

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GEJDENSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

APPOINTMENT OF JAVIER SOLANA AS NATO SECRETARY GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, in the post-cold-war era, security considerations that used to be commonly debated are almost never part of our political or civic discourse.

The threat of the Soviet Union, with its thousands of nuclear warheads pointed at American cities and military installations, with its dozens of army divisions poised to strike Europe, with its surrogate incursions into Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America, and its financial support for terrorist groups throughout much of the world—the Soviet Union provided us all with a common enemy that kept our attention focused on the most serious security concerns of our time.

But the world has not become a safe place simply because the Soviet Union collapsed. The Soviet Union collapsed above all else because Mikhail Gorbachev failed to understand that ultimate ruthlessness and the obvious willingness to utilize terror in a consistent and systematic manner, are necessary for the retention of power by Marxist-Leninist regimes. Gorbachev believed that he could be a civilized communist, at least somewhat respectful of the rights of his citizens, and so the Soviet Union rapidly collapsed as people throughout Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union realized that they could attempt to be free without the guarantee of fierce and merciless, forceful retaliation by their totalitarian states.

Many of the threats to the security of the United States that existed before the Soviet collapse have not gone away, however; what more shocking example of this can exist than the story of the spy for the KGB, Aldridge Ames, whose activities were directly responsible for the deaths of numerous American agents in various places throughout the world? Ames continued to spy for Russia even after the collapse of the Soviet Union and until the very moment that he was apprehended by U.S. counterintelligence personnel.

So the attitude that I believe can often be perceived from the actions of the Clinton Administration, that all is well with regard to people who would have been clearly objectionable for delicate positions in our security structure during the existence of the Soviet Union—that attitude that the past acts of former Marxists or anti-American agitators should be excused or understood as “youthful indiscretions”—

that attitude that I clearly perceive as too-often characteristic of the Clinton Administration, is risky at best.

We need to look at the latest example of that Clinton Administration attitude: the appointment of Javier Solana as Secretary General of NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO, of course, is the military wing of the Western Alliance. It was greatly responsible for maintaining the security of Europe throughout the Cold War, and today we are poised to intervene militarily in an armed conflict in Europe for the first time since World War II, in the Balkans, under the military shield and utilizing the military structure of NATO. Thus, though NATO was always important, it perhaps is even more so today.

So, who is the man who was named yesterday in Brussels as the new Secretary General—the Chief—of NATO? Javier Solana is the Foreign Minister of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party government. Mr. Solana opposed NATO with vehemence throughout the 1970's and 1980's. As late as 1986, when the Socialist-sponsored referendum was held in Spain to determine whether it would remain in NATO, Mr. Solana, then Culture Minister, was one of the most outspoken opponents of Spain remaining in NATO. Solana also opposed the presence of U.S. military bases on Spanish soil. As late as 1985, he contemptuously stated while discussing the issue of U.S. bases, “if need be, we'll send a copy of the Spanish Constitution to Washington so they'll know what a sovereign country is.”

Until September 29, 1979, Mr. Solana was formally a Marxist. That is the date that his party, the Socialist Workers Party, erased the word “Marxist” from its political program so as to help it win the next Spanish general election.

Despite the opposition of much of Western Europe, the Clinton administration insisted upon Mr. Solana to be the new NATO Secretary General. Much of the military and intelligence community of the NATO countries simply could not understand why the Clinton administration would insist on Solana as the new NATO head with other available candidates in contention, such as Mr. Ruud Lubbers, the former Dutch Prime Minister, who was endorsed by France, Germany and Great Britain. Mr. Lubbers is a lifelong and dedicated supporter of NATO with exemplary security credentials.

The Clinton administration insisted on imposing the Spanish Socialist Solana as we prepare to use NATO to intervene militarily in Europe for the first time since World War II, despite the fact that the Spanish government is being wracked by scandals that involve massive governmental corruption that includes even the assassination of opponents by government-created death squads, and despite, perhaps most importantly, that Spain since the Socialist-proposed referendum in Spain

on the issue of NATO in 1986, that country is officially not part of NATO's military structure. That Foreign Minister, of that country that is not part of NATO's military structure, was the Clinton administration's imposed choice for NATO Secretary General.

□ 1900

CONTINUED NUCLEAR BOMBING IN SOUTH PACIFIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ENSIGN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, this may sound like a broken record, but it is not, when it involves the lives of millions of men, women, and children who live in the Pacific region. The crisis may even impact the lives of millions of Americans who live in the State of Hawaii and the Pacific Coast States like Washington, Oregon, and California.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues are not aware of the fact that after our Government, that is, the United States Government conducted approximately 106 nuclear bomb explosions in the Marshall Islands in the Pacific region—yes, this was a period when we were at the height of cold war era between our country and the former Soviet Union—yes, our Government proceeded to conduct one of the most comprehensive nuclear testing programs ever recorded in history, and our national security as well as the security of the free nations of the world was at risk—so, we conducted these nuclear bomb explosions so that our nuclear capability would never be undermined by the former Soviet Union. We exploded nuclear bombs in the atmosphere, on the Earth's surface, beneath the Earth's surface, and yes, even on and under the Atoll Islands of the Marshall Islands—we did such a good job we even arranged to destroy one of the islands whereby it just simply disappeared from the face of the Earth—gone, no more in existence. Some of these islands, 60 to 28, Mr. Speaker, to this day are not fit for human resettlement because of the high degree of nuclear contamination still in existence.

Now just remember, Mr. Speaker, the former Soviet Union was also aggressively pursuing a nuclear testing program—and the Soviets were also exploding nuclear bombs in the atmosphere and on and below the Earth's surface.

Well, something happened Mr. Speaker. Not only protects foreign countries around the world, but the fact was that in some of the nuclear explosions that were conducted in the atmosphere—the winds and cloud formations shifted and carried nuclear contamination to various regions of the world—and in doing so, scientists discovered the presence of strontium 90 in milk and related products—yes, also consumed by Americans.