

campaigned on in 1994. It is still the parameters of which we will do business.

If we did not care for these programs, we would do nothing, we would not fight to make sure that this Government stays solvent; that we can pay our bills; that we can take care of the next generation in Medicare and Medicaid and help those people who we really sincerely believe need help. It is our responsibility to help them. That was the driving force behind this whole plan on the Republican side when I campaigned last year.

Had we not cared, we would have turned our back on this and said, "Do it any way you want to, Mr. President. We will keep on doing business the way we have been doing it for 40 years," or at least the last 6 years that I have been here. We could have said no, but we did not do that. We did what was responsible. We came to the forefront to fix it, to save it, to make it stronger and make sure we assure the integrity of the programs designed to serve the people on Medicaid and Medicare, the needy and not the greedy.

I think we have done that. Now the hard work begins. We will get onto the main playing field. There will be a lot of dust and a lot of talk, but basically what you looked at yesterday is exactly what we campaigned on in 1994 and which continues to be the noble goal of this Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LABOR, HHS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, for several years I had the privilege of chairing the appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies. This year, the chair is Senator SPECTER from Pennsylvania. We had our bill finished in pretty good time, but now it is being held up and there have been various unanimous-consents propounded about trying to bring it up. Last week, we hotlined it on this side, and I am informed that the Republicans hotlined it on their side to bring the bill up without the legislative riders and simply pass it on voice vote. No Democrat on this side objected to that. The objection came, as I understand it, from the other side.

I thought perhaps over the weekend and in the spirit of compromise and in the spirit of moving this legislation forward I might try to propound a unanimous-consent request again.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous-consent that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of H.R. 2127, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill; that the language on page 21, lines 3 to 10, relating to striker replacement, be stricken; that all other committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

Mr. BURNS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNS. There is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I guess I probably expected that there would be objection to my unanimous-consent request.

I wish to make the case again that this bill is ready to come to the floor but for a legislative rider that is on this appropriations bill which deals with striker replacement. It has no business being on an appropriations bill. There are other legislative bills that will be before this body before we adjourn on December 15, or whenever that occurs, that would be more appropriate for that to be attached.

I would also point out that we have voted twice on this issue in the Senate and cloture could not be obtained. Again, I would just for the record repeat for the record what Senator DOLE, our majority leader, said on this bill on September 29, 1995. He said, "I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania," meaning Senator SPECTER, "and the Senator from Iowa," meaning me, "that we ought to pass the bill on a voice vote. We cannot get cloture. There were two votes, 54 to 46, party line votes." That was on the striker replacement. "So my view is we ought to do it, pass it and find out what happens after a veto in the next round."

I might also say for the record that I checked with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] before I propounded this unanimous-consent request, and he also concurs that this is the way we ought to do it—bring the bill up without legislative riders, pass it on a voice vote, go to conference with the House, and work on the legislation from there.

So again I wanted to point out that it is really not this side holding up the Labor, HHS bill. We are willing to get it now in 60 seconds, voice vote it through but for the legislative rider that was attached in committee, which, as I have pointed out, is a legislative rider and is not a matter of appropriations whatsoever. If that side is willing to strike that, we can bring up that bill and pass it, as I said, within 60 seconds.

As I said, I hotlined this last week and no Democrats objected to it, and unless the majority leader has changed his mind I think he agrees with that process also, as he stated on September 29.

So, Mr. President, I wanted to make that point because I feel strongly it is important we move ahead with that bill. It not only appropriates the money for the Department of Labor and for job training programs but also the Department of Health and Human Services to administer the Medicare program, for the Health Care Finance Administration, HCFA. It also appropriates money for the National Institutes of Health and for all of the programs there, for biomedical research,

and also the Department of Education, some very important programs and agencies that need to be funded with the appropriations bill. And as I said, there is really no reason why we should not pass it except for the insistence by some that they have a legislative rider attached to it, which, again, I understand the process here.

A lot of times people try to attach legislative riders. Sometimes it is done without too much concern, people support it on both sides; they will support a legislative rider on an appropriations bill. But I think in a case like this, where you have a legislative rider which is so adamantly opposed by at least a majority on this side—and I think maybe even a few on the other side—this is no place for that legislative rider.

Lastly, Mr. President, let me say that I am glad that both sides over the weekend worked out an arrangement, an agreement on the continuing resolution, and also on the budget. As I have said before, the continuing resolution should not have taken that long since it is only a sense of the Senate anyway. It has no binding force and effect. But I am glad we did agree on the 7 years. I had voted for 7 years for balancing the budget. What I oppose, however, is the manner in which it was proposed that we do it.

I still object to the budget that was passed here. That is why I voted against it. And I trust the President will veto it sometime later this week, and then we will begin in earnest next week in trying to work out some compromise on the budget. That will be the important work of the Senate and of the House in the next 2 weeks or so, because that is the budget, that is the money. That is where we sign on the dotted line, so to speak, as to who is going to pay and who is going to benefit in the next 7 years when we do reach a balanced budget.

I must say that I agree with an article in the U.S. News & World Report written last week by David Gergen in which he pointed out that "the lowest 20 percent of the population [in income] would lose more income under these spending cuts than the rest of the population combined. At the other end, the highest 20 percent would gain more from the tax cuts than everyone else combined."

As Mr. Gergen pointed out, he said:

Ronald Reagan is often invoked as the patron saint of this revolution. How soon we forget that as President, Reagan insisted that seven key programs in the safety net—Head Start, Medicare, Social Security, veterans, Supplemental Security Income, school lunches and summer jobs for youth—would not be touched; now, six of those seven are under the knife. Reagan believed, as he said in his memorable address accepting his party's nomination in 1980, that "we have to move forward, but we're not going to leave anyone behind."

This budget that this Senate passed, which I voted against, which is going to the President, moves a few people ahead. As a matter of fact, it is like

Monopoly. It moves them to the Boardwalk. They did not have to pay any rent either. But for everyone else, especially for the lowest 20 percent, it is "Go to jail" and "Do not pass 'go,'" "Go directly to jail," because that is where they are going to be kept.

This budget pulls up that ladder of opportunity, that ladder of opportunity that I believe my party, the Democratic Party, has always believed in, in making sure that as you make it to the top, as others make it in this country—and there is nothing wrong with making it; there is nothing wrong with being rich and there is nothing wrong with being a success; that is the American dream—but we have always believed, and I have always believed as a Democrat, as an American, that one of the prime purposes of Government is to make sure, when you make it to the top and others make it to the top, that we leave that ladder down there for others to climb.

And I choose my words carefully. I say a "ladder." I did not say an "escalator." I did not say something that someone could get on and ride to the top. I said a ladder, or a ramp of opportunity. The ladder is the structure, but individuals have to exert their own energy to climb it. A ramp is a structure, but those with disabilities have to exert the energy to go up that ramp.

And, yet, what this budget does is it takes away the ramp and it takes away the ladder. When you cut Head Start, when you cut education as deeply as the budget does, when you cut summer youth training, job training, when you cut education support, student loans, yes, even when you cut Medicare as much as this does and push it all to the upper income, you take away that ladder of opportunity.

So, that is why I will fight as hard as I can over the next couple of weeks to make sure that as we reach a compromise—and I understand it has to be a compromise—that we—perhaps I will continue to invoke the words of Ronald Reagan that we should not leave anyone behind, and, no, those seven key programs ought to be left untouched, because those programs really do leave that ladder of opportunity down there. And that ought to be the sentiment that guides the Senate over the next couple weeks.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The majority leader.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR NANCY LONDON KASSEBAUM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, during my years in the U.S. Senate, it has been my privilege to serve alongside two remarkable colleagues from Kansas.

The first was Jim Pearson, who was a Senator of great common sense and great integrity who was widely respected by Members on both sides of the aisle.

When Senator Pearson retired in 1978, Kansans replaced him with an-

other person of common sense and integrity—Senator NANCY LONDON KASSEBAUM. Kansans reelected Senator KASSEBAUM in 1984 and 1990 by overwhelming margins.

And there is no doubt that she would have received another landslide next November.

This morning in Topeka, however, Senator KASSEBAUM announced that she would retire from the Senate at the end of next year.

Yes, this announcement was not unexpected, but still it comes as a blow to Kansans, and to all of us here in the Senate who have grown to count on Senator KASSEBAUM's leadership, wisdom, and friendship.

I will have more to say about Senator KASSEBAUM in the coming weeks and months, but I did want to take just a minute today to pay tribute to our colleague and friend.

The Senate has debated many historic and important issues in the past 17 years, and Senator KASSEBAUM has played a key role in many of them.

As a member of the Labor and Human Resources Committee—a committee she now chairs—Senator KASSEBAUM has tirelessly worked for legislation to assist America's working men and woman.

Kansans have a tradition for helping neighbors in need, and Senator KASSEBAUM continued that tradition here in the Senate, as she devoted time and energy to improving programs that help the less fortunate.

Senator KASSEBAUM also emerged over the years as a strong force in shaping America's foreign policy. One example of her leadership in the arena was her instrumental role in shaping the policy that helped move South Africa to a new era of equality.

Senator KASSEBAUM's father, the great Alf Landon, once said, "there are some smart people in Washington. There are more of 'em in Kansas."

Senator KASSEBAUM has succeeded because she has always kept those words in mind, and she has always understood that Kansans and Americans did not need the Federal Government to run their lives and make decisions for them.

Mr. President, NANCY KASSEBAUM's record of intelligence, integrity, and independence has ensured that she will always be remembered as one of the true giants of Kansas political history.

And I know I speak for all Members of the Senate in saying that we are very proud to call her our colleague and our friend.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 19, 1995, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolu-

tion (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 20, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the enrolled joint resolution was signed on November 20, 1995, during the recess of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 529. A bill to authorize the exchange of National Forest System lands in the Targhee National Forest in Idaho for non-Federal lands within the forest in Wyoming (Rept. No. 104-175).

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DOLE:

S. Con. Res. 32. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate on Monday, November 20, 1995, until Monday, November 27, 1995, and a conditional adjournment of the House on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995, or Tuesday, November 21, 1995, until Tuesday, November 28, 1995; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PELL):

S. Con. Res. 33. A concurrent expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as the Architect of the Capitol; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 837

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 837, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison.

S. 851

At the request of Mr. JOHNSTON, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. KEMPTHORNE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reform