from the bottom of our hearts, and we look forward to working with you. I know I certainly do.

HONORING RON BROWN AND TED WEISS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, when Senator BRADLEY spoke and he said he believed that this Senate would continue forward despite the fact that so many fine people on both sides of the aisle are leaving, it occurred to me that he is right, that the incredible strength of our democracy is the fact that we move forward. When there is a void to be filled, somehow, even though you think it never will be—and it may take more than one person to fill the void of one person's departure; it may take three, it may take four—I just hope that we will all read the comments of the Senator from New Jersey, because one point he made is that he tried to stay away from the meanness of it all that we sometimes face.

I hope in that spirit we will in fact pass two bills that were just objected to by the majority, one to rename a Federal building in New York after Ron Brown and one to rename a Federal building in New York for Ted Weiss. Both of these men served their country so well.

Ron Brown, as Secretary of Commerce, did so much in his lifetime to move forward the cause of economic justice and to bring prosperity to all the people of this country. He died serving just that cause, that human cause. He died in a tragic plane crash with some other quite wonderful people. It seems to me we ought to come together as Democrats and Republicans and make this tribute to him and to his family.

Ted Weiss, someone I served with for 10 years in the House of Representatives, the toughest fighter for health care for those who need it. The people of New York want to remember Ted this way. We ought to come together and make that possible.

THE OMNIBUS PARKS BILL

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we ought to come together on this omnibus parks bill that is so important to 41 States. It seems to me that when the House sent us over a bill which passed virtually unanimously—I think it had four or five or six opposing votes—that was a statement that the controversial projects were dropped from the parks bill.

If Republicans and Democrats in the House could come together on a parks bill, my goodness, why cannot we bring it up here and get it done? The majority leader says he wants to get it done. I have no reason at all to doubt that. But I must say, Mr. President, that I understand the rules of the Senate. I know it is in his hands to bring this bill before the U.S. Senate. He has chosen not to do that. If he had brought this bill up like he did the FAA bill, we could have filed a cloture motion. Mr. President, I daresay we would have had 70, 80, maybe 90 votes in favor of bringing debate to a close and passing that parks bill.

How do I know this? Well, for one, I have spoken to most of my colleagues individually. I know that every single Democratic Senator is in favor of this bill, and I know that the vast majority of Republican Senators are in favor of this bill.

Forty-one States. Alabama has two important parks projects in the bill, a historic trail designation and funding for a historic black college. Alaska has 10 projects included in this bill. Arizona has four. Arkansas has two. California has 17. Colorado has nine. Florida has one. Georgia has two, Hawaii has one. Idaho has five. Illinois has two. Kansas has two, including the Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve, which is so important to the Senators from Kansas. Louisiana; Maryland; Massachusetts has four. Michigan has one; Mississippi two; Missouri one; Montana two; New Hampshire two; New Jersey two, and one of those is Sterling Forest, which is so important to make that land purchase.

New Mexico has five. I have spoken to both Senators from New Mexico, one a Democrat, one a Republican. They are most anxious to get this parks bill passed. New York has two projects. Ohio has one. Oklahoma has one. Oregon has eight. Pennsylvania has two; one each in Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas; four in Utah, including the Snowbasin exchange, the Sand Hollow exchange, the Zion Park exchange, and a ski fees proposal. Virginia three; Washington State has three. West Virginia has one. Wisconsin has one. Wyoming has three.

Then there are several others, including Martin Luther King Memorial; American battlefield protection, which is so key; Japanese-American Patriot Memorial, and some very important national park agreements.

Mr. President, no one could ever stand up here and say that this bill is perfect. I daresay no bill is perfect. It may only be perfect to the bill's author. But in this case, so many people worked on this bill. In many cases it took 2 years to get some of these provisions together.

Why am I so concerned? We have the Presidio in San Francisco, a former military base with an extraordinary history. We want to set up a nonprofit public trust corporation to ensure that this magnificent sight becomes a jewel in the National Park System. We know we can do it with this trust. If we do not have this trust, we are going to have to do everything we can to have vision to make this work. But we know, just as the Pennsylvania Avenue rehabilitation took a trust, that a trust would be able to really do this job for the Presidio.

We have other things in here for California that I worked on, bills that I wrote for Manzanar which would preserve the very dark history of the days where our Japanese-American friends were placed into camps, internment camps during World War II. We want to preserve the history because we learn from history.

This bill is strongly supported by everyone in the House and in the Senate. We have a very important provision in here for the Cleveland National Forest. So we have many things in our State.

But I truly am not here simply because of what is in this bill for California, although clearly it is very important to our State. This bill is an excellent bill. It came over from the House with tremendous bipartisan support. There is no reason why we should not be voting on this bill.

The majority leader knows the rules, knows if he had brought it up, we could have filed cloture, we could have had the vote, and we would have had the bill.

He has chosen instead to say, I want to do this by unanimous consent. Well, that runs a bit of a risk, Mr. President, because just one Senator, in even an anonymous fashion, could object to this entire package. I just, frankly, do not think that is fair. Too much work has gone in, too much sweat, too many tears, too many expectations, too much work to allow, it seems to me, one Senator to stop this bill.

Now, I am hopeful that we can get every single Republican to support this bill. As I say, as far as I know, the vast majority do. I just want to say to those who would consider objecting to this bill because something they wanted did not get in it, the beauty of the legislative process is that you live to fight another day.

Now, this year I have been most fortunate in being able to accomplish a lot of my agenda. I am most appreciative of everyone, both in my State and on the committees here, who helped me do that on both sides of the aisle. I am most fortunate. It has been very productive for me. If this goes down, this will be a harsh loss to me, but I can truly say we will fight again. Why should 41 States be deprived of this bill? We have the votes here to do it. We should have seen the bill brought up. We should have had our vote. This bill should be on the way to the President.

Now, it can still happen by unanimous consent, but if one Senator takes a position that he or she is going to say, ''I didn't get everything I wanted; I only got a few things for my State; I didn't get everything, therefore I am going to object,'' if one Senator does that, that is a harsh thing to do. I want to keep reminding the Senate about this. I know I will sound like a broken record, but that is a harsh thing to do.

For many years I have been working on an ocean sanctuary bill—started 14 years ago—to not allow the Federal waters off the coast of California to have additional oil drilling off that coast because of its dangers. I have a tremendous amount of support. Yet,