

be reformed and brought into the 21st century. Politicians using scare tactics and acting like demagogues won't accomplish anything. Let's be responsible and confront the issue. And, solve it.

OPPOSITION TO THE DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Defense appropriations bill, especially given the priorities currently being established in Congress.

Now that the cold war is over, why do we continue to spend \$100 billion a year to defend Europe and Asia against a nonexistent enemy, while at the same time this Congress proposes major cut-backs in Medicare and Medicaid?

Why are we continuing to fund the absurd star wars program, but make disastrous cuts in student loans and education, the future of America?

Why are we expanding the B-2 program at over \$1 billion a plane, when the Pentagon has not even asked for any more planes, but we are cutting back on school nutrition programs and child care?

Why are we not cutting the CIA and the other intelligence programs now that the Soviet Union does not exist, but instead are cutting back on Head Start?

CONGRESS MUST BALANCE THE BUDGET AND STRENGTHEN MEDICARE

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks, after decades of fiscal irresponsibility, Congress will at last face up to its fundamental duty to balance the Federal budget. Not since 1969 have Federal expenses matched Federal revenues. Since then, we have compiled a national debt that bears down on our economy like a lead weight, the new Republican Congress is owning up to its commitment to balance the budget as a matter of moral obligation to future generations.

In addition, we are serious about saving the Medicare system. This is not a partisan issue—the President's own Cabinet Secretaries tell us the system is going bankrupt. Republicans find that unacceptable, Mr. Speaker, and our plan will strengthen and preserve Medicare for the sake of America's seniors.

Years ago, Ronald Reagan asked, "If not us, who? If not now, when?" Mr. Reagan's questions still resonate today. For the sake of our children and our parents, we will balance the budget and strengthen Medicare.

□ 1040

SUPPORT FOR U.N. CONVENTION ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN [CEDAW]

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today women from around the globe are meeting in Beijing.

The U.N. Fourth World Conference on Women, despite all of its problems, is turning out to be a testament to the will and determination of women who seek to create a better world for one-half of the world's population. Women today, in Beijing, are taking a stand for women.

Today, in these Chambers, I am asking my colleagues in the House of Representatives to take a stand for women. Today, I am introducing a resolution to urge the Senate to ratify the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, also known as CEDAW.

I hope that the next century will be the first century in the history of humanity where women are not faced with Government sanctioned discrimination. My resolution will be a step in that direction.

I look forward to the Congress of the United States approving my resolution.

WHY I SUPPORT THE B-2 PROGRAM

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the B-2 amendment. Like my colleagues I have taken a hard look at the B-2 program. In fact, I have gone out of my way to find a reason to vote against the B-2. I came to Washington to cut the deficit and eliminate wasteful programs. I voted against the space station because in my opinion the program did not make sense in the current budget environment.

The same cannot be said for the B-2. The truth is, that I have been unable to find a compelling reason to justify halting this program at 20 planes. The B-2, with its unprecedented combination of stealth, range, and payload is precisely the kind of technologically advanced weapon in which the Congress should invest.

A single B-2 has the ability to complete a mission that would require many more conventional aircraft. This in turn puts far fewer lives at risk. During the Gulf War the stealthy F-117 flew only 2 percent of the missions but hit 40 percent of the targets. The stealthy B-2 has a far greater capability than the F-117. We must keep our technological edge as we move toward the 21st century. The B-2 stealth bomber is the weapon that can meet future challenges.

REPUBLICANS' MEDICARE PLAN DOES NOT MAKE SENSE

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Last month, Mr. Speaker, I listened to Ohioans in the 13th Congressional District in a town meeting in Newton Falls, at county fairs in Medina County, Portage County, at a supermarket in Sheffield Lake. People could not believe the Republicans' plan to cut \$270 million in Medicare and at the same time turn around and give tax breaks to the wealthiest Americans of the same amount. I say to my colleagues, if you make \$300,000 a year, you save \$20,000 a year of your taxes under the Republican plan, while, as a Medicare beneficiary, it will cost you \$1,000 a year. If you are paying right now as a Medicare beneficiary a premium of about \$46 a month, under the Republican plan you will pay somewhere in the vicinity of \$110 a month.

Mr. Speaker, that extra \$60 or \$70 may not sound like much per month to a Member of Congress. But if my colleagues are making \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year, and they are retired, on Social Security, paying that extra several hundred dollars, \$700 or \$800 a year, for medical care is an absolute back breaker, and it does not make sense, Mr. Speaker, to make Medicare beneficiaries pay a thousand dollars more a year, all so they can give tax breaks to the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, it does not make sense.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

Mr. WISE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The Democrat leadership has been consulted and has no objections to these requests.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

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