various objectionable natural resource and environmental policies. One would retain the notorious patenting provision whereby the government transfers billions of dollars of publicly owned minerals at little or no charge to private interests; another would transfer Federal land for a low-level radioactive waste site in California without public safeguards.

While making such devastating cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and other vital programs, this bill would provide huge tax cuts for those who are already the most well-off. Over 47 percent of the tax benefits would go to families with incomes over $100,000—the top 12 percent. The bill would provide unwarranted benefits to corporations and new tax breaks for special interests. At the same time, it would raise taxes, on average, for the poorest one-fifth of all families.

The bill would make capital gains cuts retroactive to January 1, 1995, providing a windfall of $13 billion in about the first 9 months of 1995 alone to taxpayers who already have sold their assets. While my Administration supports limited reform of the alternative minimum tax (AMT), this bill's cuts in the corporate AMT would not adequately ensure that profitable corporations pay at least some Federal tax. The bill also would encourage businesses to avoid taxes by stockpiling foreign earnings in tax havens. And the bill does not include my proposal to close a loophole that allows wealthy Americans to avoid taxes on the gains they accrue by giving up their U.S. citizenship. Instead, it substitutes a provision that would prove ineffective.

While cutting taxes for the well-off, this bill would cut the EITC for almost 13 million working families. It would repeal part of the scheduled 1996 increase for taxpayers with two or more children, and end the credit for workers who do not live with qualifying children. Even after accounting for other tax cuts in this bill, about eight million families would face a net tax increase.

The bill would threaten the retirement benefit of workers and increase the exposure of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation by making it easy for companies to withdraw tax-favored pension assets for nonpension purposes. It also would raise Federal employee retirement contributions, unduly burdening Federal workers. Moreover, the bill would eliminate the low-income housing tax credit and the community development corporation tax credit, which address critical housing needs and help rebuild communities. Finally, the bill would repeal the tax credit that encourages economic activity in Puerto Rico. We must not ignore the real needs of our citizens in Puerto Rico, and any legislation must contain effective mechanisms to promote job creation in the islands.

Title XII includes many welfare provisions. I strongly support real welfare reform that strengthens families and encourages work and responsibility. But the provisions in this bill, when added to the EITC cuts, would cut low-income programs too deeply. For welfare reform to succeed, savings should result from moving people from welfare to work, not from cutting people off and shifting costs to the States. The cost of excessive program cuts in human terms—to working families, single mothers with small children, abused and neglected children, low-income legal immigrants, and disabled children—would be grave. In addition, this bill threatens the national nutritional safety net by making unwarranted changes in child nutrition programs and the national food stamp program.

The agriculture provisions would eliminate the safety net that farm programs provide for U.S. agriculture. Title I would provide windfall payments to producers when prices are high, but not protect family farm income when prices are low. In addition, it would slash spending for agricultural export assistance and reduce the environmental benefits of the Conservation Reserve Program.

For all of these reasons, and for others detailed in the attachment, this bill is unacceptable.

Nevertheless, while I have major differences with the Congress, I want to work with Members to find a common path to balance the budget in a way that will honor our commitment to senior citizens, help working families, provide a better life for our children, and improve the standard of living of all Americans.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1995.*

□ 1845

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President and the bill be referred to the Committee on the Budget.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST FURTHER CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–385) on the resolution (H. Res. 291) waiving points of order against the further conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier I was unavoidably detained. If I had been here, on H.R. 2076 I would have voted ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed two votes.

Had I been present, I have would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall 840 and ''no'' on rollcall 841.

ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER REVISING EXISTING PROCEDURES FOR PROCESSING EXPORT LICENSE APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–142)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In order to take additional steps with respect to the national emergency described and declared in Executive Order No. 12924 of August 19, 1994, and continued on August 15, 1995, necessitated by the expiration of the Export Administration Act of August 20, 1994, I hereby report to the Congress that pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) (''the Act''), I have today exercised the authority granted by the Act to issue an Executive order (a copy of which is attached) to revise the existing procedures for processing export license applications submitted to the Department of Commerce.

The Executive order establishes two basic principles for processing export

license applications submitted to the Department of Commerce under the Act and the Regulations, or under any renewal of, or successor to, the Export Administration Act and the Regulations. First, all such license applications must be resolved or referred to me for resolution no later than 90 calendar days after they are submitted to the Department of Commerce. Second, the Departments of State, Defense, and Energy, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will have the authority to review any such license application. In addition, the Executive order sets forth specific procedures including intermediate time frames, for review and resolution of such license applications.

The Executive order is designed to make the licensing process more efficient and transparent for exporters while ensuring that our national security, foreign policy, and nonproliferation interests remain fully protected.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 5, 1995.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

MEMBERS SHOULD CONSIDER LEGISLATION TO PROTECT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT DURING FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is day 10 of my countdown since the last shutdown of the Federal Government and, astonishingly, of the District of Columbia, not a Federal agency, you may have noticed.

We face the possibility on December 15 of another closedown, or perhaps a short-term CR. For the District that would not be much better than a shutdown, because it is almost impossible to run a city on a 30-day basis without the flexibility to obligate your funds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS, a strong supporter and cosponsor of the D.C. Fiscal Protection Act to allow the District to spend its own funds and to continue to operate in the event of a shutdown or a failure of the President to sign an appropriation in time. The gentleman from Virginia had a hearing on this bill today, and I would like to note for the RECORD some of the remarks of the witnesses, because they reflect a very broad support from every sector in the District on a bipartisan basis for this legislation.

The Comptroller of the United States testified for the administration that the administration believes that legislation is necessary. Dr. Brimmer, the Chair, the distinguished Chair of the Control Board, testified, ''the city's' critical fiscal condition would be aggravated by any more such actions.'' He went on to say, ''nearly 15,000 employees were furloughed, resulting in a $7.3 million loss in productivity.'' May I add, Mr. Speaker, that this is a city in the throes of fiscal insolvency. The notion that the Congress would participate in aggravating that condition is simply unacceptable, and I think unintended by this body.

Dr. Brimmer goes on: ''District headquarters and agency budget analysts were nearly all deemed nonessential. This delayed critical work on the development of the District's 1996 and 1997 financial plan and budget needed to provide the city's fiscal recovery. We agree that the District should be allowed to obligate or expend an amount equal to all locally generated revenues such as local taxes and local fees.'' One might ask: What is the District's own local money doing in the Congress of the United States in the first place, Mr. Speaker?

The Board of Trade testified today, and I am quoting: ''One week of delay in licensing and permitting inspections and other business-related regulatory process increases costs. These were services that are largely paid for by locally generated revenues.''

Mr. Tidings of the Board of Trade concluded: ''I understand that some Members of Congress are concerned that should the District be exempted from the larger Federal budget debate, there no longer would be a distinction between which other Federal agencies deserved the exemption and which do not. No matter how individual Members of Congress may view their constitutional oversight responsibilities for the District of Columbia, it is a unique Federal entity and one that cannot and should not be compared to any other Federal department or agency. The Greater Washington Board of Trade fully supports this subcommittee's efforts to allow the District of Columbia Government to remain open during a Federal shutdown under the spending parameters outlined in Ms. NORTON's proposal.

Two unions also testified, Mr. David Shrine and Mr. Hicks, Mr. Shrine of the AFGE, and Mr. Hicks of AFSCME.

Every sector and bipartisan membership on the subcommittee all agree that this is the Nation's Capital for which we all must take responsibility. The notion of pushing it into greater insolvency because we allow it to shut down, or tether it to a short-term CR, making it impossible to run the city in a rational way, is not what this body should stand for. It is hard to defend adding to the waste and inefficiency for which the District has been criticized, at a time when the city is close to fiscal insolvency, it is hard to defend holding hostage the District of Columbia's own money by tethering it to a short-term CR, allowing it to operate by fits and starts, and compounding its fiscal problems. It is hard to defend putting a leash on the District, making it operate in a straitjacket that promotes terrible waste and compounds the inefficiency for which Member after Member has criticized the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this body to consider the bill. I ask the majority to bring forward the bill that has bipartisan support in the committee.

URGING THE PRESIDENT TO JOIN REPUBLICANS IN BALANCING THE BUDGET NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY} is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Members' indulgence to allow me to go ahead of the line.

Mr. Speaker, today the American people have some good news and some bad news when it comes to balancing the budget. The good news is that President Clinton has finally decided to come to the negotiating table with a 7-year budget. The bad news is that he has vetoed the only real balanced budget that gives tax relief to families, moves power out of Washington, saves Medicare for the next generation, and reduces Washington's spending.

The President's decision to offer a plan that balances in 7 years is a positive first step. He seemingly realizes that the American people want a balanced budget now, not a balanced budget sometime after the next election.

Of course, we are waiting to see if his budget actually balances according to the accounting experts, but it is a shame that the President has waited until the last possible moment to start serious negotiations, and it is a shame that he has chosen to veto the first significant balanced budget the Congress has produced in decades. We in Congress have been working for a full year, we have been working diligently to deliver the American people a real Christmas present. We have shopped around our ideas, we have balanced the costs and the benefits, and we have delivered a product that all America can take pride in.

Our budget reflects the principles so important to the American people. Our budget saves Medicare, it reforms welfare, it reduces Washington, spending so people can spend more of their own money at home. It returns power to the States from the Federal Government, and it balances the budget now.

President Bill Clinton is the proverbial Christmas Eve shopper, spending little time thinking about his balanced budget, and now rushing to beat the Christmas deadline. We hope his budget meets the test of being real, of being balanced, and of being fair to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to join Republicans in doing the will of the American people: Balance the budget now.