

and the House of Representatives, according to the House rules and the Senate rules, then will be permitted to effectively recess without corresponding necessary action by the Senate. And the particular groups that the majority leader has addressed, their needs will be left unattended.

I just want to know what the intention of the majority is going to be with regard to those individuals, particularly since the majority leader has indicated to the minority leader that he has every indication that he is going to object to a clean continuing resolution.

This appears to be the only avenue that is left open to us. I just learned a few moments ago that this was the action that was taken in the House. And this is the inevitable action that will result if the House takes off and we pass this. Those individuals which the majority leader has identified, they will be left unattended while the House of Representatives recesses and while evidently we will be unable to take any action. We will be foreclosed from taking any action too. And I find that that is a troublesome response.

I want to say at this point, I know that the majority leader has been very positive and constructive in trying to move the larger issue about the reconciliation on the budget forward. I think all of us understand that he has tried to be and is a positive force toward moving in that direction. So I am not at this time trying to interrupt that continued kind of effort.

But that really is independent from the groups that the majority leader has mentioned, from their needs being served. I fail to see how we are going to be able to reach any conclusion with regard to those individuals because it will require both bodies taking action.

Is that the understanding of the majority leader?

Mr. DOLE. It is my understanding—I would have to check—but what happened in the House was simply to give the Speaker authority to recess for 3-day periods in accordance with their rules. I do not believe the recess takes effect at 2:30 tomorrow. It is my understanding our meeting at the White House should end about 11:15, 11:30.

If we can accomplish something tomorrow morning, which I believe we can, then it would be my hope that the House would then—either we amend the bill that is over here with a CR or they send us a CR. I am not an advocate of shutting down the Government. I never have been.

We have indicated in a letter to Senator WARNER and others that we would support on this side and the House side paying all those who were furloughed. But I think we have a larger problem, as pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts. If everything else fails, I think the least we should do is take up the bill that is now here concerning veterans and add to it the other categories that might be affected.

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate that. So that would be the intention of the majority leader.

I will not object to the request. I want to commend the majority leader for that responsible action. I hope that during the time between now and tomorrow that he would use his persuasive powers, which he uses so frequently around here, to encourage that action be taken in a similar way by the House of Representatives.

Mr. DOLE. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. I certainly will make every effort. I am not certain I will be successful, but I share many of the views he has expressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOYNIHAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, it would be the right of any Senator to ask at this time that the conference report to accompany H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility Act, be read in its entirety by the clerk. Such a reading would provide the first indication to most Senators of what is in this conference report. It has been 3 full months since the bill passed the Senate, but the conference committee met only once, 2 months ago, October 24, and conducted no business at the meeting other than opening statements. The entire conference process was conducted behind closed doors and without participation by the minority, which is one reason why there is not a single Democratic signature on this conference report.

I was able to obtain a copy of the conference report only a few hours ago, as the House completed its consideration. We are woefully uninformed as to the details, but may I say that all any Senator needs to know about this legislation is that it would repeal title IV-A of the Social Security Act, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and that it will be vetoed by President Clinton. Mr. President, I do not object.

I simply want to make the point that this partisan mode is not the way great social-political issues are addressed successfully in our country, and I hope this will pass with the coming of Christmas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—START II TREATY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that immediately following the two votes, the Senate proceed to executive session to begin consideration of the START II Treaty.

Let me indicate with reference to that, there has been ongoing work that I have been indirectly involved in, in the past several days, to reach some agreement on START II. As I understand, there were seven or eight different issues that have been resolved. They are very close to getting agree-

ment. If that happens, it should not take too long to dispose of the START II treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 134

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. Many of us have watched with some dismay as the House continues to refuse to offer a resolution which funds the Government. They have now provided for a resolution which only funds that part of the continuing resolution dealing with veterans. We have no objection at all to the veterans resolution coming to the floor and passing it.

We would like to offer an amendment which does that for everything else, including the children and many others who are adversely affected by this Government shutdown.

It is our hope that at some point, certainly before the end of the week, that can be done and would like to see if it could be done tonight.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to House Joint Resolution 134, the veterans' continuing appropriations resolution; that the bill be read a third time and passed, as amended, with an amendment that will reopen the Government and keep it open until January 5, 1996; and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I do reserve the right to object and I shall object, because it does not seem to me this will serve any constructive purpose at this time.

We are going back tomorrow. The principals are going to meet on a balanced budget in 7 years. I am not certain what action the House will take on this this evening, in any event.

As I indicated to the Senator from Massachusetts, and I will again state to the Democratic leader, it is my hope we can make enough progress tomorrow that we can do precisely what he recommends. Maybe the date will not be January 5. I do not know about that date. It does seem to me we have made progress today. If we make some in the morning, perhaps we cannot only do some other legislative business, but also pass a continuing resolution. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me just say, I hope as a result of the meeting tomorrow at the White House we can move forward with some form of a continuing resolution tomorrow. I would like it to be a complete continuing resolution, obviously, dealing with

veterans and children and the whole range of those who are adversely affected by this shutdown.

It must not go on. We simply cannot leave with this matter left unresolved. And so it is important that regardless of what happens at the meeting tomorrow, the Senate be on record in support of a continuing resolution which completely funds the Government for a period of time. I am hopeful the majority leader and I can work together to make that happen at some point tomorrow under any set of circumstances.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor and yielded to the two leaders for the purpose of the unanimous-consent request. Does the Senator from Nevada yield or reclaim the floor?

Mr. DOLE. What is the pending business now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Completing the statement of the Senator from Nevada, the pending business will be the conference report.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I simply want to make an inquiry of the majority leader. I wonder if the Senator from Nevada will allow me to do that.

Mr. REID. I will, without losing my right to the floor. We talked about records. Senator DOLE talked about his record. I think I have broken a record. I have been here and yielded 12 times. I will be happy to make it for the 13th. [Laughter.]

Mr. DORGAN. Make mine the 14th.

Mr. REID. This is the 13th.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator yielding to me. I would like to inquire of the majority leader on the subject of the farm bill. Senator DOLE comes from farm country, as many of us do in the Chamber, and we face an unusual circumstance toward the end of this year. This is the year we normally would have written a 5-year farm plan. A plan has not been written. One was in the original legislation that was passed by the Senate that was vetoed by the President, the reconciliation bill.

Many of us are concerned, as are farmers from across the country, about what will be the decision of Congress, what kind of circumstance might exist for them and their lenders to anticipate with respect to planting next year, what kind of support prices and so on.

I just rise to inquire of the majority leader what his thinking is about the movement of a farm bill or the extension of the current farm program for a year. What is the current thinking of the majority leader on that subject?

Mr. DOLE. Obviously, I share the concern expressed by the Senator from North Dakota.

Let me first indicate, there will be no more votes today, because I have had inquiries.

It is my understanding that at 3:30 or 4 o'clock this afternoon, there was a discussion of the so-called farm bill with different representatives from the White House and others who were there. I would like to see it part of this package that I hope we can agree on that will give us a balanced budget but still include the agriculture legislation. It is important not only to the Midwest where we are from, but very important to consumers in America and other farmers across this country.

A 1-year extension, if everything else fails, might be an option. As the Senator knows, if that does not happen, we go back to, what is it, 1948, 1949, which would not be very productive, in my view. It would be very high price supports. So I am hopeful that we can work—we are working in a bipartisan way. I say to the Democratic leader, talking about when we get to agriculture, it must be one of the areas we must agree on if we are going to come together and pass a package.

Mr. DORGAN. I appreciate the answer. I point out, as the Senator knows, the urgency with which many farmers view this process, whether it is in or out of a reconciliation bill. I think farmers and their lenders need some understanding of what will be the circumstances for their planting next year, what might or might not be the price support system.

I am not suggesting there is blame here. I am suggesting somehow we need to get to a decision and it might be the extension of the current farm bill or it might be a different plan put in the reconciliation bill. If a reconciliation bill does not occur, then would there be a contingency and does the Senator share the urgency many of us feel on this floor about the need to resolve this issue?

Mr. DOLE. I have been on the Ag Committee—I think I have the record of more service on the Ag Committee than any other member on that committee. We have gone through this a number of times. Certainly, it is very important, very significant for America's farmers. I feel, I hope, as deeply as the Senator from North Dakota and others in the Chamber, when we have large numbers of farmers and ranchers in our States. I hope we can reach some conclusion. If not, we may have to look at an extension for a year.

Mr. DORGAN. Thank you.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, if I can ask the Senator from Nevada to yield just one more time.

SENATOR BYRD'S COMMENTS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I learned in my absence my colleague from West Virginia, Senator BYRD, revealed that I had tied the record for service as the Republican leader. I had no idea that was a fact. If Senator BYRD says it, I know it is a fact because I know he checked it very carefully. I want to thank him for his gracious comments and thank all of my colleagues who

have tolerated me during that—what is it—10 years.

SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM ACT—VETO

The Senate continued with the reconsideration of the bill.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am here to speak on the securities litigation veto override. I want everyone in Nevada to know that this is the same issue that a few weeks ago Senator BRYAN and I disagreed on. It is not a new issue. You see, in Nevada, Mr. President, it is news when Senator BRYAN and Senator REID disagree on an issue, so I repeat for the people of Nevada this is the same issue; it is not a new issue, because we vary so little in our outlook on what is good Government.

Mr. President, there are a lot of issues today that perhaps I would rather be debating, but the parliamentary measure now before us is the securities litigation. A balanced budget or welfare reform would certainly be more timely. There are a number of other issues we should perhaps be dealing with. But the matter that is now before this body is a bipartisan piece of legislation designed to curtail the filing of frivolous security strike suits.

Yesterday, in the House of Representatives, 83 Democrats voted to override, joining the Republicans to obtain, of course, over 300 House votes, significantly more than enough to override the President's veto.

I am distressed that the President has decided to veto this moderate, centrist approach to litigation reform. I am concerned that he has vetoed this legislation for the wrong reasons.

I have reviewed closely his veto message. It does not take very long to read. It would appear he has found very few substantive reasons for vetoing the measure. I believe that the President of the United States received very bad staff advice. One need only look at a number of editorials written this morning in the papers around the country. One in the Washington Times today says, among other things "According to administration aides, the crucial moment came when New York University Law School Professor John Sexton visited the White House to personally argue that the legislation should be vetoed."

I do not know who John Sexton met with, whether it was staff in the White House or whether it was the President, but if it were staff and the message was carried to the President, it was pretty bad information because had the staff properly advised the President, they would have found that this man is not really a law professor in the true sense of the word but, rather, he is the dean of a law school. In fact, if this advice was delivered from a professor, as has been stated, without clear vested interests on either side of the hotly contested issue, then the staff gave the President some pretty bad advice, because according to The Wall Street