

in congratulations to both TED, Catherine, and daughter Lilly. It's been great fun and a true privilege working with you my friend.

#### HAPPY BIRTHDAY SENATOR ROBERT BYRD

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if the Republican leadership is successful in negotiating an agreement with the President on a continuing resolution, it appears that the Senate may not be in session on Monday, November 20.

For that reason, today I would like to take a moment and wish the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT BYRD, an advance Happy Birthday. On Monday, Senator BYRD will celebrate his 78th birthday.

Mr. President, the public often views the Senate engaging in bitter partisan debate. Yes, we Republicans have our differences with the Democrats. But when the debates are over, and the votes have been cast, the public would be surprised to learn that we put aside our party labels and share friendships.

And so, the Republican Senator would like to reflect on the brilliant career of Senator BYRD. He has spent more than half of his life serving the people of West Virginia in the Congress. Six years in the House and 37 years in the Senate.

This year, he cast a record 14,000th vote; and just 3 weeks ago, on October 27, when the Senate set a 1-day record of 39 votes, it was Senator BYRD who offered the 35th amendment that broke the record.

But it is not just longevity that will provide Senator BYRD historical stature in the Senate. It is his record of service. He has served as majority whip as well as majority and minority leader. And he has served as President pro tempore and chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

What is even more remarkable is the Senator's in-depth scholarly knowledge of history. Our distinguished Republican leader, Senator DOLE, has often commented that students ought to receive college history credit simply by listening to the speeches of Senator BYRD.

Over a period of several years, Senator BYRD stood on the floor of the Senate and provided an oral history of this institution. These speeches ultimately were printed in two bound volumes and provide the best overview and understanding of the evolution of this 206 year old institution.

In 1993, Senator BYRD went to the floor on 14 separate occasions to speak on the history of the Roman Senate. These discourses were not designed solely for history students. Instead, they were intended to provide all of us with a perspective on the roots of American government and the extraordinary importance of maintaining unfettered congressional control over the power of the purpose.

On one occasion, Senator BYRD spoke for 6 hours on the floor and provided

the Senate a broad overview of the evolution of parliamentary government in England and how evolution influenced our Founding Fathers in shaping this Government.

Mr. President, I could go on and on about Senator BYRD's history lessons. But what I want to do is suggest that when future historians are writing about the 20th century Senate, Senator ROBERT BYRD will surely be remembered as one of the giants who followed in the footsteps of Henry Clay and Daniel Webster.

In particular, I believe Senator BYRD should be commended for his passionate defense of the rights of the minority in this body and to unlimited debate. Many Americans are often frustrated with the slowness of the pace of the Senate. But Senator BYRD rightly notes that in permitting unlimited debate, the Senate stands as a bulwark against tyranny and the passion of the moment.

We all owe a debt of gratitude to Senator BYRD for his wisdom. I wish him a very happy birthday this coming Monday and my sincere regards to his lovely wife Erma.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senators STEVENS, EXON, WARNER, and CRAIG, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Before the acting leader retires, I hope that we can agree to take off this 5-minute limitation on comment to be made at this time in morning business. It is my understanding that the time limit is 5 minutes for each Member; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, at this point.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, I have a longer statement I would like to make concerning the defense bill and this hiatus of funds. I would like to ask that that time be extended somewhat.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, could I inquire, how long does the—

Mr. STEVENS. Ten minutes for each one would be sufficient, in my judgment.

Mr. LOTT. I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that each Senator would be given 10 minutes.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished acting leader.

#### THE FUNDING GAP

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have been researching today also what is

happening here with regard to this funding gap, as it is called in Government circles. I find there have been 15 such funding gaps in a 19-year period since 1977. One went 17 days. And I am becoming disturbed because of the two functions I perform here in the Senate. One is chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee with regard to the general civil service and Government employees, per se; and the other is pertaining to the Department of Defense.

At this time I want to speak primarily on the Department of Defense. If we are in session later today I do intend to speak about Government employees per se, because I think there is a strong feeling building here, for some reason, that those people who have been declared nonessential and are not reporting for work are somehow at fault in this, and they are not going to be paid when we finally reach a conclusion, which we must reach at some point.

But, Mr. President, I want to talk now about the Department of Defense bill because I had urged that bill be held up and not sent to the President because I did not want it caught in this current, very deep controversy. But it has now been sent to the President for his signature.

There is every indication the President will veto that bill, for several reasons. He, of course, has the prerogative to reach the conclusion that he has reached with regard to the funding levels in our defense bill. I am here right now to urge the Department of Defense to confer with the President and do their utmost to get this bill signed. As I noted during the debate here on the floor of the Senate on that bill, this is a bill that I think is of immediate concern to the Department of Defense and one that I believe the President must sign.

If he does not sign it, under the current hiatus in terms of this funding, we are going to be in real difficulty. Today 300,000 civilian employees in the Department of Defense have been furloughed. The Department of Defense depots, supply centers, training ranges, and people who are currently on route in personal moves have been stopped. They can no longer spend money.

Now, we have U.S. troops deployed abroad. I spoke at length on the floor the other night about that also. And 240,000 or more American citizens are deployed abroad as members of our armed services. They are in Macedonia, Haiti, Cuba, Southwest Asia, all over the world, and there are many afloat. We cannot afford any further interruption in defense fundings and programs if we are to maintain our responsibilities throughout the world as the world's last superpower.

I think this would be a sad time for Saddam Hussein or the North Koreans to misunderstand the will of the United States to provide the people and the material and money to fund the commitments we have made throughout the world.

As I said, I believe the President must sign this bill in the interests of our national security. We have a very strange situation facing the Department of Defense right now. Remember, there is no defense bill until he signs it. If he vetoes it, there is still no defense bill. There should have been a new defense bill on October 1. We were prepared to go to a defense bill, but we have been held up by an extraneous issue for a long period of time this year.

But today the Department of Defense responded as follows: With regard to civilian payroll, there are 780,000 workers that must be paid by November 24. There are no funds to make that payroll. On the military payroll, there are 1,600,000 people who must be paid by November 28. There are no funds to make that payroll.

Many people believe that the food and forage concept will allow the Department of Defense to meet those obligations. That is not true. The food and forage statute, which is an ancient statute, gives the Department the authority to write IOU's for food for people in the field. It does not impact payroll. There will be no money to meet the payroll under food and forage.

As I stated, with regard to the transportation of troops, there are troops in training centers that cannot return to their units. There are people en route home for the holidays that will not be able to return. There are no funds available for discretionary travel. All fuel—all fuel—for Department of Defense expenditure will expire on November 24.

For vehicles, aircraft, and ships, they are procured through the defense logistics agency, and we are informed that that agency will have no cash to procure fuel after November 24. The military services will have to draw down from existing supplies at bases or at sea, if necessary, in an emergency. And I assume they will be reserved for emergencies.

With regard to spare parts, we get spare parts under the defense business operations fund. That fund also is in the situation where it is critical already. There is money in the bill that was presented to the President. If it is not there, there is going to be a critical situation with regard to our stockpile of spare parts worldwide.

For those people who have States that are involved in the industrial production—my State is not—but just remember that all procurement is subject to appropriated funds. If this bill is vetoed and there is no continuing resolution covering defense, all of those contracts for production and procurement will have to cease because the inspector generals will have to notify all of those contractors that the Department of Defense cannot meet the payroll, cannot pay those contracts because of the clause in each of them that says they are subject to available funds.

With regard to overseas operations, Mr. President, we have many people out there in many dangerous jobs in counternarcotics operations, from those flying the so-called cap, the oversight function in Iraq, the no-fly zone in Bosnia, the naval blockade in the Adriatic, all of the work we are doing in Cuba, all of the containment operations on North Korea. All of them—all of them—are at risk if this bill is not signed.

Now, I urge the President to sign this bill, but in any event I urge the Senate and the House to recognize the problem if he does not. If the President does not meet his responsibility, that does not mean that I am going to shirk mine. I intend to object to the passage of this resolution unless it is amended to cover the Department of Defense. And furthermore, I intend to find some way to get before the Senate a resolution which will, in fact, cover the full spectrum of the problem that exists now.

We are coming close now to the record as far as the time that we will have people furloughed, sent home, people that want to work, and then later we will pay them. Now that is another matter I want to cover. I have had several Members of the Senate tell me, "Well, this time we're not going to pay them." Never in the history of the United States have we failed to pay the workers who have been sent home because of any hiatus in the availability of cash to pay them for their jobs.

Furthermore, Mr. President, we hire people by the year. Most employees of the Federal Government are hired under contract for a full year. Their salaries are stated by the year. There are very few that are under hourly or under temporary hiring contracts, which are short of that.

It is my position that the failure of the Congress and the President to come together to make available the funds does not amount to a cancellation of that contract. If it does, I think they could all sue us for breach of contract.

I heard today both in Maryland and in Colorado, Federal civilian employees are going to the State unemployment office to get money to live. I do not know about the rest of the Members of the Senate, but raising five children since I have been here, I have seen many days, I tell you, if my paycheck had been interrupted, there would have been severe trouble in my financial circumstance. People have car payments due, they have rent payments due, they have all sorts of problems that have to be met.

Mr. President, they cannot exist without this money. It is our job to stay in session until we get the job done. I am going to object to an adjournment resolution. I am going to object to any recess. I want the Senate to stay in session until we find a way to pay the people we have hired to do the work that we consider to be necessary. Having been temporarily determined to be nonessential does not mean they are not still employees of

the United States. They deserve to be paid and paid when their money is due.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I pose a question to my distinguished colleague on my time. Senator STEVENS and I have met this afternoon on these questions.

First, I wish to join the Senator in the amendment, as we discussed earlier, to such measures that may be coming through here which can hopefully forestall this very serious list of DOD activities that would be curtailed as a consequence of the current funding problems.

But I address the first one to the Senator. We discussed that DOD, which faces a civilian payroll of 780,000 workers that must be processed on November 24, currently has no cash and likewise the military payroll of 1.6 million currently has no cash.

I hope that the Secretary of Defense will learn now, if he does not already know, about these problems and will immediately contact the Senator from Alaska this afternoon, because this message that the Senator from Alaska sends this afternoon, and in which I join, is going to cause incredible alarm not only in the United States but in our farflung military installations where our troops are serving throughout the world.

I think this requires immediate response from the Secretary of Defense. I congratulate my distinguished colleague for bringing that up.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Virginia. I might say, I have conferred with the Secretary in the past. I believe he shares the opinion that the bill could be signed. I cannot speak for him. But it is my opinion that if the President decided he did not like the level of funding, he could send up rescissions to the Congress.

But again, that is all within the prerogative of the President. I think we have our prerogatives, too. I have reached the determination we must do everything we can to see to it that this funding continues in some way. If the President exercises his right to veto this bill, then we still have the duty to come forward with another bill. I remember one time when the Congress sent to one President about 21 different bills in the process of about a week trying to solve this problem. Today, we are holding them up. I do not criticize the leadership for that, but we have a bill still here that we can amend and try to find a common ground with the President.

The main thing is, in my opinion, the Nation's security is at jeopardy if we do not pay these people. The Nation's security is at jeopardy if we are going to run out of fuel, not have flying time, steaming time and the ability to move our forces by using fuel.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I join with my distinguished colleague. He is chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, as the Presiding Officer knows well. This is a subject he has dealt with in his distinguished career in the U.S. Senate. When we met this afternoon to go over these items I thought it imperative we bring it to the attention of the Senate indeed. I do not want to cause undue alarm to 780,000 workers on the civilian payroll and 1.6 million in uniform. Please, we say, Mr. Secretary of Defense, take this message immediately and provide us with such response or solution as the Secretary of Defense and the President may have.

I should also like to add, Mr. President, that the contractors who do work with the Department of Defense are likewise faced with the lack of funding. The Defense Contract Audit Agency apparently is going to shut down and thereby terminate the payment of contractors all across America that are performing defense work.

What happens at that point? What happens at that point is that there is a ripple effect. Their employees cannot be paid, and with the 800,000 now in the Federal Government not receiving pay, there could be another 800,000 of those employees not receiving their compensation through the Department of Defense as a consequence of the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

So I join with Senator STEVENS in calling on the Secretary of Defense to give us a specific reply to that problem, because this is becoming increasingly serious, for a lot of innocent—and I underline, Mr. President, “innocent”—people who are being caught up in this controversy between the President and the Congress.

I feel ever so strongly about the need for a 7-year balanced budget. I came to the Senate with my distinguished colleague, the acting minority leader, Senator EXON, some many years ago. I have great respect for him. But I say to my distinguished colleague, I think there should be unanimity of viewpoints that we can achieve a balanced budget in 7 years. That should not be a subject of disagreement. I just hope that we can, in the words of the acting majority leader, use “honest” economic assumptions which the Senator from Nebraska understands very clearly, having served on the Budget Committee throughout his career, use that type of data to bring about this balanced budget.

So I return to the question on the Defense Department and, incidentally, so far as I can determine, the Defense Contract Audit Agency is still dealing with 1995 fiscal year funds which are available and not subject to the current impasse on the budget. But if this report is true, that is very disturbing.

Further, Mr. President, I would like to have printed in today's RECORD an article that appeared in the Virginian-Pilot newspaper in my State which

chronicles the impact of a defense contractor. I will read a few lines of that:

“The Navy is unable to pay new bills from local shipyards because of the Federal shutdown and, as a result, many yards may soon be cutting back operations . . .” in the Tidewater region of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We have the largest naval base in the world and a tremendous infrastructure of contractors which support those naval and maritime activities. This article depicts in a very colorful way, in an accurate way, the impact on the individual shipyard workers.

So I close my remarks, again, by saying that I continue to be concerned about these employees. We will achieve this 7-year balanced budget—I am confident of that—one way or another. But in the meantime, let us not bring further injury and further concern and emotional stress on so many innocent people who have offered to devote their careers either to Federal service as public servants or those who are performing the contracts for the Federal Government.

I was heartened by the meetings I had with the Speaker of the House and others earlier today that there is the assurance that eventually the Federal employees will be justly compensated for that period in time in which they were furloughed, but we cannot give that assurance, indeed, it is not the responsibility of Congress, to the employees of the contractors of the Federal Government. Their pay remains uncertain.

I should also like to have printed in this RECORD of today a letter to the Honorable TOM DAVIS, a Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia. A similar letter went to the Hon. FRANK WOLF, a Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia. The three of us are talking, on the average, three or four times a day about this problem and working together. It reflects the assurance of the leadership and the Congress, both the House and the Senate, to take care of the Federal employees.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter and this article from the Virginian-Pilot be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, November 10, 1995.

Hon. THOMAS DAVIS,  
Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR TOM: We will be sending soon to President Clinton a bill to continue funding for the federal government through December 1, 1995. Besides providing for government services, this bill also funds federal workers' salaries.

If the President decides to veto this legislation to keep government operating, the possibility exists that some federal workers may be furloughed. In the event that this takes place, it is our commitment that federal employees will not be punished as a direct result of the President's decision to veto funding for their salaries. Should this happen, we are committed to restoring any lost wages in a subsequent funding bill.

Again, we want to reassure you that if the President vetoes the continuing resolution and requires federal workers to be furloughed, we are committed to restoring any lost wages retroactively.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House.

BOB DOLE,  
Senate Majority Leader.

[From the Virginian-Pilot and the Ledger-Star, Norfolk, VA, Nov. 17, 1995]

AS NAVY STOPS MAKING PAYMENTS, LOCAL SHIPYARDS MAY SUFFER  
(By Christopher Dinsmore)

The Navy is unable to pay new bills from local shipyards because of the federal shutdown and, as a result, many yards may soon begin cutting back operations.

One small Norfolk yard has started laying off workers. Norshipco, the largest private shipyard in South Hampton Roads, may also have to furlough “hundreds” of workers soon if the shutdown isn't resolved, shipyard executives said Thursday.

“It could be a grim Christmas if this stuff keeps up,” said Jerry Miller, president of Earl Industries Inc., a Portsmouth-based ship repair firm that employs about 400 people.

As Washington politicians hunker down for a drawn-out budget battle that some threaten could last 90 days, executives at local shipyards fret that the shutdown could sink their businesses.

“What we're talking about is something that could happen if the government doesn't get its act together,” said Jack L. Roper IV, executive vice president of operations for Norshipco, which employs 2,200 full-time workers at its two yards in Norfolk and 600 people part-time. “There's a lot of ifs here.”

The Navy is paying pending bills that have been processed by the Navy's local contracting office, the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, Repair and Conversion in Portsmouth. Officers running that office are looking for a way to resume processing new bills so payments to the yards won't be interrupted.

“Obviously there is national security that comes into play at some point . . .,” said Cmdr. David S. Hattich, the officer in charge of contracting in the Portsmouth office. “It's not in the government's interest to see (the shipyards) get to the point where their cash flow is so impacted that they can't perform.”

Nearly 700 civilian workers were furloughed from the Navy's contracting offices in Portsmouth and Newport News. Without those workers, the Navy can't process bills from local shipyards.

“At some point I presume we'll have to bring some skeleton staff back in to work,” Hattich said.

The contracts office also won't be awarding any new contracts for the duration of the shutdown.

The Norfolk Naval Shipyard in Portsmouth is not being affected by the shutdown. Marine Hydraulics International Inc., which emerged from a bankruptcy reorganization in October, was determining Thursday how many of its 248 employees it would have to lay off immediately, said Vice President Gary Brandt.

The yard suspended activity on some recently negotiated, but not finalized, add-ons to its contract to repair the guided-missile frigate Clark at its Norfolk facility, Brandt said. MHI will continue already contracted work on the Clark as long as its financing holds out, Brandt said.

The extent of the impact depends a lot on how long government operations are suspended without some form of relief for the shipyards.

"If it's just a day or two, then it's no big deal," Hattich said. "If it lasts 90 days like some people are saying, then we have a problem."

"Thirty days is probably longer than we can stand," Norshipco's Roper said Thursday. "I'm not sure I can guarantee my work force can continue beyond tomorrow."

Norshipco does have some commercial jobs, but not nearly enough to sustain its work force, he said.

Moon Engineering Co. Inc. expects it could feel the pressure in two to four weeks, said James Thomas, the Portsmouth shipyard's executive vice president and general manager. "I really can't say when right now," Thomas said.

"We have a lot of government receivables out now," he said. "How soon (we're hurt) depends on whether they get paid."

Moon started a contract on the destroyer Peterson three weeks ago. The cruiser Ticonderoga arrived at the yard Thursday for repairs and maintenance.

"We've got about 250 to 300 employees here now and we're still working, but if push really came to shove, we're going to have to send people home," Thomas said.

Metro Machine Corp. has the resources to keep operating for now, said its president, Richard Goldbach. "I don't see it affecting us unless it lasts past a week or two," he said. "We'll worry about it then, but I think we'll have the resources even then to keep operating."

Other shipyards also could be unaffected by the shutdown. Newport News Shipbuilding doesn't expect any impact on its work force because of its financial condition, a spokeswoman said.

The giant Peninsula shipyard, which builds aircraft carriers for the Navy and employs nearly 19,000 people, is owned by a multi-billion dollar conglomerate that probably has the financial wherewithal to sustain the yard's operations.

Colonna's Shipyard Inc., a small Norfolk shipyard, expects to survive on its usual diet of commercial work, said Vice President Doug Forrest. "We don't have any Navy work in the yard now," he said.

#### THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from Alaska, my friend from Virginia, and my friend, Senator LOTT, for their remarks on the matter at hand. I understand as a senior member of the Armed Services Committee, and I join and thank Senator STEVENS, Senator WARNER, and others for bringing up this matter. It is a very critical matter and we cannot pass over it. So whatever help I can be to you in this regard, I will be.

I simply point out that Senator WARNER and I came here together, and we have served on the Armed Services Committee ever since then. I have been disappointed, as he has, that we still have not reported out of the Armed Services Committee the authorizing legislation, which customarily should precede the appropriations that are handled so very ably, and have been for so many years, by my colleague from Alaska. You bring up a very good point. I think that, as important as that is, we should realize and recognize that people in other areas are just as surely affected adversely. That is why we have to move.

Thank you very much, my friend from Alaska, for saying we should stay here for however long it takes; there should be no recess. I was delighted, in case my colleague did not know it, that within the hour, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly rejected a move by Speaker GINGRICH to adjourn the House of Representatives. How in the world anybody who understands Government—including the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who evidently you have been in contact with regarding the dire circumstances coming on to the Defense Department—why in the world he would want to adjourn the House of Representatives is beyond me. I was delighted to see that it was overwhelmingly rejected. I do not know whether there has ever been a case before where a motion to adjourn has been overridden on the floor. I do not ever remember that happening, at least on this side, while I have been here.

I think maybe that message was sent very loud and clear to the Speaker of the House of Representatives that this is no time for us to be adjourning or recessing. We have to stay here regardless of how early we come in or how late we work every night, to show that we are trying to work out the problems on this. I suspect and say, without knowing it for sure, that if the Members on the floor of the Senate right now would have their way, we could probably sit down and resolve this matter very, very quickly. But politics on both sides, unfortunately, are being played.

I simply say that I was so pleased that the House of Representatives did not take the recommendations of their Speaker and adjourn. I thought it was rather interesting as I watched that vote, that early in the first 5 minutes of that vote, I believe there were 87 or 88 Republicans who had voted with their leader, Speaker GINGRICH, to adjourn the House of Representatives. But before the vote was over, when the Republicans saw what was happening, that 87 or 88 shrunk down to, I believe, about 32 at the end, as even the Republicans recognized that their leader was way, way off base by trying to adjourn with the dire circumstances that face our country today, including the ones brought forth and explained in great detail by my friend from Virginia and my friend from Alaska. I will be of whatever help I can.

Now, on the overall and underlying matter that was addressed by Senator LOTT, objected to by the minority leader, I think this points up the problem that we have today. Let me, as best I can, try to explain what is being overlooked in this discussion. Within the last few minutes, I have heard, I believe, the phrase "balance the budget in 7 years" about 17 times. Well, Mr. President, notwithstanding the fact that there is some dispute as to how we get there, this Senator has wanted to balance the budget in 7 years, if not sooner, for a long, long time.

In fact, I was one of those that had voted for the constitutional amendment that would have been referred to the States to accomplish that end. So my credentials, certainly, with regard to national defense and certainly with regard to fiscal responsibility, I think, are pretty well established, and most people even on that side of the aisle would agree.

I simply say that, when you throw around this phrase, a 7-year balanced budget—I have been for that for a long, long time, as have many people on this side of the aisle. I would like to advise all so that we can straighten that out—all that are hearing my voice at this time—that as late as last night when we thought we were very near reaching a compromise, we had as a part of that agreement that we would balance the budget in 7 years. That was put up not by the President, but by Leon Panetta and myself and others who were in on the negotiations. So when we throw around the term "balance the budget in 7 years," not everybody, but most people are for that. The President's Chief of Staff was here offering to enter into an agreement for a continuing resolution to accomplish that end.

Now, the holdup comes with regard to how we reach that balanced budget in 7 years. Therein lies the grave concerns. What the Republicans are saying, I believe, without emphasizing it, is that they want to tie the President's hands to a 7-year balanced budget on their terms. I simply say, Mr. President, that I think that is wrong for lots of reasons, and I will not be part of that.

When you ask the question, "What is at stake here?"—and that question is asked by Senator LOTT—well, what is at stake here is a great deal. What is at stake here are basic principles of Government, and most of us on this side of the aisle do not agree with the way those on that side of the aisle are coming up with their numbers, setting their priorities. We think they are mixed up. I said earlier today on the floor of the Senate and, therefore, I will try again at this time to keep my rhetoric within due bounds, because I do not believe expanded rhetoric of simply abuse is particularly constructive.

However, among other things that have been overlooked about what is at stake here, I interpret it as being a basic violation of constitutional principles that is at stake here. The Constitution guarantees the right of the President to veto a bill passed by the Congress. The Constitution does not say that he has a right to veto only after consultation with Congress. The Constitution does not say that the President, in balancing the budget, has to do it in a fashion and in a manner that the majority of the House or Senate propose. The Constitution guarantees, as a very important part of that document—and the Framers of the Constitution, in attempting to have balance of the three equal branches of