

What They're Saying ...

More Support For The Line-Item Veto Legislation

"[W]e're urging Congress to give this President and future Presidents the opportunity to be able to have what is very much similar to a line-item veto. ... I appreciate the support of both Republicans and Democrats on the Hill in supporting the bill that we've submitted. I urge the Congress to pass this type of legislation so that we can work together to get our deficit cut in half by 2009, but, more importantly, assure the American people that we're being wise about how we use their money."
– President Bush, 6/8/06

Editorials Support Line-Item Veto Legislation

The Washington Post: "We have repeatedly opposed the idea of a line-item veto. So it may seem inconsistent to warmly endorse – as we do – President Bush's proposal this week for what he terms the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006." (Editorial, "A Good Line-Item Veto," *The Washington Post*, 3/10/06)

Los Angeles Times: The President's line-item veto is "solid legislation ... that should pass Constitutional muster." (Editorial, "Cutting Pork, Line By Line," *Los Angeles Times*, 3/16/06)

The Boston Herald: "To meet Constitutional muster, the bill limits the President's authority – allowing him to send line items he opposes back to Congress and requiring a vote. It's an approach Democrats, including John Kerry, have previously embraced. Now is the time to act." (Editorial, "Guarantee He'd Sign This One," *The Boston Herald*, 3/7/06)

The Indianapolis [IN] Star: "In addition, Congress should give the president the power of the line-item veto, a useful tool in cutting out the fat." (Editorial, "Some New Tools Could Cut The Pork," *The Indianapolis [IN] Star*, 4/8/06)

The Denver Post: "The Bush proposal is better than the version struck down in 1998 because it requires Congressional approval of each of the President's cuts, not the all-or-nothing vote of the earlier law." (Editorial, "Two Steps Toward Fiscal Responsibility," *The Denver Post*, 3/10/06)

The [Charleston, SC] Post And Courier: "Congress would do well to support an initiative granting the Nation's chief executive the power to curb excessive spending without forcing him to turn thumbs down on an entire spending package." (Editorial, "Right Time For Line-Item Veto," *The [Charleston, SC] Post And Courier*, 3/1/06)

Lincoln Journal Star: "The experience in Nebraska and other states has been that use of the line-item veto generally is exercised responsibly." (Editorial, "Give President Authority For Line-Item Veto," *Lincoln Journal Star*, 3/9/06)

Las-Vegas Review Journal: "The line-item veto would be a vital tool in the battle against runaway federal spending." (Editorial, "Congressional Spendthrifts," *Las-Vegas Review Journal*, 2/22/06)

Pittsburgh Tribune-Review: "Since 1996, the number of annual earmarks have ballooned from 958 to 13,999. Mr. Bush assures he'll 'tackle this problem' if Congress passes the line-item veto. Such authority – not to rewrite legislation but to kick it back to Congress – rightfully should be the president's. For taxpayers pulling the increasing burdens imposed by Congress, the line-item veto may be their only salvation." (Editorial, "A Line In The Pork," *Pittsburg Tribune-Review*, 3/4/06)

The Wichita [KS] Eagle: "So enhanced rescission authority – or the line-item veto, or whatever you want to call it – wouldn't be a cure-all. Even so, such a change would tip the balance in the right direction." (Editorial, "Budget Tool Could Help Curb Wasteful Spending," *The Wichita [KS] Eagle*, 3/21/06)

San Gabriel Valley [CA] Tribune: "We supported the line item veto under Democrat Bill Clinton, and we again support the concept under Republican George Bush." (Editorial, "Line-Item Veto May Help End Earmarking," *San Gabriel Valley [CA] Tribune*, 3/19/06)