

that the NAACP should close up shop, that its members should go home and reflect on John F. Kennedy's aspiration, 'Ask not what your country can do for you, but rather ask what you can do for your country.'" That quote is in his syndicated column of July 26, 1988.

There are many, many quotes that show that Pat Buchanan is not the person to lead the people who are suffering in America, those who are insecure and uncertain. You cannot be led by a demagog who makes these kinds of statements and called Capitol Hill "Israeli-occupied territory" in the St. Louis Dispatch in October, 1990. He referred to Capitol Hill as "Israeli-occupied territory."

In a 1977 column, Buchanan said despite Hitler's antisemitism and genocidal tendencies, he was an "individual of great courage. Hitler's success was not based on his extraordinary gifts alone. His genius was an intuitive sense of the mushiness, the character flaws, the weakness masquerading as morality that was in the hearts of the statesmen who stood in his path." The Guardian of January 14, 1992, is the source of that quote.

I cite all of these because we are at least making the breakthrough on the issues. But the issues would be thoroughly confused, the issues that relate to working people, the issues of concerns to those people who are experiencing anxiety and who are the victims of the dislocation, the people suffering because our Government is guilty of great waste.

Our Government is guilty of continuing corporate welfare for agribusiness, guilty of continuing to overfund the defense industry. Our Government is guilty of continuing to fund an overbloomed CIA that loses \$2 billion in its petty cash fund. Our Government is continuing to not pay attention to the kind of priorities that common sense has set forth.

Common sense says we should put more money into education, we should not be cutting title I by \$1.1 billion. We should not be cutting Head Start, we should not be dillydallying around with the Summer Youth Employment Program. Common sense says we ought to maximize our programs for educational opportunity. Common sense says we ought to maximize our job training programs. Common sense says we ought to pay attention to the fact that a technological revolution is going to cause a lot of suffering, and no one has a right to make a judgment that some people are expendable, that some people should be thrown overboard, that in the process of streamlining and downsizing, either the Government or in the private sector, human beings do not matter. Common sense says no.

I am happy that common sense is on the rise. That common sense in the final analysis will save this democracy. This Nation will probably endure for 1,000 years because of the fact that there is a process built in which allows

common sense to percolate and allows common sense to rise to the top. Ever so slowly the process takes place, but it is underway, and I think that it will have an impact; a revolution that is underway, pushed by the Republican majority, will hear from the people out there who will fall back on the wisdom of common sense. That common sense will prevail.

#### PRESIDENT GAGGING WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 15 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening for a brief period of time to discuss an unfortunate incident involving the Clinton administration. As the chairman of the Research and Development Committee for the Committee on National Security, my responsibility is to oversee the funding for the research and development component of our national defense. That amounts to approximately 30 billion-odd dollars a year.

One of our top priorities, Mr. Speaker, is to review the missile defense capabilities of this country, to provide for the common defense of the people of this Nation from a deliberate or accidental launch of a cruise or ballistic missile from any place or spot in the world. It is a very important topic, and one that resulted in strong bipartisan support in the 1995 calendar year, as Democrats and Republicans joined together in providing one of the single biggest differences in the Clinton administration's defense request.

In the House committee, our bill, which plussed up the missile defense accounts by \$800 million, the bill passed by a vote of 48 to 3. On the House floor, in spite of what the President had requested for missile defense, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives and moderates, joined together with a 300-vote margin in approving the changes we provided for in the committee. So there was strong bipartisan support in this Congress.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, however, the administration and the President vetoed the bill, because he said what we had done in the area providing a national missile defense would in fact violate the ABM Treaty. That was not in fact true, and we knew it at the time, but the President said it will anyway.

Starting this year, Mr. Speaker, we agreed we would bring in the witnesses from the administration to tell the story as to whether or not we could build a system that was within the ABM Treaty, at a relatively low cost, that was doable and would protect the American people.

Mr. Speaker, today we were scheduled to hold a hearing, my subcommit-

tee, at 10 a.m. A total of 12 members showed up, 10 Republicans and 2 Democrats, and zero witnesses.

The witnesses who were supposed to be at the hearing included Gen. Mal O'Neill, who heads the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, Clinton's point person on missile defense, General Garner, who is the Army's missile defense spokesman, and General Linhard, who is the Air Force's point person on missile defense.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Speaker, they were all anxious to testify. In fact, I have their testimony. Each of them submitted it to us as if they were there. As I hold up the testimony they were going to give to us, it is very interesting. In fact, I will provide this to any Member of Congress, and anyone who is watching us today, Mr. Speaker, can obtain copies of this testimony, because it is unclassified, from any Member of Congress who would in fact contact my office or the administration to get it.

But they could not show up. Why did they not show up and why could they not? Because the Clinton administration imposed a gag rule. Unbelievable as it may seem, Mr. Speaker, today for the first time, to my knowledge, in the history of this country, the Pentagon and the administration and Bill Clinton imposed a gag rule on generals in our Army and our Air Force who were asked to come before this Congress to talk about an issue of vital concern to this country, and that is missile defense.

Now, why would not these generals have been allowed to come forward to this hearing to testify before Democrats and Republicans? Was there some reason? Well, Mr. Speaker, there were two issues that were cited, and I would like to refer to both of them.

First of all, the administration claimed that they could not come forward, they were not allowed, and this was not decided until yesterday late in the afternoon, because, as Deputy Secretary of Defense White said, we did not want anyone on the Hill from the Pentagon testifying prior to Secretary Perry and Dr. Kaminski coming in and testifying before the Congress on this year's fiscal request. That was what they said was the reason why they could not appear.

That is somewhat unbelievable, Mr. Speaker, because yesterday the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Owens, appeared before the Senate Committee on National Security, gave written testimony, and answered questions about missile defense. So the policy in fact was not upheld, and that was merely an excuse by the administration to try to justify why they would not let these three generals come in.

Now, the second reason they gave, Mr. Speaker, was that they were willing to give us a briefing, but not allow testimony to occur. In fact, the only briefing that took place this week was the briefing of administrative officials

to Democrats only. Republicans were not invited.

One of our staff members was called the day before the briefing and was told that he could receive a similar briefing. He was similarly called the day of our hearing and was told that Members of Congress could come in for that from both parties. Obviously the schedules were already made up for that day and the rest of the week.

So why then, Mr. Speaker, would this administration not want generals in our Air Force and our Army to come before Congress and the American people? Very simply, Mr. Speaker, it is because their testimony would prove that this administration has once again lied.

Mr. Speaker, as pure and simply as I can put it, again these generals would prove that this administration lied to the American people. This administration said that we could not build a national missile defense system that would protect all 50 States and be compliant with the ABM Treaty.

In fact, General Garner was prepared to state on the record, as his outline summarizes, that he has a plan that can be completed in 4 years at a cost of less than \$5 billion using existing capabilities that would give us a level of protection that we have never had before in this Nation.

General Linhard was prepared in his statement to say the Air Force could give us a similar capability using existing technology for a cost of less than \$3 billion from a single site that would give us, again, a limited protection that we have never had for the people of this country. These two systems would give the American people the same protection that the Russian people already have with the world's only operational ABM system which surrounds Moscow and which protects 80 percent of the Russian people.

Now, these two generals who work for the taxpayers, but who, unfortunately, report to Secretary Perry and ultimately Bill Clinton, were gagged. They were told in personal phone calls, "You can't come up to the hill."

I chatted with Speaker GINGRICH earlier today about this, and he was outraged. I chatted with the gentleman from Louisiana, BOB LIVINGSTON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida, BILL YOUNG, chairman of the Defense Committee on Appropriations, and the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, chairman of the Committee on National Security, and they were all outraged.

Let me say this, Mr. Speaker: This administration can run, but it cannot hide. They may have prevented three generals from coming up on the Hill today, but it will not happen again. I say this, Mr. Speaker, to you as our voice to the administration: The next time this administration denies our request to have a witness, we will issue a subpoena.

□ 1815

And we will have those generals up at the table where they will be able to tell the American people and this Congress the facts.

This administration is not going to be able to distort and twist things to suit their ultimate political objectives. That is what occurred today. And if this President and this Secretary of Defense think that they will again be successful in denying the public and Members of this Congress the ability to understand and know the facts as they are, then they are very shortsighted.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you tonight that we will again hold these hearings. We will have General O'Neill again requested to come before our committee next week and I assume he will be there. But beyond that, we will again have General Linhard, and we will again have General Garner before our committee where they will be allowed to tell their story.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, they will be allowed to speak freely. They will be asked questions directly, and there will be no one to filter nor intercept or try to interpret what it is they say. And in the end, the Members of this body and the people of this country can determine why the administration did not want these three generals to appear before our committee. Because in the end the people of this country will see that once again this President and this administration has done what they do so well, and that is distort the facts, change the truth, deny reality, and attempt to sway public opinion for political purposes while in fact jeopardizing the security of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that this incident had to occur today. It is unfortunate that what was a legitimate attempt to have the Members of this body get factual information on which they can base their decisions was circumvented by an administration so worrisome about the truth getting out in terms of the facts that are out there and the evidence provided by the generals that we hold responsible for the lives of our troops and for the safety of our people.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it will not happen again.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVELS OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1996-2000

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and pursuant to sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an updated report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1996 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1996 through fiscal year 2000.

This report is to be used in applying the fiscal year 1996 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 67), for legislation having spending or revenue effects in fiscal years 1996 through 2000.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, February 22, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1996 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1996 through fiscal year 2000.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of February 16, 1996.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 67, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1996 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority of each direct spending committee with the "section 602(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 67 for fiscal year 1996 and for fiscal years 1996 through 2000. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 602(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1996 with the revised "section 602(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, since the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 602(b) suballocation. The revised section 602(b) suballocations were filed by the Appropriations Committee on December 5, 1995.

Sincerely,

JOHN R. KASICH,  
Chairman.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1996 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 67 REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF FEBRUARY 16, 1996

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1996	Fiscal year 1996-2000
Appropriate level (as set by H. Con. Res. 67):		
Budget authority .....	1,285,500	6,814,600
Outlays .....	1,288,100	6,749,200
Revenues .....	1,042,500	5,691,500
Current level:		
Budget authority .....	1,307,058	NA