

made such cogent speeches in support of the amendment. Regrettably, it was defeated 51-49.

I understand that debate on S. 1026 will continue today and perhaps into next week and that other amendments relating to ABM and NMD may be offered. I hope that our serious concerns about these issues as well as others outlined in the Statement of Administration Position may yet be addressed. But let me be clear: unless the unacceptable missile defense provisions are deleted or revised and other changes are made to the bill bringing it more in line with administration policy, the President's advisors will recommend that he veto the bill.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY LAKE,
Assistant to the President
for National Security Affairs.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do not know of any other alternative than to file cloture, which probably the Democrats have made a decision they do not want this bill to pass and that we cannot obtain cloture, but I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1026, the Department of Defense authorization bill:

Bob Dole, Strom Thurmond, John Warner, Bob Smith, R.F. Bennett, Spencer Abraham, D. Nickles, C.S. Bond, Trent Lott, Jon Kyl, Craig Thomas, Larry E. Craig, Connie Mack, Dan Coats, Bill Cohen, John McCain.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. So, Mr. President, I do not see any reason to keep my colleagues here any longer. But it is fairly clear to this Senator that for reasons stated by the Democratic leader, we will not complete action on this bill tonight. But it will be the intention of the majority leader that after, hopefully, disposition of the Treasury, Postal bill we will go back to this bill tomorrow afternoon.

There will be votes tomorrow. There will be a lot of votes tomorrow. I do not want anybody to leave town thinking, "Oh, well, we have got that taken care of." But, again, let me say to my colleagues, I would hope that we could cooperate here in the next 4 or 5 days and try to get out of here for at least part of the August recess. And I know everybody has plans or would like to have plans. Everybody asks, "Why can't we say now we can leave next Friday?" This is a good reason why we cannot say we can leave next Friday. We could have finished this bill by this morning or tomorrow afternoon, but we are told that is not possible. If we took all these amendments we could not go to final passage.

It is pretty obvious that there may be enough Members on the other side

to prevent us from obtaining cloture. And even if cloture is obtained, you have 30 hours. That would take some time.

So there will be no more votes this evening. And we will do our best to proceed tomorrow on the Treasury, Postal bill.

MORNING BUSINESS

(During today's session of the Senate, the following morning business was transacted.)

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE OF VERMONT'S ENVIRONMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of the most important aspects of the quality of life in my native State of Vermont is the quality of our environment. We can swim in our lakes, fish in our streams, camp on public lands, hike through the woods, and breathe fresh air without risking our health. The quality of Vermont's environment is recognized nationally and drives much of the economy for us in Vermont.

Vermont's environmental quality depends on Federal environmental laws to set standards and fund cleanups—this is an undisputed fact. The Clean Air Act has reduced air lead levels by 99 percent, carbon dioxide emissions by 50 percent, sulfur dioxide by 40 percent, and acid rain chemicals by 27 percent. However, many cities have experienced ozone levels this summer that are twice the maximum healthy limit. Some Americans simply cannot take an afternoon walk without experiencing breathing troubles. Polluters do not have the right to deprive people of an afternoon walk, and as a Senator from a State downwind of one of the country's biggest ozone generators in the country, New York City, I am concerned. Clearly, we have more work to do.

In 1970, 60 percent of Vermont's communities discharged raw sewage into the State's waterways and bacteria consumed so much oxygen that many of the State's streams could not support fish. Through the Clean Water Act and other efforts, we have provided at least secondary waste treatment facilities for all communities and reduced point-source phosphorus pollution by 80 percent. With the Department of Agriculture's help, more than 400 Vermont farmers have contributed a total of \$5.8 million to match \$13.4 million of Federal funding to reduce the phosphorus runoff from farms. On the other hand, 1,500 hazardous waste sites in Vermont threaten the groundwater for some of the 120,500 public and private wells, and the State recently had to issue a mercury warning for Vermont fish. We still have work to do to protect our children and our communities from water pollution.

Vermont's fish and wildlife populations are relatively healthy because of international wildlife treaties and

domestic efforts to protect habitat in Vermont. Where we once had abandoned farms and woodlots during the Depression, we now have the Green Mountain National Forest—350,000 acres of habitat for black bears, songbirds, and even Atlantic salmon. In 1985 Vermont had its first nesting pair of peregrine falcons since the 1950's; last year 11 pairs fledged 31 peregrine chicks. Still, nine species of native mussels are threatened by the zebra mussel, and heavy metals such as cadmium have been found in moose and deer liver. Without constant vigilance, certain fish and wildlife populations may slip into decline as they have in other parts of the country.

I am proud to share these successes, and hope that others will join me in enjoying the fruits of our efforts to protect the environment. The results of our hard work have made Vermont a better place to live for families. Vermont's quality environment provides activities like swimming, snowmobiling, boating, fishing, hunting, hiking, and camping that keep us refreshed and entertained all year long. Many of these activities are Vermont traditions which have been passed from generation to generation. I do not want to give these up.

I also want to make people aware, however, of an effort to turn back the clock on these successes. There is a new four-part strategy in Congress to dismantle environmental protections in our great country. The antienvironment lobbyists and some Members of Congress are using indirect, backdoor efforts to gut the statutes that have helped us clean up and protect our environment. I want people to understand what the new majority is doing so that we can turn back these attacks.

The first step in this strategy is to cut the funding of environmental and natural resource agencies. This year alone, the House of Representatives cut the Fish and Wildlife Service by almost 25 percent, the National Biological Service by 30 percent, and the Environmental Protection Agency's [EPA] enforcement budget by 50 percent. Without officially repealing the Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Clean Air Act, the new majority has made it nearly impossible for the Government to carry out these goals.

Their second step is to create regulatory gridlock. The so-called Regulatory Reform Act forces agencies to do study after study, each one subject to lawsuits from well-financed corporate industries. The EPA estimates that the studies will require hundreds of new staff and delay new environmental rules by several years, if not indefinitely. By cutting the budget but increasing the workload, it is clear that some people want to tie the hands of the EPA so it is powerless to protect the environment. They are saying, "Go ahead and pollute because we don't give a hoot."

The third part of the attack on the environment is the unfunded mandates law that the 104th Congress has already passed. This bill says that the Federal Government cannot ask State governments to enforce environmental laws unless the Federal Government provides the funding necessary to implement and enforce them. While the bill does not affect current laws, we would not have our Safe Drinking Water Act, Clean Water Act, or Clean Air Act if this law had been in place 25 years ago.

The final piece of the four-part attack is the so-called takings legislation. This legislation is based on the premise that anybody can do anything they want on their land, regardless of what the impact is on their neighbors, their community, and their country. Senator DOLE's takings bill forces the Government to pay cash to landowners who are asked to do something to protect the environment, such as putting a filter on a smokestack or not cutting trees within 50 feet of a river. Essentially, the bill forces the Government to pay a landowner not to pollute, not to harm endangered species, and not to fill in wetlands. Since our Government has a deficit already, it is clear that the proponents of takings legislation believe that the bill will force the Government to allow polluting since we cannot afford to pay people to stop.

This is only the tip of the iceberg. There are other bills to open hundreds of thousands of acres of wilderness to mining and oil drilling, perpetuate the golden giveaways in the 1872 mining law, turn over more public land to subsidized ranchers, and suspend environmental laws that regulate national forest logging. I am afraid that we face a difficult challenge protecting the environment in the 104th Congress. But I know that the environment is important to the American people. And I believe people will not tolerate these attacks. Everyone who shares even a remote concern for the environment and the world our children will inherit needs to be aware of the efforts underfoot. There are many ways that Americans can come together to stop the anti-environment effort. The people of this country did not ask this Congress to turn back the clock. They should not try and we should not let them.

STUDENTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF FEDERAL COLLEGE AID

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as we continue to navigate the budget process and make difficult decisions about spending cuts, we must look harder at our priorities and make sure that our choices are sensible.

It is easy to fall into the trap of looking at budget numbers in an abstract way and forget about the very real consequences that cuts in student aid will have on young men and women in this country.

The most compelling arguments for the preservation of student aid are

made by the recipients of that aid whose lives have been changed for the better by the education they have received. My office has received over 1,500 statements from students or former students responding to the proposed cuts of that aid. Almost to a person, they say that aid is crucial. I ask unanimous consent that a sample of these statements may be printed in the RECORD. The States where these students live or attend college are listed, but other identifying information has been removed.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA

When my oldest sister went to college grants were offered to lower income students. Today, loans are the only offers in abundance. Education for America's future is not a priority. It should be.

ALABAMA

(1) After having gone bankrupt and losing a lot of my material goods in 1993, college did not appear to be in any way even close to an option. At that time I was not familiar that someone of my age could even apply for financial aid. I did apply. I was awarded with financial aid. I have been on the president's honor roll now for three out of five quarters at the University of Alabama-Birmingham. My major is Social Work with an emphasis in working with people with disabilities. I am also learning sign language. With the internalized experiences that I now have—in putting my life back together—I have too much to offer the field not to go in that direction. I hope one day to open a vocational training center in wood working and welding for the deaf. I will succeed.

I can certainly empathize with congressional constituents in attempting to cut the budget. It cannot be an easy task I know. But the last place that I would think that you would want to cut would be education.

ARIZONA

(1) I am now a Junior at the University of Arizona, and I am studying Material Science and Engineering. I come from a single parent household, and at the age of 18, I left home because my mother could not afford to keep up the rent on the home we lived in. Without the financial aid I get, I would have to work about 30 hours a week instead of the 12-15 hours that I do work now in order to support myself. Living with my mother's boyfriend is not an option because we do not see eye to eye on many things, and living there would put too much undo strain on all parties involved.

I am a first generation American of Mexican descent, therefore my mother didn't attend college and from what I have heard, my father didn't graduate from high school. I have an opportunity to be the first member of my entire extended family to attend a university and earn a degree. Financial aid is vital to my survival here.

I know there are more out there with my story, so please don't cut financial aid, it will hurt those of use who really need it. I can't afford to work many hours and go to school at the same time; not when I am working for an Engineering degree.

(2) My story is quite simple, really. I would not have gone to school without student aid. It is just that simple.

I graduated in 1993 from the University of Tulsa with a BS in Economics. I graduated Magna Cum Laude and Phi Beta Kappa. Currently, I am employed as a market analyst with WiTel, the fourth largest telecommunications company in the US.

None of these opportunities would have been possible without the SEOG and Pell Grants I received. My father was working class and only had an income of \$16,000/yr while I was in college. I worked 30 hours a week at various jobs, including a pawn shop and a financial planning firm, to cover my living expenses through school. Without the grants, however, my only option for paying tuition would have been loans. Mind you, I took \$8,000 in loans to cover tuition that was not paid by my grants, so I did not get a free ride. But borrowing much more than that would have made college costs prohibitive.

I am a pretty pragmatic person. Considering today's job market for college graduates, I could not have justified borrowing \$15,000 or \$20,000 to go to school as my earning potential would not have been enough to cover my loan payments upon graduation. Furthermore, there was no guarantee of a job upon graduation. Borrowing that amount of money would have been a poor risk. Without federal support, my life would not have succeeded as it has. Please support continued funding for student loans.

CALIFORNIA

(1) I grew up in rural California in a town called Laytonville. My high school consisted of 180 students. I graduated with 35 other individuals, about 10 of whom have gone on to postsecondary education. Of those people, I don't know of one who would be able to continue their education without federal financial aid. Due to unsustainable logging practices, the Laytonville economy (which used to be based on logging) is almost non-existent. The few legal jobs available are in education or in catering to the needs of wealthy tourists or the marijuana farmers that support most of the town. By continuing my Stanford education, I hope to be able to make meaningful contribution to society. I hope to work to improve the logging practices that destroyed the economy of my hometown.

My father commutes three hours a day to work as a paralegal and my mother makes under \$15,000 a year as a clerk in a clothing store. They cannot afford to pay for my education. Without federal support I would have to return home and choose between dodging police helicopters to make a decent living growing marijuana or barely subsisting on the wages of a gas station attendant. I have worked hard to reach Stanford. I would hate to have to spend the rest of my life knowing that my government was more interested in making missiles to sell overseas than in helping me to make a meaningful contribution to my country.

(2) I cannot even begin to express my gratitude to the programs that have allowed me to have the financial ability to pursue my education. Everyday I feel so fortunate to be able to have this opportunity. I always knew that I would go to college, but I never really thought about what a financial burden it could be.

My mother depends on her meager income and assistance from our immediate family to keep us financially stable. She came to this country from the political oppression of Vietnam in search of a better future. But, as her daughter, I wonder if it is any better for her as she endures 12-hour days, six days a week, as a manicurist, with no vacation, no health insurance, and no pension. My mother waits by the mailbox everyday to see if my financial aid will be as helpful next year as it has been this year. She has given up on her future and knows that she must work to survive. But, for me, she hopes not just for survival, but possibilities. When I was a child,