among the Federal, State, and local levels of government.

These proposals will help us to create a stronger economy and more effective Government. I will ask for Congress's help in these efforts.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 6, 1995.*

VOTE FOR THE LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. SANFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you and the rest of this body to encourage the adoption of the line-item veto. In fact, I have a scary couple of numbers here in front of me.

What do $1.75 million for national pig research have in common with $1.7 million for plant stress have in common with $600,000 to ease fish migration up a western river? The thing they all have in common is I cannot do anything about them.

I came here to affect the way Government is spending money, and yet the way Congress works is that I cannot get my hands on them.

The line-item veto would allow the President to do what 43 Governors can do, and that is to reach in, say this is a piece of fat, it does not make sense and it needs to go.

Please vote with me for the line-item veto.

LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 55 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. 2.

□ 1445

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 consideration of the bill (H.R. 2), to give the President line-item veto authority over appropriation Acts and targeted tax benefits in revenue Acts, with Mr. HOBSON (chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Friday, February 3, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, February 3, 1995, only the following further amendments, if offered, will be considered:

An amendment by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] debatable for 1 hour;

An amendment by the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] debatable for 1 hour; and

An amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] debatable for 1 hour.

No amendment to the specified amendments are in order. Debate on each amendment will be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment.

The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ORTON: At the end of section 4, add the following new paragraph:

(5) The term ''discretionary budget authority'' includes authority to enter into contracts under which the United States is obligated to make outlays, the budget authority for which is not provided in advance by appropriations Acts.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous consent request, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Will the gentleman please state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure that we understood the rule the Chair read in its entirety. It was also our understanding, I believe the gentleman would agree, there would be no secondary amendments offered on votes that were going to be held and amendments that were going to be held for rolling; is that a correct assumption?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, no secondary amendments are in order.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am a Member who has supported the line-item veto since before being elected to Congress. This is not a partisan issue, and the line-item veto did not begin with the Contract With America. Many Members on both sides of the aisle support the line-item veto and many new Members have come to the floor of the House today to support the line-item veto.

I would ask those new Members especially to carefully consider the amendment which I now offer. It will be very difficult to explain a ''no'' vote against this amendment which does not weaken but strengthens the President's line-item veto.

The purpose of H.R. 2, the line-item veto, is to single out specific projects of pork barrel spending which are tacked on to larger billions. In fact, last Friday Chairman CLINGER, in accepting the Obey amendment said that the purpose of the bill was to ''get at pork wherever and whenever it may occur.'' My amendment does that in a very simple and straightforward manner. It states, ''the term discretionary budget authority includes authority to enter into contracts under which the United States is obligated to make outlays, the budget authority for which is not provided in advance by appropriations Acts.''

□ 1450

The most visible type of pork-barrel spending are the earmarked projects tucked neatly into large appropriation bills. H.R. 2 will subject this type of pork to line-item veto.

We are also aware of targeted tax expenditures wherein a limited group of taxpayers get a special deduction or credit. H.R. 2 will subject some of this pork to line-item veto.

However, there is a third type of pork which H.R. 2 does not reach without my amendment. It is direct spending which is not appropriated in advance but, rather, is obligated under contract authority. The most common types of contract authority spending are transportation projects authorized by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee which are not appropriated but, rather, spent directly from the trust funds.

Most funding under the Federal Aid Highways Program goes out to the States by formula based upon total highway miles, transportation tax revenues, et cetera. This spending is included in the annual 602(b) caps, and the Appropriation Committee limits the total amount which can be expended under such contract authority.

However, the Transportation Committee also earmarks certain demonstration projects. Demonstration projects are not subject to appropriations limitations but are subject to the