have been and should have been President. Instead, we got Richard Nixon—some consolation prize!

The obituaries of MUSKIE were appreciative but barely did justice to the clarity with which he addressed two overriding national issues decades before most other politicians came to grips with them.

As chairman of the Senate's intergovernmental relations subcommittee—a backwater assignment if ever there was one—he made it the forum in the 1960s for that favorite issue of the 1990s, downsizing the Federal government and shifting power and responsibility to the States.

That was hardly the mind-set of most Democrats in the era of the Great Society, but MUSKIE and a handful of others insisted that as the scope of governmental responsibilities widened, the constitutional relationship between the States and Washington needed protecting. MUSKIE was not averse to activist government; he wrote much of the new environmental protection legislation enacted in the next decade. But he was wise enough to see that many of the new domestic initiatives needed to be tailored to the varying conditions of the 50 States. As later events proved, he was right.

MUSKIE's second great insight was that Congress needed to put its fiscal house in order. This goal has yet to be achieved, but he was working on it 20 years before the authors of the Republican Contract With America took the issue to the country.

With the leadership of MUSKIE and conscientious Republicans like then Senator Henry Bellmon of Oklahoma, the effort quickly moved beyond partisanship and led to the creation of the congressional budget process—now the centerpiece of each year's legislative work. MUSKIE was the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee and was instrumental in keeping the deficits minuscule by today's standards.

All of this—plus a leadership role on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—made MUSKIE a natural for national office. He was the favorite for the nomination in 1972, but the Nation and the Democratic Party were being ripped apart by controversy over the Vietnam War. MUSKIE—an instinctive moderate who moved in small steps from support of the war to opposition—was unable to satisfy those who insisted that their position, whatever it was, was the only morally permissible one.

As if that were not enough, Nixon and Spiro Agnew set out in the 1970 mid-term campaign to convince the country that Democrats were guilty of "appeasement" of communism abroad and of crime at home. MUSKIE rebuked them in an election-eve television address, as applicable today as it was then, contrasting "the politics of fear and the politics of trust."

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

But the man who preached reasonableness and reconciliation was himself a man whose emotions were easily provoked. And in the 1972 New Hampshire primary, when Nixon operatives baited him (as we later learned) by planting in the compliant Manchester Union Leader a forged letter accusing him of prejudice, MUSKIE lost his composure, alternately raging and weeping in frustration, while denouncing the newspaper. The scene raised questions about his stability, and his campaign slid downhill.

As a reporter on the scene, who still has a guilty conscience about unwittingly helping the Nixon saboteurs do their work by publicizing MUSKIE's emotional reaction to their libel, I was saddened that footage of that awful breakdown in the blizzard was being replayed more often than anything else in the TV obituaries.

I prefer to remember him on a summer night in 1983, in a big circus tent on the lawn of a State park outside Portland, ME, when he joined the local symphony orchestra as the narrator in Aaron Copland's "Lincoln Portrait," entertaining the Nation's Governors, who were in town for their annual meeting.

MUSKIE's admirers always compared "Big ED" to "Honest Abe," not just because of his height and shambling gait and innate candor and endless stock of humorous tales, but because—like Lincoln—he could weep at injustice and still proclaim his faith in the bonds of trust that hold Americans together. That night, hearing that fine deep voice of MUSKIE's intone Lincoln's magnificent words of reconciliation at the Gettysburg battlefield, many of us wept—as we do now at his death.

[From the Portland Press Herald, March 31, 1996]

AS SPORTSMAN AND STATESMAN, ED MUSKIE WAS THE FINEST KIND

(Editorial)

He was the kind of companion any fishing or hunting party would have welcomed. He did not want a boat load of fish or a game bag filled with birds and other wildlife.

ED MUSKIE was a cautious, capable sportsman and an excellent marksman.

The political exploits of the former Secretary of State have been well chronicled. But MUSKIE was also a good fly fisherman and patient outdoorsman who loved to spend as much time on a lake or river bank as possible. He always fitted in, like a pair of old gloves.

He never sought special treatment; he could wait for a strike while trolling Moosehead Lake or jigging a hunk of cut bait through a hole in the ice at China Lake. If he caught a fish he gave it all the credit possible. If a fish got away, he cheered it for outwitting him and wished it years of life in a clean environment.

I was interviewed about him after his death on the east bank of a Maine river, the first to be cleaned up under the Federal Clean River and Water Bill which MUSKIE was greatly responsible for passing while in the U.S. Senate.

Messalonskee Stream was keeping the snow melt and rain runoff between its banks. Overhead, a flock of Canada geese honked, heading north to nest and perpetuate the species. A bald eagle soared above, as the emblematic bird had done for many springs.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

"How was MUSKIE as a hunting companion?" one of the television interviewers asked.

He was patient but skilled. If he was in clear line to shoot at a flushed pheasant, ruffed grouse or woodcock, he would do so with accuracy befitting a veteran at the sport. He seldom missed.

MUSKIE enjoyed fly-casting for wild brook trout and did well at it. He was particularly pleased to be taken to a wilderness beaver flowage, casting where a trout was waiting.

His desire to partake of a perch fry once led to an ice-fishing trip to China Lake with Lloyd Davis and Art Thibodeau. Muskie's son Steve drilled holes in the ice while MUSKIE cleared them. MUSKIE then followed Thibodeau's instruction on jigging the baited hook and caught his share of perch.

Bird hunting was another favorite MUSKIE pastime. It mattered little what species were being hunted. He always exemplified caution in the handling of firearms, whether in a waterfowl blind or in wild bird habitat.

In an ice fishing shack after saltwater smelts, or after grouse in dense woodlands or black ducks from a coastal blind, MUSKIE was always the good, safe companion.

Hubert Humphrey once said of MUSKIE, "He has qualities of intuition, judgment, and wisdom. He carried them in all walks of life."

That is why he was a great sportsman.

[From the Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME), April 1, 1996]

NATION HONORS MAINE'S 'GREATEST'; JIMMY CARTER, GEORGE MITCHELL EULOGIZE MUSKIE

(By Paul Kane)

ARLINGTON, VA—America paid tribute Saturday to the most important environmental lawmaker in history, the man who tried to save a Presidency from certain failure, the man who turned Maine into a two-party State, the man known as "the greatest public official in Maine's history."

With full military honors and a 21-gun salute before former President Carter and hundreds of others whose lives he touched, EDMUND S. MUSKIE was laid to rest on a crisp spring afternoon.

MUSKIE, just 2 days shy of his 82nd birthday, died of a heart attack Tuesday in Washington's Georgetown University Hospital.

Barely a tear was shed as Carter and five others, including two of Muskie's sons and former Maine Senator George Mitchell, eulogized MUSKIE's unwavering integrity and his willingness to take unpopular stands.

They celebrated his work as Governor of Maine, his relentless pursuit of the Nation's first environmental laws as a U.S. Senator for 21 years, his unsuccessful bids for Vice President in 1968 and President in 1972, and his diplomacy as Secretary of State.

"I turned to ED MUSKIE as one of my closest advisers. He was still a hero to me," Carter told mourners at the Church of the Little Flower, the Roman Catholic church just outside Washington where MUSKIE worshiped since first being elected Senator in 1958.

Carter joked about his first meeting with MUSKIE, when MUSKIE was running for President in 1972 and the young Georgia Governor tried to curry favor with the Senator from Maine, hoping for a spot on the Vice Presi-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

dential ticket. Carter put MUSKIE up for a night in the Governor's mansion, expecting MUSKIE to be "more sophisticated than I was."

When Carter offered to make a drink, MUSKIE asked for a scotch and milk. "I was taken aback," Carter said. Embarrassed at not knowing anyone who drank scotch and milk, Carter poked his head back into the room: "Sweet milk or buttermilk?"

"Sweet milk," MUSKIE said. At his lowest moment as President, however, Carter turned to MUSKIE again. In April 1980, a rescue mission in Iran trying to free 53 American hostages had ended in failure, with helicopters crashing in the desert. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance had resigned in protest, and Carter's entire Presidency was facing an attack from Senator Edward Kennedy in the Democratic primaries.

"I turned to ED MUSKIE and I asked him if he would serve," Carter recalled. MUSKIE stepped in as Secretary of State, and in the Carter administration's final days and hours in January 1981, his relentless work "made it possible to bring every hostage home safe." "Typically, ED MUSKIE did not seek any credit," Carter said.

MUSKIE energized the once dormant Democratic Party in Maine, and spawned a group of politicians and diplomats, including Mitchell and U.N. Ambassador Madeleine Albright, both of whom were MUSKIE aides.

Mitchell, former Senate majority leader, said few Congressmen ever accomplished so much legislative success, particularly with the clean air and clean water acts MUSKIE wrote and saw passed in 1970.

"ED MUSKIE changed things for the better," Mitchell said.

Leon Billings, a MUSKIE aide for three decades, said, "You changed the way the world acts to the environment. That legacy will last as long as people breathe." Calling MUSKIE, his "hero, my mentor, my friend," Mitchell said, "Just about everything I know about politics and government, I learned from him."

Mitchell laughed about MUSKIE's sharp temper, which he demonstrated when Mitchell first met the Senator at his first job interview to become a MUSKIE aide.

But the angry tirades would never last, Mitchell said. ED MUSKIE was not one to dwell on the negatives.

"Maybe that's how he got past the disappointments he suffered," Mitchell said.

As the 75-minute ceremony came to a close, EDMUND MUSKIE made his final journey through Washington, police directing a motorcade nearly a mile long through the Nation's capital across the Potomac River and into Arlington National Cemetery.

There, six members of the U.S. Navy Ceremonial Honor Guard held a U.S. flag taut over the casket as Muskie's pastor, Monsignor William Kane, gave the final prayers and benediction. In the distance, seven soldiers fired three rounds. A lone bugler played taps.

The soldiers then folded the flag, 16 times, into a crisp triangle. It was given to Muskie's wife, Jane. She walked away with the flag tightly wrapped under her arms.

Afterward, the family held a reception in the Capitol's Mansfield Room. Six weeks ago, the same room was the setting for Senator William Cohen's wedding.

A memorial service for MUSKIE will be held in Maine sometime in April. Mrs. Muskie and the family are expected to decide on the date and place sometime this week.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

[From the Bangor Daily News (Bangor, ME), April 1, 1996]

A CLEANER ANDROSCOGGIN IS MUSKIE MONUMENT

(By John S. Day)

They came to say goodbye to "Big ED."

With humor and fond memories.

A former President.

Diplomats, Senators, Governors, former staffers.

And many ordinary people who love Maine and saw the State's rugged character personified in EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

Jimmy Carter joked about outfishing his former Secretary of State 15 to 1 during a stopover in Alaska. Contrary to MUSKIE's popular slander, the 39th American President asserted, Secret Service agents did not "tie down the fish" and affix them to the White House fly hook.

Stephen Muskie, the Senator's oldest son, remembered long-ago summers at the family's lakeside cottage in Maine, and his father's imaginative way of telling children's stories "replete with the kind of sound effects the public never heard from Dad."

Leon Billings, a MUSKIE adviser most of his adult life, recalled screwing up the courage to address his old boss by his first name shortly after both men retired from government service.

"So, it's going to be ED now?" MUSKIE answered imperiously.

There were anecdotes about MUSKIE's legendary temper.

His vocabulary was often politically "incorrect," said Madeleine Albright, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and former MUSKIE aide. Former Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell relived the terror he felt during his first encounter with Maine's political legend 34 years ago. Mitchell was a young Justice Department trial attorney in Washington trying to return to his Maine roots. As part of his job interview with MUSKIE, Mitchell was instructed to write a legal brief on a political issue pending action by Congress.

"Unknowingly, I reached the opposite conclusion of the Senator.

He didn't waste time with small talk. Instead, he launched into a furious cross-examination of my memo, taking it apart line by line," said Mitchell, who confessed his knees began shaking during the confrontation.

"I hope you'll be better prepared next time," MUSKIE told the man who ultimately succeeded him in the U.S. Senate.

"That was his way of letting me know that I had been hired" Mitchell said.

MUSKIE's legacy, Mitchell said, is the clean environment we now take for granted.

The folklore of MUSKIE's activism is well-known. Upon his arrival in the Senate in 1959, Democratic leader Lyndon Johnson asked whether MUSKIE would support his position on a coming vote.

Not having made up his mind yet, MUSKIE imprudently answered that the clerk calling the Senate roll hadn't gotten to the M's yet.

An angry Johnson banished MUSKIE to the least politically attractive Senate assignment, the Public Works Committee, which later would deal with pollution laws. Despite strong opposition, much of it coming from the paper companies that dominated Maine's economy, MUSKIE eventually drafted and gained passage for the Federal clean water and clean air laws.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The Senator often told reporters that childhood images of the pollution-choked Androscoggin River in his hometown of Rumford inspired him to seek a cleaner environment.

"There have been about 1,800 men and women who have served in the Senate since our Nation was founded. Only a handful have legislative records of accomplishment comparable to EDMUND MUSKIE," Mitchell said.

"It's one thing to write and pass laws. It's another to change the way people think. He actually changed the way the American people act and think with respect to the environment," Mitchell said.

There will be many monuments to MUSKIE in future years. Bridges and schools will be named for him. But there's a stretch of highway along the Maine-New Hampshire border that gets me thinking about the man. I pass along it two or three times a year in my travels back to Maine.

I covered the Old Town City Council as a young reporter during the early 1960's when MUSKIE was battling the paper companies over clean water regulations. One of the local councilors was an engineer at what now is the James River paper company. He objected to the cost of a new sewer plant being mandated by MUSKIE's Clean Water Act.

The engineer was an outdoorsman. He owned a canoe. He was not a corporate shill.

"We have to face facts," he argued. "The Penobscot River has only one useful purpose now—to transport waste to the Atlantic Ocean."

I more or less agreed back then. Growing up in western Maine, I saw what he saw. My high school teams played against the mill kids in Mexico, Jay, Livermore Falls, Lisbon and Madison.

The damp sulfur smell was the first thing you noticed as you approached those towns. Next came billowing smoke clouds and a canopy of smog. Finally, the rivers—so polluted the stuff floated on top of the water.

Like the engineer from Old Town, I never thought the rivers could be cleaned up.

A couple of years after that council meeting, however, a ski trip to Sugarloaf got me thinking in other ways. Some former college buddies and I struck out for the New Hampshire slopes to round out the weekend.

Suddenly, along Route 16, there was a beautiful river. The water was so clear you could see bottom rocks.

"What's that?" I asked.

"The Androscoggin," a companion answered.

I didn't believe him at first. This couldn't be the same water that down river was stinking up the mill towns in my high school football conference.

Most of America's rivers now look like the pristine stream I first glimpsed from Route 16 three decades ago.

Even the rest of the Androscoggin below the mills in Rumford and Jay.

That's Big ED's monument.

The air we breathe, and the water we drink.

[From the Los Angeles Times, April 2, 1996]

ED MUSKIE AND THE SECOND POLITICAL RESURRECTION OF RICHARD NIXON

(By Howard Baker, Jr. and Alton Frye)

In the crevices of a great career, one sometimes discovers true character. So it was with EDMUND MUSKIE. His many public roles garnered esteem, but perhaps the most revealing confirmation of his quality as a statesman

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

lies in an unknown facet of his public service: ED MUSKIE was a central figure in the political resurrection of Richard Nixon.

The story will surprise most people who knew the two men, but it offers an extraordinary demonstration of how concern for the Nation's interest can bridge the most intense partisan differences. The tale is a tribute to both men, exemplifying a civility and capacity to cooperate that is rare among veterans of political combat.

In the early months of the Reagan administration, many observers in both parties worried that U.S. policy was tilting too sharply into a rigid nonnegotiable posture toward the Soviet Union. President Reagan's rhetoric and the policy impulses of some of his appointees were so fiercely anti-Soviet that it appeared doubtful any useful business could be done with Moscow. In particular, the negotiated restraints on nuclear arms, so laboriously crafted in the Nixon, Ford and Carter administrations, were in jeopardy.

By 1983, worry about the downward spiral in superpower relations had crossed the line in alarm. Some questioned whether it was possible to find common ground between Republicans and Democrats on the divisive issue of U.S.-Soviet relations. And even if there were the basis for a bipartisan approach, how could it be framed to enlist President Reagan's personal interest—especially if he received counsel against the grain of his deep-seated convictions about the "evil empire"? Mutterings in various Washington settings ran frequently to the theme that, if anybody could tender sensible advice that Reagan would consider, it was Richard Nixon.

But Nixon was still damaged goods, an outcast viewed warily by the Reagan circle. To consult him was not a natural impulse, particularly when some officials considered him either too soft on the Soviets or too likely to overwhelm their own preferred positions on dealing with the Soviets. How, then, could Nixon's strategic insight and diplomatic experience be brought into play?

Pondering the question in discussions with us, ED MUSKIE recognized the possibility of doing so by engaging his former political adversary in a confidential initiative to offer President Reagan independent views from outside the normal bureaucratic channels. For Reagan to take counsel from Nixon in partnership with a former Democratic Secretary of State and Presidential contender would be a very different matter from listening to Nixon as a solo advisor. The concept was intriguing and Nixon proved more than curious and willing to talk.

As a first step in the delicate exercise, MUSKIE met with Nixon at the New York apartment of his daughter Tricia Nixon Cox. When the two old warriors sized each other up, what was most striking was the total lack of rancor. Whatever the residue from the bitter campaign battles they had fought, not least the dirty tricks perpetrated against MUSKIE by Nixon's lackeys in 1972, the two men moved immediately to focus on their shared concerns about the impasse in Soviet-American diplomacy.

Out of that initial conversation grew a sequence of consultations that opened a channel for quiet advice to President Reagan as he moved through the 1984 election and into a more forthcoming period of negotiations with the Soviets in his second term.

The consultations were fascinating. All participants, including the authors, required confidentiality, especially MUSKIE, for whom the risks in the collaboration were greatest. It could have been exceedingly harmful to the Democratic candidate (Walter Mondale) if the incumbent defended himself against foreign policy challenges by announcing that he was receiving advice from the previous Democratic Secretary of State. To their credit, Reagan

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

and James Baker, then White House Chief of Staff and the inside contact for the project, respected that requirement and did not exploit the effort for political advantage. (The venture did become public in January 1985, when Life magazine published a photograph of a meeting among Reagan, MUSKIE, Nixon and Howard Baker.) For his part, MUSKIE informed only Mondale and did not discuss the substance of the private exchanges with Reagan.

In preparing ideas for Reagan, the three outsiders (MUSKIE, Nixon and Howard Baker) circulated a good many papers, although the group did not meet often. But they found their ideas broadly compatible and their encounters memorable. MUSKIE and others involved met a different Nixon from the one who had resigned his office. He retained the extraordinary strategic grasp and the workaholic habits for which he was known, yet he now conveyed a good humor and cheerful detachment that made it easy to be with him. The coiled-spring quality and strained efforts at hearty camaraderie that marked Nixon at the height of his ambition had yielded to a warmer, more natural personality, albeit one still tinged with formality.

At his New Jersey home or in a restaurant, Nixon was an exceedingly gracious host, open-minded in discussion and more comfortable to be around than one would have imagined. An ultimate gesture of personal thoughtfulness came one evening at Nixon's home, when be broke out a wine bottled in 1914, the year MUSKIE was born. Perhaps to their own surprise, the men enjoyed each other's company and were reinforced in their sense that they could work together. The cautious first approach from MUSKIE to Nixon gave way not to a bond of friendship, but to a genuine mutual regard.

The effort culminated in a luncheon session with Reagan at the Waldorf Astoria on September 27, 1984, following Reagan's address to the United Nations. What did they tell the President? One point of emphasis concerned the exorbitant verification standards being pressed by some arms control critics in the administration. Nixon's message was that adequate verification was feasible, and he argued that Reagan should not allow that issue to be the linchpin of the entire negotiations. MUSKIE underscored the building blocks that prior strategic arms agreements (SALT I and SALT II) could provide for the major strategic reductions to which Reagan was already committed. Given Reagan's advocacy of "Star Wars," MUSKIE steered clear of arguments about strategic defense, realizing that he was more skeptical of its promise and more worried about its destabilizing potential than the other participants. The conversation ran not to details of nuclear theology, but to the statecraft needed to reverse the dangerous turn that had developed in the languishing relationship with the Soviet Union.

Whether that discussion and the group's other communications had a major impact on Reagan's subsequent movement toward strategic arms negotiations, no one can say. But the tenor of their counsel certainly ran in that direction. Perhaps most important, largely due to MUSKIE's involvement, this series of efforts went far toward legitimizing Nixon's emergence as a senior statesman.

The MUSKIE-Nixon collaboration was the prelude to Nixon's continuing service in his latter years, including the meetings with Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin on which he drew for reports to Presidents Reagan and Bush. By 1988, a private meeting with Nixon, flown to the White House for that purpose, did more than anything to engage Reagan in the business of that year's Moscow summit. As Nixon spoke at length about the critical questions coming up, Reagan appeared mesmerized. (That visit, by the way, gave Nixon his first glimpse of his wife's portrait hanging in the White House.) Out of his fallen predecessor's return to service also came what

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

President Clinton has called the best brief advice on foreign policy he ever received, a compliment to Nixon that Clinton says his own advisors did not entirely applaud.

So there you have another vignette of ED MUSKIE's contributions to the republic. Not his greatest achievement, but a notable measure of his magnanimity as a man and his pragmatism as a political leader. Knowing that his views would carry little weight if voiced by him alone, he enlisted the perfect ally in a cause they both considered vital. No statesman could have done it better—indeed, it may be that no one else could have done it at all.

[From the Ellsworth American, April 4, 1996]

THE MAN FROM MAINE

(By Marvin Ott)

For of all sad words of tongue or pen
The saddest are these: "It might have been!"
By John Greenleaf Whittier

Once again, we have been reminded—in a most painful way—of Maine's extraordinary contribution to national political life. Following close upon the passing of Margaret Chase Smith and the retirements of Senator George Mitchell and Senator William Cohen, we now have the unexpected death of former Senator EDMUND MUSKIE. To understand how singular Maine's postwar record of political representation in Washington has been, one need only compare that of the two largest States, California and New York, during the same period. It is an open and shut case.

If Margaret Chase Smith was this State's most beloved political symbol, MUSKIE was its greatest public servant. He belongs to that small handful of Senators—Hubert Humphrey, Richard Russell, Arthur Vandenberg, Everett Dirksen, Philip Hart, Lyndon Johnson—who have shaped modern America. He could have—with an even break from the fates—risen still higher. There have been three tragic "might have beens" concerning the Presidency in this century: the premature death of Theodore Roosevelt (foreclosing an almost certain return to the White House), the assassination of John F. Kennedy, and the failure of MUSKIE's campaign for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1972. No one has ever been better qualified for the Presidency and this writer, like many others, is convinced he would have proven a truly fine President. Think how different American history would have been had a MUSKIE administration come into office in 1972. There would have been no Watergate and the whole sad legacy of citizen distrust of the Federal Government and the poisonous politics it has produced. MUSKIE's diamond-hard integrity would have been a powerful antidote to that whole tendency.

Contrast our current politics of top-of-the-lungs zealotry and ill-informed certitude with these words MUSKIE composed for a Presidential prayer breakfast in 1969:

Teach us to listen to one another, with the kind of attention which is receptive to other points of view, however different, with a healthy skepticism as to our own infallibility. Teach us to help one another, beyond charity, in the kind of mutual involvement which is essential if a free society is to work.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

MUSKIE lived by his words and spent his entire political career working closely with colleagues of both parties in a tireless search for common ground.

Senator MUSKIE's career was not one focused on foreign policy. But it was a keen interest. His first preference for a committee assignment upon entering the Senate was Foreign Affairs. Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson denied his request. Much later, in 1979, President Jimmy Carter asked him to leave the Senate and become Secretary of State. It was not a job MUSKIE had sought and many were surprised when he accepted. The omens were hardly favorable. The Carter administration was in a tailspin with the President's political standing in the country melting like a snowman in July. The Iran hostage ordeal made MUSKIE's year as Secretary about as unpleasant as it possibly could have been. So why did he accept the post? Partly, it was, by his own words, the challenge. But it must also have been that a President in trouble was seeking his help. It was not in Senator MUSKIE's makeup to walk away from such a request.

Surprisingly—and Senator MUSKIE would probably be one of the most surprised—his career is likely to leave a profound imprint on U.S. foreign policy and international affairs generally. The reason lies in his role as the original architect of America's environmental legislation. For good reason he has been eulogized as "the first steward of the planet earth." We live in a political moment when it has become fashionable to pretend that the Federal Government can do nothing right and everything wrong. Yet in the last 30 years, America's major rivers and lakes have been transformed from toxic dumping grounds into healthy playgrounds and the air, while not entirely clean, has become far healthier for those of us who breathe it. This miracle of public policy is traceable directly to the landmark of legislation authorized by Senator MUSKIE and his counterpart in the House, Representative Mo Udall.

There are growing signs that environmental issues will emerge as core concerns of foreign policy and national security policy in the decades ahead. The Secretary of State recently directed all bureaus in the department to give environmental factors high priority in their respective areas of responsibility. The Pentagon has created an Office of Environmental Security. The CIA and military intelligence agencies have established a program to provide sensitive intelligence data to environmental scientists. Environmental issues make increasingly frequent appearances on the agenda of the National Security Council. The impetus comes from facts on the ground. China, for example, in its breakneck drive to industrialize, is poisoning its land, water, and air on such a scale that it will soon have serious negative consequences for the entire globe. Most of this has happened since ED MUSKIE left government. But he laid the foundation. It is part—and only a part—of the remarkable legacy of a small-town lawyer from Rumford.

[From the Montgomery Advertiser, April 4, 1996]

ED MUSKIE STILL HEROIC TO INTIMATES

(By Edwin Yoder)

WASHINGTON—The tributes to EDMUND S. MUSKIE from those who knew him well show that even in a cynical age a man can be a hero to his intimates.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

I knew him hardly at all, but I can add a few firsthand snapshots to the collection. They all suggest his singularity.

The beloved Senator Sam Ervin Jr., whom I regularly interviewed and wrote about during my newspaper days in North Carolina, once told me in an interview that ED MUSKIE was the keenest intellect he had encountered in his years in the Senate.

"If the Constitution ever needed rewriting," Ervin said, "ED MUSKIE is one of the few I'd trust with the job." It was a handsome compliment from one who was thought of as the Senate's resident constitutional expert.

A year or so after this conversation, I moved unexpectedly to the Capital to work for The Washington Star and found myself surrounded by former MUSKIE lieutenants. Berl Bernhard, the Star's legal adviser, had been an aide of MUSKIE's in the 1972 Presidential campaign. Learning of my admiration for his old boss, Berl arranged a private meeting. We met one sparkling autumn morning in MUSKIE's hideaway office in the Capitol.

I came primed with big questions. What was on ED MUSKIE's mind, however, was Campobello, the Nova Scotia island where Franklin D. Roosevelt had vacationed, now jointly maintained by the United States and Canada as a memorial to the 32nd President.

MUSKIE served as a trustee and spoke of it with transparent enthusiasm. The talk of Campobello led into a conversation that stretched on through the morning about FDR and his political legacy and the effect on our history of the fact that Roosevelt, as a young man, had been stricken with polio at Campobello. MUSKIE knew American history and cared about it. It struck me that here, among the outsized egos of the Senate, was a man with both feet on the ground and his priorities straight, utterly lacking in self-importance.

That was our only really personal meeting. Our last, far briefer, came a few years ago at a Gridiron Club dinner, the festive occasion of mutual kidding between press and politicians. As we walked in to dinner, I found myself beside the towering MUSKIE, who was now stooped and visibly aging. I mentioned a recent newspaper piece of his I had admired. MUSKIE had skewered a strange position which the Reagan administration was advancing on the interpretation of the anti-ballistic missile treaty—that the classified and inaccessible "negotiating record" shed more authoritative light on American and Russian intentions under the treaty than what the Senate had been told when ratifying it. MUSKIE's angular face lit up. His heart was in an issue that most Senators considered too esoteric to worry about. MUSKIE knew that it went to the heart of the vital constitutional balance between Presidents and the Senate.

Between those two meetings I learned something else about MUSKIE, quite by chance. One fine spring day in 1980, a few days after the failed effort to rescue the American diplomatic hostages in Tehran, President Carter invited three journalists to lunch. We sat in the April sunlight, just outside the Oval Office. Iran and the hostages were on Carter's mind. The atmosphere was pleasant and the talk discursive, and when the President excused himself after an hour or so the three of us agreed that the visit was social not journalistic.

Had we written about it, however, none of us would have failed to mention the most startling thing the President said—that he had appointed ED MUSKIE as Secretary of State (replacing Cyrus Vance, who had resigned) without consulting anyone other than his wife, Rosalynn Carter. "I didn't discuss it with anyone but Rosie," Carter declared. I can't be sure at this remove, but three pairs of eyebrows probably went up when he said it. As

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

I think about the revelation 16 years later, it seems further testimony to the confidence MUSKIE inspired.

These are, as I say, snapshots. But all confirm what a loss the Nation suffered when MUSKIE's Presidential bid freakishly failed and we lost a chance to be led by this good and brilliant man.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, April 10, 1996]

REMEMBERING SECRETARY MUSKIE

(By David D. Newsom)

When EDMUND S. MUSKIE died on March 26, the tributes spoke warmly and accurately of his service as a United States Senator and, especially, of his contributions to cleaner air and water. His shorter but equally distinguished service as Secretary of State is also worthy of tribute.

From May 5, 1980 until January 20, 1981, it was my privilege to serve as his Undersecretary of State for political affairs.

Senator (he preferred being called Senator) MUSKIE came to the Department of State at a difficult time. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, highly respected in the Department, had resigned over the rescue attempt in the Iranian desert. Fifty-two U.S. diplomats remained hostage. Relations with the Soviet Union were tense; the Washington debate over Russian policy was unresolved. State Department personnel wondered about the new boss coming from that other government on "the Hill."

The new Secretary quickly dispelled doubts. In his first meeting, jokes obviously honed by years on the campaign trail in Maine relieved the tension. After being sworn in, MUSKIE called for a series of meetings with officers responsible for various geographic areas. He wanted to hear their views on current policies. Bureaucratically skeptical, many officers first wanted to know "where he was coming from." They soon found out he really did want to hear other views; some of the freshest discussions of policy issues resulted.

MUSKIE's domestic political roots were part of his everyday life. His heart was always in Maine, where he had been Governor and legislator. Veterans of his political campaign and Senate staffs like Leon Billings, now in the Maryland legislature, came with him to the Department. He used to say that "the role of Secretary of State was politics on a global scale." Ties to Senate colleagues remained close but were tempered by a recognition that his role as a policymaker in the executive branch carried different responsibilities.

He found the same tensions that had plagued some of his predecessors. President Carter assured his new Secretary of State that he would be the primary spokesperson on foreign policy. But Carter diluted the charge by stating that MUSKIE would understand that he would, from time to time, want others to speak out for him.

Shortly after he took office, we saw one of the rare flashes of a MUSKIE temper about which we had heard reports. He was to give his first major speech on Soviet-U.S. relations. As we sat with him in a staff meeting that morning, an assistant brought a wire-service item about a background briefing given by a White House official on how the speech should be interpreted. His color rising, he left to phone the official. We never heard of any further efforts to give advance "interpretation" to a MUSKIE speech.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The Iranian hostage crisis hung like a sword over him throughout his brief term, but he sought and seized opportunities that might break the impasse. When a new Iranian premier was appointed in April 1980, MUSKIE wrote to him. Despite some advice to the contrary, he publicly addressed the new government in Tehran. His gesture was seen by the Iranians as a sign that negotiations might be possible, and they began seriously shortly thereafter. The hostages were released as he was making his final exit from the Department, but, even then, politics plagued his achievement. The new Reagan team refused his request to use the State Department auditorium to brief the press on the Algerian agreement that resolved the crisis.

Those of us who had the opportunity to work with Secretary MUSKIE were indeed privileged. We were associated for all too short a time with one who embodied the finest traditions of political courage and public service.

[From Commonweal, May 3, 1996]

EDMUND S. MUSKIE

(By Abigail McCarthy)

LET US NOW PRAISE HONORABLE MEN

When former Secretary of State EDMUND S. MUSKIE died recently, a neighbor couple came to call on his wife Jane. "We always liked and admired your husband," they told her, "but we didn't really know that he was a great man." In a way it was as if, like those neighbors, the whole country came belatedly to that realization and to the realization of what we owe him. But it was not only a belated but a limited realization.

Columnist David Broder, perhaps, as he has been called, the pre-eminent American political journalist, wrote that MUSKIE was an apostle of civility and a politician of rare vision. "The obituaries of MUSKIE were appreciative but barely did justice to the clarity with which he addressed two overriding national issues decades before most other politicians came to grips with them." One was the necessity of equalizing the relationship between the Federal Government and the States as governmental responsibilities grew and widened. The other was the need to put order into congressional spending, and in response to that need, he led the way to the establishment of the budget process.

Few people can and do appreciate these fine but important points of governance and their effect on the country, but we can all give thanks for MUSKIE's greatest gift to us—clean air, clean water—a livable world. Commentator Mark Shields said it best:

Before he began his work, there were no national laws and no international agreements governing the quality of the country's air and water. None. When he began his work, nearly three-quarters of the nation's rivers were unswimmable and unfishable. The Great Lakes were dying. In too many places, the air was a threat to a child's lungs and even to a community's life.

In no small measure because of the laws he wrote, 20 years later three-quarters of the Nation's rivers were both swimmable and fishable. The Great Lakes were alive—recreationally, economically, and spiritually. More than 95 percent of the lead had been removed from the Nation's air.

To to that MUSKIE had to change the way people thought. He had to stem the unbridled despoliation of field and river and lake and terrain that for

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

200 years Americans had accepted as necessary for progress. He had to bring about a revolution in the way people lived and acted, convert them from selfish heedlessness to healthy, sane, and safe practices that benefit the whole community. And he did just that quietly and effectively. How?

The way lay in his character. A striking example of one of his basic beliefs is recounted in a letter to the editor of the Washington Post after his death. Former Ambassador Julius Walker told of a staff meeting at which MUSKIE presided when Secretary of State. One of the subjects was how the United States should vote on a forthcoming resolution at the UN. All the attending assistant secretaries advised against voting for it. It might split the NATO countries, cause problems with other states, etc. Secretary MUSKIE ended the discussion by saying that nevertheless the United States would vote for the resolution. "Because it is right," he said. Principle outweighed politics.

As Secretary of State he could enforce what was right by fiat. It was one of his very human characteristics that, as he often frankly said, he preferred being Governor of Maine and Secretary of State—offices in which he exercised final authority—to being in the Senate where legislation was a matter of consensus. Yet he was the quintessential legislator; almost reflexively, the eulogists at his funeral called him Senator. He was the master of achieving consensus, of persuading colleagues of both parties to unite in support of ground-breaking and politically threatening initiatives. He could do that because he was fair, open to other Senators' problems, deliberative, and convincing. But in the end he could do it because what he was advocating was right and others recognized the basic integrity on which his cause was based.

In his tribute at the final service, former President Jimmy Carter said that no man was more presidential or more worthy of being President than ED MUSKIE. That he never became President is attributed now to the shabby press handling of an incident during the 1972 primary campaign, an incident unfortunately exhumed by far too many news shows at the time of his death. He was a victim of several of the Nixon-planted "dirty tricks" during that campaign. He was finally driven to an emotional public attempt at refutation in New Hampshire when the infamous Manchester Union Leader was fed and published a scurrilous attack on his wife. A man of deep feeling, he is said to have wept. At the time his emotion and frustration were depicted as signs of instability and weakness. His campaign languished and eventually died.

Reflecting on this at the time of MUSKIE's death, David Broder wrote that he still has a guilty conscience about "unwittingly helping the Nixon saboteurs do their work by publicizing MUSKIE's response to their libel." Others noted the sea change in public opinion that now welcomes and approves a display of feeling by a President. There was ironic and touching evidence of this in the speech Stephen Muskie, the eldest son, gave to gathered friends. He spoke emotionally, with unabashed love and sentiment, of a father dear to his wife, and five children, of a grandfather who delighted his grandchildren with mischievous play, and was met with emotion in return.

Great men are essentially human. MUSKIE could rage at injustice but exhibited great reasonableness and a spirit of reconciliation in working for justice. Like George Washington, he contended with a towering temper as he strove for moral rectitude. Like Lincoln, to whom he was often compared, he had a fondness for humorous and sometimes earthy stories and disarming candor.

ED MUSKIE was a man of faith. Every Sunday at home saw him at his parish Mass and, a world traveler, he sought out a church wherever he was.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

His fierce patriotism was rooted in his pride in a country in which he, the son of a Polish immigrant, could achieve a professional education and high office. He loved his books, especially histories; he also loved golf and spectator sports. He believed in his fellow man and practiced the politics of trust. He walked by his own words spoken in 1970. "The world is a baffling and hazardous place, but it can be shaped by the will of men." We shall miss him.

[From the New Democrat, May/June 1996]

REMEMBERING ED MUSKIE

(By Al From)

HIS LEADERSHIP ON A RANGE OF ISSUES MARKED HIM AS A POLITICIAN WAY AHEAD OF THE CURVE

Many Americans are understandably cynical about politics these days. Raised on an unhealthy diet of sound bites and photo ops, they see the political arena as a place where enduring values are suspect, and where the honest exchange of ideas matters less than the clashing of verbal swords.

Some of us, though, were lucky to be raised with a different political experience, one that set an enduring example that put cynicism to shame. We know that public service can be morally and intellectually invigorating. And we have an obligation to share that experience when the occasion arises, as it did last March with the death of former Senator EDMUND MUSKIE of Maine.

I worked for MUSKIE from 1971 until 1978, some of his most productive years. He wasn't the easiest man to work for. His temper was legendary, his cross-examinations withering, his demeanor gruff.

But for those of us who worked for him, the lessons about public service he taught by example will last a lifetime; that integrity is to be valued above all else; that public service is a calling, not a job; that ideas matter in politics, and that making them real requires us to move beyond political party; that liberty and democracy are to be revered, even when they're disorderly. There was no place for cynicism here.

MUSKIE's legacy is enormous. He was best known for his pioneering work in environmental protection. How important was his contribution? This is how former Senate majority leader and fellow Mainer George Mitchell put it: "If you want to know about ED MUSKIE's legacy, take a deep breath, or walk down to the nearest river."

MUSKIE's eulogists, however, largely neglected to note his leadership on what today would be called the New Democrat issues. His potions on a range of issues—budget reform, Federal and State responsibilities in the post-New Deal era, pruning away the deadwood in government, to name a few—marked him as a politician way ahead of the curve.

In two groundbreaking speeches—to the Liberal Party of New York in October 1975, and to the Democratic Party platform committee in May 1976—MUSKIE delivered a blunt message to his fellow liberals: To preserve progressive governance, we had to reform liberalism. His words remain remarkably apt today.

"We (liberals) failed in 1972 to reach a majority consensus for liberal change," he told the Liberal Party. "And on the eve of 1976, we face the grim possibility of failing again." He continued:

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

How can that happen? After 7 years of a Republican administration distinguished only by its failures, how could the American electorate fail to vote for a new liberal administration? When we know what's right, how can so many Americans not follow our leadership? How can so many Americans miss the point?

The answer, I submit, is that we have missed the point.

For in the past decade, liberals have developed an ideology and state of mind that is narrow, unimaginative, and often irrelevant. Four decades ago, we had discovered the possibilities of government action to better the lives of Americans. People were excited by the possibilities and they prospered as a result. But something has happened since then—and it's basically happened to us.

People still are discontented. They still want change. Yet when the average citizen turns to us for help, what does he find? Consider the 1972 national platform of the Democratic Party. It was a wonderfully comprehensive and esoteric document. Yet the results of the election showed that the 1972 platform was irrelevant, for all practical purposes.

For in promising so much for so many, it was meaningless. The Democratic platform of 1972 represents to me the culmination of years of liberal neglect—of allowing a broad-based coalition to narrow, of progressively ignoring the real fears and aspirations of people, and of assuming we know best what the people need.

I read my mail, I talk with voters, and I listen. I find people everywhere who can't cite from the Federal Register but know what's wrong anyway. They feel victimized by the economy. Their jobs are in danger as layoffs continue. Yet all around them they see special interests which have escaped these troubles if they are big and powerful enough. Money and power buy access to government, whether it's Lockheed or a firemen's union. Most important, they don't believe that government really cares about them. All they need is one encounter with some government bureaucrat to confirm that.

A year from now, people will again choose their leadership. What alternative will we offer?

Why can't liberals propose fundamental changes in the structure of the executive branch that published this year a 799-page manual just to explain its structure?

Why can't liberals start hacking away at the regulatory bureaucracy where it keeps costs up and competition away?

Why can't liberals talk about fiscal responsibility and productivity without feeling uncomfortable?

My basic question is this: Why can't liberals start raising hell about a government so big, so complex, so expansive, and so unresponsive that it's dragging down every good program we've worked for?

Yet we stay away from that question like it was the plague. We're in a rut. We've accepted the status quo. We know that government can do much to improve the lives of every American. But that conviction has also led us to become the defenders of government, no matter its mistakes.

MUSKIE expanded on that point in his speech to the Democratic Platform Committee:

Some Democrats seem to accept waste and inefficiency as a cost of helping people—a commission we pay for a Faustian bargain to protect what little we have gained—and that attacking waste somehow amounts to a repudiation of the New Deal.

Well, all I can say is, what's so damned liberal about wasting money?

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

I never heard Franklin Roosevelt say we had to reject reform ideas because we had more to lose than to gain. Instead, I heard him call for "bold, persistent experimentation," and say in 1936 that "government without good management is a house built on sand."

The Democratic Party is still engaged in the debate that MUSKIE began a generation ago. It takes a long time to turn a national party around. But for those of us who learned from him, it's worth trying. As he said in the conclusion of his speech to the Liberal Party:

Plainly, we cannot move forward without questioning . . . basic assumptions and running certain dangers. The American people have already spoken: Government must put its own house in order before it takes on new and bigger responsibilities.

And as long as we shrink from offering an alternative to a system of government people have lost confidence in, we can expect to remain a minority.

Our challenge is to restore the faith of Americans in the basic competence and purposes of government. We must recognize that well-managed, cost-effective, equitable, and responsible government is in itself a social good. We must do this secure in the conviction that the first priority on efficient government is not a retreat from social goals, but simply a realization that without it, those goals are meaningless.

The New Democrat movement did not emerge onto the national political scene until long after ED MUSKIE retired from public life. But his powerful words, spoken two decades ago, were the seeds from which it sprouted.

○