this, President Chirac of France in defiance of global consensus on raising tensions and suspicion, and even to promote again the extension and proliferation of nuclear weapons testing and development, France has already now exploded five nuclear bombs to improve its nuclear delivery capabilities with its long-distance missiles.

It might interest my colleagues that French Government officials—and they're masters of these ploys—a few leaks here and some leaks there—some critical points that President Chirac is going to shove right at our noses at the joint session of Congress next Thursday.

First, a warning to Republican leaders and the President that closing our Government down will have serious economic consequences not only to France but to Europe and other regions of the world.

Second, that the United States contributes too little in foreign aid to Third World countries.

Third, that the United States should live up to its global responsibilities, whatever that means.

Fourth, that United States contributions to the crisis in Bosnia is not enough, but at the same time, France expects to play very prominent, if not, the leading role as far as Europe is concerned relative to Bosnia.

And fifth, France does not want any nation of the world to criticize its current nuclear testing program, because France does not trust the United States involvement with Europe's security needs for the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleagues that what we're going to get from President Chirac next week is not the eloquence of Marquis de Lafayette, but the ghost of Charles de Gaulle II.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the January 24 New York Times for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1996]

POSSIBILITY OF DEFAULT STARTS TO WORRY EUROPE, ESPECIALLY FRANCE

(By Craig R. Whitney)

PARIS, January 23.—The possibility that the deficit-cutting impasse between Congress and the Clinton Administration could start causing the United States Government to default on its debt next month has begun to sink in on European leaders, and the French are anxious to avoid the turmoil that could result.

President Jacques Chirac, who will visit Washington next week, is prepared to warn in a speech to a joint session of Congress that default would upset economies around the world and deeply undermine the American global position, French officials said today.

Congressional Republicans have threatened to refuse to raise the national debt limit unless the Clinton Administration agrees to their agenda for cutting the Federal deficit. If the Administration refuses to give in and fails to find other ways of coming up with money, the Government could start running out of money to pay obligations due on March 1.

At this point, some European leaders are said to be beginning to feel like onlookers at a political game whose players appear little concerned about the chaos a default would cause in international currency and bond markets.

Some see a situation comparable to that in 1975, when Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany felt compelled to warn President Gerald R. Ford that letting New York City go bankrupt could send economic shock waves around the world, which was still fragile from the effects of a sudden rise in oil prices.

Mr. Chirac told the Senate majority leader, Bob Dole, and Speaker Newt Gingrich during his last visit to Washington in the summer that the United States gave too little foreign aid to developing countries, and French officials say that he plans to deliver the same message to Congress in an address planned for Feb. 1.

''We hope that Congress will be disposed to let the United States live up to its global responsibilities,'' one official here said.

Mr. Chirac will tell Congress, French officials say, that Europe, with about the same size economy as the United States, gives three times as much to developing countries—$31 billion, compared with less than $9 billion last year from the United States.

''Where is America and its traditional generosity, where is its desire to help reshape the world?'' asked one French policy maker.

Mr. Chirac is also likely to use his visit to tell both Congress and the Administration that France will insist on reshaping the NATO alliance to reflect changes since the end of the cold war, according to officials in Brussels and Paris.

Mr. Chirac has reintegrated France into some NATO military structures that it left in 1966, but officials say he did so to push for the creation of a stronger European defense arm within the alliance. ''We need to be able to deal with crises like Bosnia even if the United States doesn't want to become involved,'' an official said.

Mr. Chirac may also tell Washington that American plans to contribute $600 million to the reconstruction of Bosnia over the next three years are inadequate. European estimates of the total cost run to $3.7 billion. ''Don't think that the Europeans will be the only ones paying for Bosnian reconstruction,'' Mr. Chirac said in a recent interview, adding that the Europeans expected the United States to pay about the same as they will—about one third.

American officials have responded that the United States committed 20,000 soldiers to the NATO peacekeeping force that began moving into Bosnia last month, a larger contingent than any of its allies.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1719

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2880, THE BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2880) and that it shall be in order at any time to consider the bill in the House; that the bill be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; that all points of order against the bill and against its consideration be waived; and that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to the final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I simply want to take this reservation in order to observe that, unlike so many episodes which the public has seen lately in the Congress where divisions among us have caused great turmoil and consternation both on the floor and throughout the country, both sides of the political aisle have worked very hard and very intensively with a great deal of involvement of people on both sides of the aisle in order to assure that we can overcome major differences and keep the Government open.

I would simply, in continuing my reservation, make the point that there are some items in the proposition which the gentleman from Louisiana is about to bring to the House with which I have strong disagreement; for example, the reduced level of funding for education and a number of other items in the bill. But I think the overriding need of the country is for us to overcome our differences, or at least manage to live with those differences, especially since this is a CR of short-term duration, with the exception of a couple of items in the bill.

So I would simply say that I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana for the way he has handled this difficult task. I am pleased to say that the White House, while they certainly do not agree with every provision in this bill, as I do not, they have signed off on this as a short-term compromise. I very much appreciate both the way they have handled things and the way the gentleman from Louisiana and other Members on both sides of the aisle have handled this.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield to me, before he withdraws his reservation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I

want to say that I appreciate his statement, and I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation over the last few days.

They have been hectic; this has been an incredibly tense negotiation, but the fact is that with the help of the gentleman, both sides of the aisle have come together, along with Members of the other body, and have crafted a compromise to keep the Government open for the next 45 days, one which meets the needs of satisfaction or of best desires of no side completely satisfactorily, but one which represents, I think, the finest of legislative endeavor in that we are able to understand each other's differences and reach agreement in some fashion of compromise, not only among ourselves, but with the White House. Frankly, in view of where we started, I am somewhat amazed.

But I think this also provides the seeds for a long-term solution which will provide us a continuity of Government throughout the rest of the year. At least it is a first step. We will have to judge that when this continuing resolution or this targeted appropriation cycle is over. But at any rate, I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation and yield back to him.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Continuing my reservation, I would simply observe that we do not have to endorse every provision in this proposal in order to endorse the fundamental idea that the Government ought to stay open to continue to provide services to our tax-paying citizens.

I would simply observe that this has been an immense amount of consultation with a tremendous number of people. I think this morning we were at draft number 32. I do not know what number it is now, but whatever number it is, I am glad it is the last one.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I would like to ask the chairman if he would tell me, not having had the opportunity to read the entire bill, does the bill contain any of the provisions of the line-item veto in this bill? Does it contain those provisions?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I would advise the gentleman that this Balanced Budget Down Payment Act, I, as we have called it, has no language whatsoever dealing with the line-item veto, but that the line-item veto, as the gentleman does know, has passed the House of Representatives and in a much different form has passed the U.S. Senate, and is awaiting resolution in conference.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I would say to the gentleman that that conference not having reached a resolution, many of us here are concerned that in the middle of the 1996 process, as this body and the other body continue to identify areas of spending with which we disagree and seek to reduce or eliminate funding, we believe that it is just as important to allow the President to identify funding to attempt to cut as well through the line-item veto.

I would simply note that on Tuesday evening, the President called upon the Congress to pass the line-item veto, at which a supermajority of both Democrats and Republicans gave him a standing ovation. I would call upon this body to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I will not object, because I do understand the importance and necessity of keeping the Government operating, of having this continuing resolution. But if we are going to continue week after week or month after month passing additional continuing resolutions, I would certainly hope that the majority would include the line-item veto provisions in the next continuing resolution so that we could give that to the President and allow him to do the same thing we are attempting to do in reducing spending.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield further, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I especially appreciate him not making an objection.

I would point out to the gentleman that as a long-standing proponent of the line-item veto myself, I look forward to a speedy resolution of that issue in the conference, but that I would, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, rather not include it in the appropriations process, because I think it is a little astray of what we are trying to do. We often find that we take on a little bit more than we can carry, and then we try to chew it and have to spit it out.

So, I appreciate the gentleman's position. I certainly agree in principle with his position, and I hope that that matter will be resolved before long.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's position is certainly understandable. The concern, however, is that it certainly was a major platform in the Contract With America. It passed this body with overwhelming support. The President supports it, yet the 1996 appropriation process is virtually through, and the line-item veto does not apply to it. So we would like to develop a way to get it applicable to the 1996 process, and that is the purpose for trying to put it on the appropriations bills or continuing resolutions so that we could involve the President, give this President the authority now to start cutting that kind of pork-barrel spending.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield one last time, I would simply point out that he is absolutely on point. However, I might add that, as the gentleman knows, for this year and in years past we have continued to appropriate within the discretionary budget limits which are being reduced more and more and more. The fact is that this Congress, since the 104th Congress was sworn in, has saved the American taxpayer, within the discretionary portion of the budget, some $20 billion under what we would have spent in original fiscal year 1995 level, and another $22 to $30 billion below that level in fiscal year 1996 already.

So we are on that glidepath toward a balanced budget, but the gentleman is correct. A line-item veto would enhance our ability to do so, and I appreciate his position.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and, if I may, engage the distinguished chairman in some discussion.

I hope I do not have to object, and I certainly commend everybody involved in what seems to be some progress in establishing or reestablishing a tradition of some bipartisan give and take and inclusiveness in this difficult process.

□ 1730

I have been relying on a three-page document prepared, I assume, by the Committee on Appropriations staff that summarizes this 60-plus page bill which we have just gotten, and therefore need to be able to rely on the summary.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of things here concerns me. Down at the bottom of this first page, the summary recites essentially a 75-percent floor on certain specific items, including, for instance, the Advanced Technology Program. While earlier in the summary it is recited as the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations, we will be at the level that had been agreed to in the conference that was ultimately vetoed. My concern is the possible inconsistency or conflict between those provisions.

Is the body to understand that that 75-percent floor supersedes contrary provisions that were in the conference report, which as to ATP was at a much lower level?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would say it is a 75-percent cap as opposed to a floor. With that acknowledgment, I would say that the provisions of this particular legislation that we pass today do not affect programs that were addressed in targeted appropriations or in previous appropriations bills except for a few instances.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, it is not that point, but the apparent internal inconsistency between the 75-percent cap and the other language in this legislation that prescribes funding levels for the Commerce Department in accordance with the earlier rejected conference report or the earlier vetoed

conference report. In that conference report, for instance, the ATP program was funded at substantially lower levels than the 75 percent. I want to make sure the 75 percent controls.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this funding would be more than what was in that conference report. The gentleman is correct that while we provide for the conference levels of funding for most programs, several of those programs which were terminated or slotted for termination, such as the one the gentleman mentioned, would be brought up to a 75-percent cap by virtue of this legislation.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, just in trying to reconcile the text of this 60-plus pages with the summary, I notice that, for instance, on page 18–E of the bill, we address the question of a partial repeal of a provision recently enacted in the Lobbying Reform Act that is not mentioned in the summary.

I am just wondering if the chairman would indicate whether there are any other changes in permanent law similar to this one, which I happen to be familiar with, which are included in the bill but not itemized in the summary, so that Members can be fully informed of permanent law changes?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman the only ones that were inserted were done so at the last minute in the process of negotiations between the House, Senate, and White House. There are a few, and I intend in my opening statement to identify those. Frankly, they are not of major significance, but I will touch on them.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing on my reservation and with respect to this particular point, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the approach that we are taking in correcting this problem with section 18 of the Lobbying Reform Act that this Congress recently passed and the President signed. I think Members have become aware of the difficulty in implementing that particular provision with respect to some of the organizations organized under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code and the prohibitions in section 18 against any such organization that receives a contract or a loan or award from the Federal Government engaging in any lobbying activities.

This bill, as it is presented to the House, is a partial remedy to the problem that we now know is created by section 18, in that it deletes contracts from the scope of the section 18 prohibition.

It seems to me that with the 140,000-plus 501(c)(4) organizations, that include all manner of civic organizations, housing associations, organizations of local governments, a lot of different organizations that may get from time to time a Federal grant or loan or contract, that to address only the ability of contracts of Government and not these other 501(c)(4)s to be able to fully engage in their legitimate rights to talk to us abut problems facing the Nation or in legislation is unfortunate, and that we simply ought to deal with the entire scope of the difficulties that exist under section 18.

As it is, we are responding to the understandable concerns and legitimate concerns, particularly of the Blues and some HMO's who are in a particularly difficult situation. I understand that, and we ought to solve their problem. But we ought to solve the entire problem, not just the problem of people who have a lot of resources and a lot of wealth and influence around this place. We should get at all of the 501(c)(4) issue.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would only say to the gentleman there are lots of problems we could have dealt with in this bill. We dealt with those most exigent problems we felt needed to be dealt with in order to resolve anomalies that, frankly, were hanging out there that would cause great hardship had we not addressed them.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions in this area. The gentleman well knows that this problem was brought to our attention when the lobbying bill was moving through the Senate, as a matter of fact, and the cosponsors on the Senate side, Senator SIMPSON and Senator CRAIG, had attempted to correct it at that time.

It is not that we are responsive to a narrow segment of those who are affected by the lobbying bill. It is that this was an area which is in clear conflict because of the unique history of this particular group.

Blue Cross/Blue Shield associations were classified as 501(c)(4)'s back in the 1930's. Usually if you are classified under the Internal Revenue Tax Code as a 501(c)(4), for example, you are tax exempt in your activities. Ironically, in 1986 in the tax bill Congress placed the selfsame organizations in a taxable category, so they are now classified as 501(c)(4)'s, but they are, in fact, paying taxes, so they do not get a tax-free benefit from the classification.

In addition to that, the Blue Cross/Blue Shield associations have been carrying out on a contractual arrangement the financial management servicing for Medicare, 40 percent of the recipients of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program under the U.S. operation, CHAMPUS, and a number of other areas.

This is a real problem faced now by virtue of a letter, and I would like to place it in the RECORD, and if you have not seen it, I want to share it with the gentleman from Colorado, dated January 16, in which the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, rightly, in trying to carry out the law as written, has sent out notices asking a series of questions, ''Please fax immediately to your contract specialist those who are contractees with FEHBP,'' and question one, ''Is the organization tax exempt?'' This group would say no.

Question two, ''Is the organization considered a 501(c)(4)?'' This group would say yes.

What we have here is a situation in which with full knowledge we went ahead and passed a law that would put these people in a very narrow timeframe, in significant jeopardy of continuing to run the Medicare, CHAMPUS, and FEHBP program.

This group means to comply with all of the lobbying disclosure and reporting requirements. This is not an attempt to create a loophole. If people are receiving grants, then that is what we want to focus on. If they are receiving awards, we want to focus on it. But our failure to understand the complexity of the history of certain organizations and the interaction that would be triggered immediately and our inability to carry out needed functions brought about this technical amendment.

I would tell the gentleman if he identifies other groups that fall in the category of 501(c)(4) and are, in fact, taxable and would stop a significant portion of the Federal Government's ongoing contractual obligations and does not fit into this particular amendment, we may have to look at another one. This one is real, it is now, and it needs to be fixed. I commend the chairman for understanding that this is a real problem. A technical correction solves it.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I appreciate the validity of all of the points the gentleman has just made, but I think he draws the boundaries a bit narrowly on the organizations in this country that have legitimate reason to be concerned.

As it happens Blue Cross/Blue Shield is in a position to follow legislation here very closely. They did that. Their lawyers and lobbyists were able to identify this problem very quickly. But we are realizing the consequences of legislating in haste and without appropriate hearings and examination of consequences with regard to section 18 of the Lobbying Act, which was added in the Senate without any hearings and, even as it was working its way through the process, realized it was going to have unintended and unfortunate consequences.

We only are awaiting the further experience of organizations like the National Association of Counties, the National Rifle Association, which I believe has contracts or grants from the Federal Government, and some of their activities, to see exactly how intrusive and violative of the rates of other

501(c)(4) organizations to participate fully in the political life of the country. So it will not just be that nicely drawn narrow category the gentleman identified, but I think we need to be concerned more broadly than that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say I fully agree with everything that the gentleman has said with respect to this issue. In my view, what you have here is a case of the squeaky wheel getting the grease, which means that the Blues and a couple of other parties are being taken care of because they have raised legitimate objections about how this impacts them. But I think this Congress is remiss in not recognizing there are many other people who may not be as big, but whose proximity to them will be just as big because of the language, which ought not be in the law in the first place.

So I think this is a case here of this proposition being better than the situation that would exist without it, but not nearly as good as it ought to be, because it ought to include everybody who has a similar problem.

I would hope that, upon reflection, the Congress would recognize it has made a mistake in limiting it in the future and to correct it. But for now, I think even though I agree fully with the gentleman, I did not think that that objection would be sufficient to justify bringing down this entire proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the letter that I indicated from the Senate was dated November 17. It has been more than 3 months. It has been almost a month since the law went into effect. Does the gentleman from Colorado have in his possession a letter from any other organization indicating a failure to carry out a contractual obligation with the Federal Government because of this legislation?

Mr. SKAGGS. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you have a letter?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, it has only been a couple of weeks since this law became effective. I think the gentleman assumes a level of alacrity across the country which is unrealistic in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, having made these points, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make inquiry, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know that the work that was done was to assure that we did not shut the Government down. I think we need to accept that responsibility.

Can the gentleman help me as I try to answer some of the questions regarding this impact on my constituents? There is a section on page 10 that indicates a prohibition against no new grants and it lists health and human services, and particularly refers to National AIDS Program, homeless service grants. There is a whole litany, the youth gang substance abuse.

My inquiry is that this does not shut them down; what you are saying is that they cannot activate, and I want this to be my understanding, not put words in your mouth, they cannot activate any new grants, but they can carry on their business? Is that my understanding?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is correct. Actually it goes a little bit beyond that. They can actually engage in providing grants up to 75 percent of previous monthly levels. So the fact is they cannot only service old grants, but they can engage in current activity up to 75 percent of previous limits.

□ 1745

This is a change put in the bill in just the last few minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. They can carry on current business and provide new grants at a 75-percent level that would include youth gangs, substance abuse, child welfare.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There is a lengthy list, and we will make that a part of the RECORD.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I noticed in reference to NASA, as the gentleman well knows, they are engaged now in a series of space explorations and research, and, in fact, were preparing for such during the Government shutdown. There seems to be on page 2931, and I have no problem with assisting any of our sister States, some transfer of dollars, $10 million to Mississippi, but that is not going to impair any further, ongoing, present explorations that are proposed now for NASA in the coming months and impinge on any safety factors for NASA?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield further, she is correct, and this measure will free up an additional $40 million for NASA; so they are actually better off because of this provision.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am so concerned and I have two last questions.

There was an Executive order recently to deal with increased utilization of the Border Patrol coming from the State of Texas and obviously concerned with drug influx and other problems. The Department of Justice not being funded, do we have concern, or is there any way that that will not be negatively impacted, or are we in jeopardy?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield further, I would advise the gentlewoman that the Department of Justice is funded at the conference level, and, in fact, most law enforcement authorities were already provided for in the targeted for appropriation under the bill that we passed early in January. So actually the Border Patrol would have been taken care of by the last bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If we pass the CR, but as you have indicated, that is protected and covered?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not only covered through the term of this bill, but through the end of the fiscal year by virtue of what we did earlier.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, lastly there were several riders in the VA–HUD bill, and, of course, we do realize that even though we are concerned and want to make sure that the Government stays open, there are still levels of disagreement on many of these pieces of legislation and, obviously, the appropriation process. Are these riders still in this CR that we might have some disagreement, particularly relating to the environment and relating to HUD in particular?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield, I would advise the gentlewoman that the VA–HUD bill is funded at the conference level, but under last year's terms and conditions. So the restrictions and guidance language in the conference report would not apply.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Would not be included?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Right.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. I think that we are all trying to move to the point of resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2880, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

THE BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, I

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the bill (H.R. 2880) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.