There was no objection.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON S. 4, THE SEPARATE ENROLLMENT AND LINE-ITEM VETO ACT OF 1995

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, and by direction of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and the Committee on Rules, I offer a privileged motion and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLINGER moves that the House insist on its amendment to the bill S. 4 and agree to a conference with the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, on February 6 of this year the House passed H.R. 2, to give the President the line-item veto. The Senate followed suit in adopting S. 4, a separate enrollment version of item veto which was both considerably weaker than the House language and which posed substantial administrative burdens.

The disparity between our approaches was obvious, and so for the past several months Representatives of the House and Senate have been meeting informally to sort out the differences between our bills. The meetings have helped to identify areas for compromise and have focused attention on areas of remaining concern, such as the bills' target tax benefit language and en bloc voting provisions.

Because of these informal and bipartisan discussions, it now appears that agreement on the line-item veto is well within reach. House and Senate leaders have agreed that a formal conference is now warranted, and we are prepared to act. But to progress further and achieve a final agreement, the House must agree to a conference. My motion will allow us to move forward through a conference to resolve our few remaining differences and send to the President the bill he has been seeking—the strongest possible line-item veto.

I urge the motion's adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the privileged motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. WISE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WISE moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendments to the bill S. 4 be instructed to insist upon the inclusion of provisions within the scope of conference making the bill applicable to current and subsequent fiscal year appropriation measures.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I offer this motion on behalf of the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], and the other Democrats on the committee. I would hope that it would be noncontroversial.

Mr. Speaker, my motion does one thing and one thing only. It instructs the House conferees to insist upon an agreement giving the President line-item veto authority over current fiscal year appropriations, not just appropriations that are enacted after the enactment of the line-item veto. In other words, if my colleagues believe in the line-item veto, that they want it to apply as early as possible, that is the purpose of this motion to instruct.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, pending that I would just indicate that, as chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, we are pleased to accept the motion offered by the minority to instruct. The motion simply urges conferees to extend the full effect of the line-item veto to the President insofar as the scope of the conference will allow, and it is an eminently reasonable suggestion which fulfills the spirit of the line-item veto legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the motion.

Mr. Speaker, the report from my constituents during the month of August was very clear: Get on with the task of balancing the budget and downsizing government.

One tool that is going to be critical in the effort to reduce wasteful spending is the line-item veto. I have long supported a line-item veto for the President and have repeatedly introduced legislation to provide for this provision.

Both Houses have passed a line-item veto and it is time to go to conference and get this enacted into law.

I do not care whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat, we should give him a line-item veto, and we should do it now.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for yielding me half of his time. I applaud the chairman for the outstanding work that he and his committee have done to bring the line-item veto bill to this point, along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and other members of the Committee on Rules who have worked so diligently and so long on this very important issue. I agree with Chairman CLINGER that the gentleman's motion to instruct be accepted.

However, Mr. Speaker, it must not go unnoticed that we are at an historic moment right now, one which some of us have awaited for over 125 years. I recall 17 years ago when I came here with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] it was the first bill that I introduced in the Congress, and having waited all these years, it is going to be so gratifying to see this bill finally become law.

It is going to mean something to another person that I have such great respect for, and that is the man on whose birthday we passed this line-item veto back on February 6. His name is Ronald Wilson Reagan, one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever known, and, once this passes both bodies and is signed into law by the President, no one will be happier than that former great President.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to allow the ranking member, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], to control the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, my motion does one thing, and one thing only. It instructs the House conferees to insist upon an agreement giving the President line-item veto authority over current fiscal year appropriations, not just appropriations that are enacted after the enactment of the line-item veto.

At the outset, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for his support for my motion. Although we disagree over the need to give the President line-item veto authority at all, his willingness to give the President this authority over 1996 appropriations, if applicable, demonstrates his fairness and his commitment to the line-item veto as an instrument of fiscal policy.

In fact, the policy of the House-passed bills is to cover current year appropriations, and my motion simply ensures that this will continue to be the policy of the House. As a result of the passage of the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the President would have 10 days after the bill's date of enactment to line-item veto any unobligated funds from previously enacted appropriations for the current 1995 fiscal year.

My motion simply updates the intent of this amendment by instructing the conferees to make the line-item veto applicable to any current year appropriation, which may be fiscal year 1996 by the time the line-item veto conference is concluded.

The Obey amendment, which was adopted on February 3 of this year, received support from both sides of the aisle.

In accepting the amendment for the majority, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and manager of this bill, said ''it is an excellent addition to what we are trying to do here, which is to get at those elements of pork, wherever they may exist and wherever they exist every year.''

Some have suggested that after receiving publicity for passing the line-item veto, some Republican proponents of this legislation wanted to deny President Clinton use of the line-item veto against upcoming fiscal year appropriations which they have written.

Again, the debate from earlier this year makes it clear that this was not their stated intent at the time.

During the floor debate, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, and a manager of the bill, made this very clear and forceful statement, and I quote:

> Well, here we are. We get a Democratic President, and here is Solomon up here fighting for the same line item veto for that Democratic President. I think this is something that a chief executive in government, regardless of political party, should have, just as 43 Governors of States have it. * * *.

The gentleman from New York went on to say, ''I guess I have enough confidence in any President, regardless of political party, to use this new tool selectively and judiciously.''

In his closing arguments, the Speaker also went out of his way to make it very clear that he had no interest in playing partisan politics with this issue. This is what the Speaker said at that time:

> For those who think that this city has to always break down into partisanship, you have a Republican majority giving to a Democratic President this year without any gimmicks an increased power over spending, which we think is an important step for America, and therefore it is an important step on a bipartisan basis to do it for the President of the United States without regard to party or ideology.

The record is clear on both points. There was every intention to give the President line-item veto authority over current year appropriations, including those passed prior to the enactment of this bill, and not to deny the President this authority for partisan political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I personally do not support the line-item veto bill, but if it is the answer to the country's spending problems that its proponents say it is, then this President should have it to deal with appropriations that may soon become law.

Once Congress cedes the line-item veto authority to a President, it is unlikely that it will every get it back. In the future, there will always be Presidents to whom the Congress may not want to give the line-item veto authority, but they will not have that choice. To deny the President line-item veto authority over fiscal year 1996 appropriations is to admit that the line-item veto is a mistake.

Today, I ask all proponents of this measure, to demonstrate again that their purpose is serious, fiscal reform. Vote for my motion to instruct the conferees to insist that the bill continue to apply to current appropriations, including, if applicable, those 1996 appropriations measures that soon will be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds in order to recognize the enormous role that the chairman of the Committee on Rules has played in this whole effort. As he said, starting 17 years ago he has been in the forefront of the effort to bring to fruition the line-item veto, and I commend him for his commitment to this goal over these many years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], another leader in this effort, who has done a superb job and, hopefully, will be a member of the conference and bring this thing home.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, today the House is taking action to provide the President an important tool necessary to reduce Government spending. As we move to go to conference on the line-item veto, we take a major step toward eliminating wasteful projects which are often buried in public laws without the benefit of public scrutiny.

On February 6 this House passed H.R. 2 by the overwhelming and bipartisan vote of 294 to 134. The Senate unfortunately disregarded that version and went on to pass a somewhat cumbersome line-item veto which would split larger bills into hundreds of pieces when they went to the President's desk.

Separate enrollment, as the other body calls its version, would create many problems, not the least of which would be giving the President writer's cramp from signing the thousands of bills Congress would be forced to send him.

The House, on the other hand, produced a strong, workable bill which preserves the balance of power between the legislative and executive branches while providing the President with more flexibility by allowing a reduction of spending items. I am confident that in working together with the Senate we can come up with a fine compromise.

By the end of this fiscal year, the Federal debt is estimated to be more than $4.9 trillion. In fact, appropriately on Friday, October 13, of this year, the Federal debt will reach the incredible level of $5 trillion. That means a child born today is immediately saddled with an expense of more than $187,000 over their lifetime just to pay the interest on their debt. While it will not in and of itself balance the budget, the line-item veto will be an important tool the President can use as this country moves toward that goal in 2002.

By moving forward on the line-item veto today, we are poised to deliver a long-overdue instrument of fiscal discipline not only to the President, but to the entire system of government here in Washington. Because we have kept our promise to swiftly maneuver the line-item veto through Congress, the days are numbered for wasteful projects rolled into omnibus spending bills.

This is truly an historic day because common sense is finally coming to our National Capital. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] for his tremendous leadership on this issue as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and many Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle who think this is a very, very important tool for the President to have.

□ 1100

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to go to conference and the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] to instruct conferees to H.R. 2, the line-item veto bill. I am pleased, frankly, that we are finally naming conferees, although I am disappointed that it has taken so long. I would like to give some credit to my colleague, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], for prodding us to this point in the process.

Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago, February 6, the House passed H.R. 2; the Senate passed its version of the bill on March 23. We did it with great fanfare. In fact, the date that was chosen, February 6, was not fortuitous; it is the birthday of Ronald Reagan. My friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, said this was one of the proudest days of his life. The Republican leadership took particular pride in the fact that they were willing to give a Democratic President this substantial accession of power.

The Speaker himself said during the debate:

For those who think that this city always has to break down into partisanship, you have a Republican majority giving to a Democratic President this year without any gimmicks an increased power over spending.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], said:

A few years ago when we started pushing for this legislative line-item veto, there were a few doubting Democrats who said, ''Solomon, it is easy for you to support the line-item veto when your party controls the White House, but we bet you will not be so gung ho when we have a Democratic President.''

Well, here we are. We get a Democratic President, and here is the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] up here fighting for the same line-item veto for that Democratic President.

So in view of all of the fanfare, what has been the fate of this bill? Almost 150 days after the House and Senate have passed it in different versions, and significantly different versions, that is part of the problem, we are finally getting around to appointing conferees. What happened to the gung ho enthusiasm, to the bipartisan spirit? One has to wonder whether the Republican leadership is no longer so sure that it wants to give these broad powers to a Democratic President. One has to wonder whether they are concerned, afraid that this might give the President too much leverage during the upcoming budget battle. Whatever the reasons may be, I hope we can finally go back to that bipartisan spirit, that enthusiasm that was expressed on February 6.

Mr. Speaker, I still have constitutional questions about this bill. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] knows, every time we brought it up, I have been out here with an alternative that I think is a more workable alternative that would clearly pass constitutional review. However, I finally came around to voting for this, because I think it will help restore credibility in the congressional spending process if we give the President some additional power to cull out wasteful spending and to send it back here for final review.

Mr. Speaker, the question I am raising today is whether we are going to match our rhetoric with action today, and I hope the conferees will not just take their appointment, but move quickly to resolve differences between the House and Senate bill. I think we have to move to the House bill. I think the Senate has come up with an unworkable proposal as well as an unconstitutional proposal.

Let me take just one final moment to urge support for the motion of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] and to commend the gentlewoman for bringing forward this particular motion. This should not be controversial. All they do is make clear that H.R. 2 applies to fiscal year 1996 spending bills, even if these bills become law before H.R. 2 is finally enacted.

As a result of the delay in passing H.R. 2, the item veto bill, it could be interpreted to exclude fiscal year 1996 spending measures from its coverage. It was never the intent of the House, I do not believe when we passed the bill, to exclude fiscal year 1996 spending bills. In fact, when H.R. 2 was considered by the House, we passed the Obey amendment. The Obey amendment gave the President the authority to veto items in fiscal year 1995 appropriation bills within 10 days after passage of H.R. 2, even if H.R. 2 was enacted.

So I do not think that the Collins amendment should be controversial. If we are true to our intent here, true to our purpose, we will make this part of the instruction, and I hope it will come back, the conference report itself, will come back with the Collins provisions incorporated.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to briefly thank both my former office neighbor, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], who is also a Chicago Bears fan along with me, and it looks like they were going to be coming back strong this year, and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] for quoting my previous remarks. Yes, I did back in 1979 support the line-item veto for a President called Jimmy Carter, and I supported it later on for a President called Ronald Wilson Reagan, and I supported it later on for a President called George Bush, and I still support it for a President called Bill Clinton, because it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to the gentleman, that he wants us to get back on a bipartisan basis. We are doing that right here, because we are supporting the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS]. We want to make this bipartisan. I intend, as one of the conferees, to make sure that we are going to lean toward the House-passed bill, because much of what the gentleman from South Carolina said is true: There are constitutional problems with the Senate version. Plus, from a practical point of view, it is just totally unworkable, if we are going to have a real meaningful line-item veto that a President can use effectively.

So I look forward to working with those Members, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and others who will be conferees to make sure that we get a meaningful line-item veto finally, once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], another leader on this issue and one of the most fiscally responsible Members of this body, a member of the Committee on Rules, who has led the fight for fiscal responsibility since the day he set foot on this floor.

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise obviously in very strong support of the House-passed version of the line-item veto. I would point out that taking this up today as we start out the fall session is a promise kept. We said we would do it, we are doing it. I certainly commend the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] for carrying her motion to resolution which we agree with, as we have said, to instruct conferees. I think it is a useful addition.

I would point out that by a vote of 294 to 134 in early February, this House acted, I think, very decisively to grant line-item veto authority to the President. We really are committed to establishing this tool to root out unnecessary or wasteful spending where we can identify it, and we can, and unfair tax breaks as well, where we can identify them. Our colleagues in the other body obviously have come up with a markedly different approach to the line-item veto, as we all know, their so-called separate enrollment process, and I frankly think that is a very cumbersome and complex process, and I do not think it can be effective, but we will discuss that in conference. We are going to have our work cut out for us over there.

Preliminary discussions, however, make me a little optimistic that we are going to be able to make some progress. I think we are beginning to see some wisdom from people on the other side in understanding our position on this and why we think it is going to work better.

I commend particularly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for their efforts of really keeping this on the front burner as we have gone along, even at a time, frankly, when some thought the differences between the House and the other body were going to be too great to overcome. We are back at it, and I think that is right where we should be.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct conferees reflects a spirit of bipartisan cooperation, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has just reiterated, by urging the conference to move expeditiously so that the line-item veto can begin to work as soon as possible on appropriations measures. This language restates our commitment to implementing the line-item veto expeditiously, as we have promised we would do.

I was down in the district as we all were on this recent break, and I can count on two questions coming up any time I get a gathering of more than two or three people in my district. One of those questions is where is the line-

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 Reform 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