

Even though we talk about the deficit, we do not do anything when it comes to the defense bill.

Then we look at threat potentials, at the United States and what we are spending on defense, here is what Russia spends, here is what China spends, and here is what a whole range of other countries spend: Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Cuba. Either we are not spending very well or something is really wrong. We are spending an awful lot of money on stuff that there is some question about.

What do I think the real problem is? In Great Britain they are talking about mad cow disease. This Congress has sacred cow disease. They see the Defense Department as the biggest sacred cow around here, and they will not allow anybody to touch their sacred cow. So, everybody, watch. This is our wonderful Republican colleagues pulling the sacred cow back in.

The bill we are taking up today will not allow any cuts at all, even though it is 5 percent above what the administration asked for. Any number of us requested the ability to at least offer cuts to bring it down to what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said was enough, what the Commander in Chief said was enough, but, no, we are not even being allowed to debate that here. We are totally gagged.

Do the Members know what we are going to debate here today? Today this body is going to become the moral police for the military. The people who represent us in the military, we do not want them to have the rights other Americans have, that they defend. Other Americans will get the Constitution defending their rights. People in the military get the Congress. Ask the average American, "Who do you want defending your rights, the Constitution or the Congress?" I think most of them will go with the Constitution. The Constitution looks a whole lot better today.

But that sacred cow, I cannot even touch it today. I had an amendment to try to bring down the numbers. Any number of Members had amendments to bring down the numbers. I have been on the Committee on Armed Services for 24 years, and they are not going to allow us to touch the sacred cow. So sacred cow disease is alive and well.

What are we doing today? We are charging it all to our kids. That is basically what we are doing. Anybody who votes for this bill today and tells us that they are a deficit hawk, that they really want to bring the deficit down, is absolutely wrong. What they are really saying is they will do everything they can to spend money on weapons systems.

I guess that to me is the saddest part of all, because it is even coming out in the military. I just saw their new poster, their new poster that has nothing on it but fancy dandy toys, new toys for the boys from the Congress. These are all cold war weapons. They do not really fit any of the kind of missions

that we are on today. But are we not happy to have them?

I am so old, I remember that when we had Armed Forces Day, we celebrated the men and women who were in the Armed Forces. That is who we celebrated. None of these weapons are worth anything if we are not paying attention to the men and women in the Armed Forces and their families.

So I find this a very sad day as we begin the debate on my last defense bill, because I am leaving. But in fact we have been gagged, we cannot mention one cut. We are going to spend hours here debating whether women should have the same reproductive rights as American women. We are going to have all sorts of stuff about HIV, sexual preference, what kind of magazines they can read, where they can read them, when they can read them, what they can do about them and on and on and on. We are encouraging a culture all driven by the industrial complex. This is sad, and I hope America wakes up.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL MEETS NATION'S COMMITMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that I get a chance to follow my esteemed colleague from Colorado, Mrs. SCHROEDER, because I want to show her some of what she calls wasteful spending on the part of the Republican majority for defense.

I have with me an ammunition pouch. It is an empty ammunition pouch. It was issued by the U.S. Marine Corps and it symbolizes some of the increased defense spending that we are going to be engaged in as we pass this bill through the House. It manifests some of the \$12 billion plus in defense spending which, as the gentlewoman said, is a little less than a 5-percent increase over what the Clinton administration asked for.

This year I had a meeting with the services, and I had the ranking member, the Democrat, my good colleague from Missouri, Mr. SKELTON, the ranking member on the procurement subcommittee that I chair, participate in this meeting with me. We asked the services to come in. We asked the Marine Corps and the Army and the Navy and the Air Force to come in.

I had a basic question for them: "Do you have enough ammunition, basic bullets for your troops, to fight the two-war scenario that we request you to fight, that President Clinton has said you must be able to meet?" That means if we should have a problem in the Middle East, like Desert Storm, and at the same time perhaps have a problem in the Korean Peninsula, if the North Koreans should take advantage of our being tied up in the Middle East and start moving down the Korean pe-

ninsula, and we had to move there and fight basically two contingencies at the same time, would we have enough basic ammo to fight that two-war contingency under the Clinton administration's defense budget?

The answer from the Marines—and, incidentally, the Marines are always the most candid, perhaps they are the worst politicians in Washington but they are always the most candid—they said, "Congressman, we don't have enough bullets to fight the two-war contingency that we are charged with."

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield briefly to my colleague, although I did not ask her to yield, but go ahead.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman knows I was not going to make any amendment that would attack extra ammunition. That is not the point. The point was about some of the weapons that I think even the gentleman might agree we did not need to add.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend but I want to tell her, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, what my jurisdiction includes and what we are adding money for. I want to go through the list, but the most basic one, the one that I charged our staff with first, was to make sure that the troops have enough bullets in their guns to be able to defend the country. That was the first priority that we gave on this \$6 billion add-on.

To get back to my point, I asked the Marines what it would take to fill their ammunition pouches and to add all the mortar rounds, the howitzer rounds and everything else, starting with basic M-16 bullets for infantrymen. What did they need beyond what President Clinton is providing them in his budget? They said, "Congressman, we are about 96 million M-16 bullets short. That means we run out. That means our ammo pouches are empty when we get to that point."

So the first thing we put in this budget was enough money for 96 million M-16 bullets, and we put that in the budget this year. They then gave me a list. I said, "Give me a list of what it is going to take you to be able to handle the two-war scenario." They gave us that list and it came to about \$360 million. That was the first addition that we made.

We then went to the Chiefs of the respective services, because last year when the Republicans added defense money it was charged, "You're adding stuff that the President doesn't want, you're adding stuff that the Pentagon doesn't want, that his Chiefs in the services don't want." So we asked the Chiefs to come before us. We did that because we got a memorandum from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili, that said we need to spend for modernization, that is for new equipment for our soldiers, \$60 billion a year.

Even President Clinton in 1995 when he was projecting the 1997 defense budget, which is what we are debating today, said "In fiscal year 1997," that is this year's defense budget, "I want to have almost \$50 billion spent on modernization." Yet when he came through with the budget, it was \$10 billion less than what he said he was going to be asking for a couple of years ago. So it did not even fit the President's blueprint. It was \$10 billion under the President's blueprint for defense spending this year.

So we asked the service Chiefs to come in. We said, "What do you need to make sure that the men and women of the services have the best equipment?" They came up with a list of \$15 billion. In the defense bill today we are going to be able to go over those systems and tell the Members exactly what they are. We did improve the safety requirements for the Marines also. We are adding 24 Harrier safety upgrades, in light of the 3 crashes that occurred in the last few months. We will describe this in greater detail in the defense debate.

PLIGHT OF THE KASHMIRI PANDITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President might have delinked human rights from trade, but that should not be taken as a signal by other countries that the U.S. Congress no longer cares about human rights.

Indeed, concern for human rights in our own country and around the world remains a prominent concern on both sides of the aisle. Congresswoman PELOSI, Congressman LANTOS, Congressman SMITH of New Jersey and Congressman WOLF are just four of the many Members who have made human rights a burning concern.

I want to add my voice today to the concern about human rights in a part of the world about which we hear very little: Kashmir.

Indeed, Kashmir is one of the main trouble spots in the world today. India and Pakistan have fought two wars over Kashmir, and it remains a sore spot in Indo-Pakistani relations. Pakistan has taken every opportunity to destabilize the situation in Kashmir.

Soon after I took office in 1993, I received a group of activists from the Kashmiri Pandit community. The Pandits are not well known in this country.

They are Hindus who have been made refugees in their own country.

They are also a proud people with a special place in the history of India and the subcontinent. I might note that as India struggles to form a new government in the wake of the historic defeat suffered by the Congress Party, the Pandit community has made enormous contributions to Indian culture, including Jawaharlal Nehru.

Listening to the Pandits, I was touched by their story.

And I was shocked by the human rights abuses that have been perpetrated in Kashmir against the Hindus.

Indeed, the Pandits have been the target of a campaign of ethnic cleansing.

They have been brutalized and killed because they are Hindus.

Many of them have been forced from their ancestral homeland and now live in squalid camps.

Their future is uncertain.

I believe the Pandits are truly the forgotten people of Kashmir.

The State Department recently included a mention of the Pandits' plight in the annual "country reports" on human rights. That is at least a start—a recognition of a human rights problem.

We must not look the other way while Pandit people are killed, raped, abducted, brutalized and exiled. We must not accept the fact that they have been exiled in their own country.

We must pay attention to the plight of internally displaced people, a status that is becoming all too familiar in our new world.

I urge other Members to look below the surface of the conflict in Kashmir and focus on the human cost.

In the refugee camps there is a growing sense of unease, even panic, at the thought of being forgotten by the rest of the world.

As we have shown in Bosnia and other places, the United States is not the type of country that turns its back on people who are in dire straits.

That hope is what keeps the Kashmiri Pandits and other internally displaced people from lapsing into despair at their predicament.

They look to the West for the hope of a better future. We must not look the other way.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY— WILL AMERICA GROW UP BE- FORE IT GROWS OLD?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning business for 6 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I attended a Social Security forum. One of the presenters at that forum said Social Security could be taking in less money from FICA taxes than it is required to pay Social Security checks by the year 2005. By the year 2005, Social Security under that definition could be broke. There is no real trust fund. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I have entitled my remarks for this morning "Protecting Social Security—Will America Grow Up Before It Grows Old?"

In 1983 Congress passed historic legislation to save Social Security. At that time the Social Security Administration warned that the system had an un-

funded liability equal to 1.82 percent of payroll. In other words, the taxes would have to be increased by 1.82 in order to accommodate the requirements for survival for Social Security.

A 1983 law eliminated this liability temporarily. However, the actuaries today now say that the unfunded liability is 2.17 percent of taxable payroll, 19 percent worse than in 1983, and yet, Mr. Speaker, we do nothing. Some people have called it a third rail. Some people say, do not touch Social Security because you might not be reelected, because seniors do not want their Social Security interrupted or considered. I do not believe that is true. I believe most senior citizens today want to protect Social Security for their kids and their grandkids.

Let me tell my colleagues about the existing liability that equals \$4 trillion in Social Security. Put another way, under the current system every beneficiary for the next 75 years will have to absorb a 14-percent cut in benefits for the system to balance. The other alternative is that we raise taxes by 16 percent on the already overburdened American worker.

Traditionally Congress waits until the last minute or the last moment to solve these kinds of problems, using a crisis environment to convince our constituents and ourselves that sacrifices could be made. If that happens, probably what Congress would do first is to look at reducing COLA's for existing retirees.

That is not the right way to solve this problem. I think, no matter how we try under current law, there will only be two workers paying into the system for each retiree drawing benefits by the time that we reach the 2010 to 2020 era. When we started this program, there were 38 workers for every 1 retiree. Today there are 3 workers for every retiree. When we hit the catastrophic era of 2010 to 2020, there will only be two workers for each retiree.

I am introducing legislation this year, and it offers a way out and I believe it justifies consideration. Part one of my bill eliminates the unfunded liability of the trust funds by slowing the growth of benefits in two basic ways.

Under the bill initial benefits will still rise after inflation, but they will not double as they do now under current law. It also imposes some modest means testing of benefits. This proposal holds harmless low-income workers and also existing retirees. I repeat, my proposal holds harmless the low-income workers and also existing retirees. Furthermore, this proposal gradually raises the retirement age, then indexes it to life expectancy. These two reforms more than eliminate the unfunded liability of this system, according to the Social Security's actuaries.

The Social Security Administration has scored this bill and found that each worker could invest between 1.8 percent of what they earn in payroll and 10 percent of their paycheck in a personal retirement savings account that