

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 gentleman 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 legis-

lation 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.