

item veto, the other question by them is what about the notch.

Mr. Speaker, let us today support this motion and get on with our work in conference.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding, and I rise frankly just to suggest to my colleagues a word of caution that I raised with my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], 17 years ago when we were freshmen, about this matter. I agree very strongly with those who are concerned about our deficit and the importance of moving toward a balanced budget.

Having said that, I feel very strongly about local government and State running a lot more than the Federal Government, but there are reasons to have a Federal Government, including our national defense. From time to time in the history of this country we have tended to be penny-wise and pound-foolish in that area. As peace looms on the horizon, many an administration becomes very cautious about spending money in this area. I would rue the day that a President, for example, chose to use the line-item veto to strike the B-2, for example, so critical to our future ability to project peace in the world. So a word of caution, my friends, as we move forward with the streamroller that seems to be heading toward either a direct line or a cliff.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion, and I compliment the gentlewoman from Illinois for putting forth this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that this body get on with the work that the American people want us to do, and that is to accomplish the line-item veto legislation. When this legislation was first introduced in January, and it is a piece of legislation that I have supported both in this Congress and in the last Congress, I cautioned my constituents, saying that I feared what we would see is we would see quick action in the House, perhaps separate action by the Senate, and then there would be serious delay in getting the two bodies together, and unfortunately that is clearly what has happened up to this point.

But now it is time for us to get to work. Let us do the work that the American people want us to do, let us sit down as conferees, get the differences between the two houses ironed out and give the President the authority to get rid of pork barrel spending and special interest tax breaks.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take just this moment to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Government Re-

form and Oversight, the chairman, for his assistance in this matter and for the spirit of cooperation that he has always dealt with the minority on this particular matter. He has done so repeatedly, and he has always been there to discuss these very important issues with us.

I want to also thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules who, I am glad to say, is still a very avid fan of the Chicago Bears and, along with him, I too hope that we are successful this term.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois, the ranking member. We may not always agree, but we are always very civil and she has always been very cooperative in accomplishing what needs to be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I would just point out again that this measure did have broad bipartisan support when it came before the House in February. I am pleased that we come out of this motion today again united, with bipartisan support, in moving forward and trying to address the issues with the other body.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to instruct conferees, which seeks to apply line-item veto legislation to all fiscal year 1996 spending bills.

I am pleased to see House leadership appoint conferees today for H.R. 2, the line-item veto legislation. This move is long overdue. On February 6, the House approved H.R. 2, the line-item veto bill, by the overwhelming majority of 294 to 134. Line-item veto was a key component of the Contract With America. The Senate passed a line-item veto bill in March. However, it is almost 6 months later, and we are finally getting around to appointing conferees.

As a strong supporter of line-item veto, I became increasingly distressed this summer to hear statements from leadership that line-item veto was dead for the year. In an effort to increase pressure to revive this bill this year, I attempted to offer an amendment to each of the five remaining appropriations bills to apply the provisions of H.R. 2 to those individual appropriations bills. My concern was that even if we passed line-item veto this year, a delayed agreement would mean that over \$500 billion in fiscal year 1996 spending would not be subject to line-item veto.

When I was denied the opportunity to offer this amendment, I then introduced a House resolution on the last day before recess calling on House leadership to appoint conferees. This resolution was cosponsored by 66 Members of the House. My resolution also stated the sense of the House that we should not send appropriations conference reports to the President unless we took steps to apply line-item veto to such conference reports.

The motion to instruct conferees goes to the heart of this issue. The motion instructs conferees to insist that line-item veto be applicable to any current or subsequent fiscal year appropriations bills—which would include all 1996 spending bills. It is my understanding

that leadership will accept this motion. I applaud this constructive move, and again, support the action we are taking today to begin the conference process on line-item veto.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge that finding an agreement between the House and Senate will not be an easy chore. While there is a clear majority in both the House and Senate in favor of some form of line-item veto or enhanced rescission, there are honest disagreements over the best form of such legislation.

However, I have never understood why the potential difficulty of reaching agreement should prevent us from even trying. That is why I have pushed so hard to begin the process. It is my hope that we can move expeditiously to reach an agreement and send a line-item veto bill to the President for his signature into law.

However, the appointment of conferees and the motion to instruct still provide no assurance that line-item veto will apply to 1996 spending bills. Therefore, I reiterate my call to apply line-item veto provisions to each spending bill that we send to the President this year—and to urge that we make every effort to make sure that every dollar of discretionary spending is subject to the fiscal scrutiny of Presidential authority to veto individual items of pork barrel or unnecessary spending. If we can do so, we can help restore taxpayer faith that their tax dollars are spent wisely.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CLINGER, SOLOMON, BUNNING, DREIER, BLUTE, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois and Mr. SABO and Mr. BEILENSON.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 2126, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PROCEDURE FOR CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2126, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further

consideration of the bill H.R. 2126 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 205 shall also be governed by the following order:

Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the following amendments—identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII—each of which may be considered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member—or one of the Members—specified, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, may amend portions of the bill previously amended, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall not otherwise be in order during further consideration of the bill for amendment: One of the amendments numbered 10, 11, 18, 34, or 56, by Representative KASICH or Representative OBEY, to be debatable for 60 minutes, with 10 minutes controlled by Representative KASICH, 10 minutes controlled by Representative DELLUMS, 10 minutes controlled by Representative OBEY, 15 minutes controlled by Representative DICKS, and 15 minutes controlled by Representative YOUNG of Florida; one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 61, by Representative OBEY, to be debatable in the aggregate for not more than 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and one of the amendments numbered 3 or 15, by Representative DORNAN, together with the amendment numbered 48 as a substitute therefor, by Representative DELAURO, to be jointly debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by Representatives DORNAN and DELAURO.

□ 1115

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 205 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2126.

□ 1116

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2126) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. SENSENBRENNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 31, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] had been disposed of and title III was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further consideration of the bill for amendment in Committee of the Whole may not exceed 5 hours, exclusive of time consumed by recorded votes and proceedings incidental thereto.

Before consideration of any other amendment it shall be in order to consider the following amendments—identified by their designation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII—each of which may be considered only in the order specified, may be offered only by the Member—or one of the Members—specified, may amend portions of the bill not yet read for amendment, may amend portions of the bill previously amended, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable as specified, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall not otherwise be in order during further consideration of the bill for amendment: One of the amendments numbered 10, 11, 18, 34, or 56, by Representative KASICH or Representative OBEY, to be debatable for 60 minutes, with 10 minutes controlled by Representative KASICH, 10 minutes controlled by Representative DELLUMS, 10 minutes controlled by Representative OBEY, 15 minutes controlled by Representative DICKS, and 15 minutes controlled by Representative YOUNG of Florida; one or more of the amendments numbered 37, 58, 59, or 61, by Representative OBEY, to be debatable in the aggregate for not more than 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and one of the amendments numbered 3 or 15, by Representative DORNAN, together with the amendment numbered 48 as a substitute therefor, by Representative DELAURO, to be jointly debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the Representatives DORNAN and DELAURO.

Are there any amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KASICH: Page 23, line 17, strike "\$7,162,603,000" and insert "\$6,669,603,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement previously agreed to, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be rec-

ognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Well, we have been through this so many times now, it is kind of hard to bring additional facts to the table, but it seems as though every day we turn around in regard to the B-2 bomber there is another interesting development.

In this morning's Wall Street Journal, the head of the Air Force procurement program, the Air Force general in charge of the procurement programs for the Air Force, so Members of Congress, if you are concerned about the C-17, if you are concerned about any of the acquisition programs of the Air Force, General Muellner, said despite the wishes of many in Congress, quote, the Air Force cannot afford to buy more than 20 B-2 stealth bombers. The bottom line is the budget will not support it, he said. I really believe that.

I mean when we have no one in the Pentagon that wants this airplane, when we have the General Accounting Office talking about the performance problems and performance issues associated with the aircraft, when the cost of the airplane is not affordable, and I ask Members how they can go home and defend the billion dollar airplane while at the same time we are trying to squeeze savings out of this Federal budget, and at a time when the mission of this airplane, which was to invade the Soviet Union in the middle of the nuclear war is over, how the heck can we go forward and tell the Pentagon to buy more?

I will say to my Republican colleagues one of the criticisms that many I have encountered over the break is how is it that we want to squeeze down funding for certain programs but yet we want the Pentagon to spend \$7 billion more than what they have asked for. Now, some people say that generals do not tell the truth any more, that they are all political. Well, it is interesting, in the last administration the generals' words were good. Now the generals are all political.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit to Members that as one who has questioned aggressively the brass in the Pentagon and the civilians in the Pentagon, I have never yet seen the Pentagon come to Capitol Hill and ask for less spending. It blows my mind that the Pentagon could come and ask for less spending and we keep telling them we know better.

When the general in charge of acquisition for all the major weapon systems for the Air Force says we do not want the plane, we cannot afford the plane, folks, it is time to come to the floor and make a big chop out of the stack of wood labeled corporate welfare and adopt this amendment and abide by the