

In my country, we recently celebrated the 75th anniversary of women's suffrage. It took 150 years after the signing of our Declaration of Independence for women to win the right to vote. It took 72 years of organized struggle on the part of many courageous women and men.

It was one of America's most divisive philosophical wars. But it was also a bloodless war. Suffrage was achieved without a shot fired.

We have also been reminded, in V-J Day observance last weekend, of the good that comes when men and women join together to combat the forces of tyranny and build a better world.

We have seen peace prevail in most places for a half century. We have avoided another world war.

But we have not solved older, deeply-rooted problems that continue to diminish the potential of half the world's population.

Now it is time to act on behalf of women everywhere.

If we take bold steps to better the lives of women, we will be taking bold steps to better the lives of children and families too. Families rely on mothers and wives for emotional support and care; families rely on women for labor in the home; and increasingly, families rely on women for income needed to raise healthy children and care for other relatives.

As long as discrimination and inequities remain so commonplace around the world—as long as girls and women are valued less, fed less, fed last, overworked, underpaid, not schooled and subjected to violence in and out of their homes—the potential of the human family to create a peaceful, prosperous world will not be realized.

Let this conference be our—and the world's—call to action.

And let us heed the call so that we can create a world in which every woman is treated with respect and dignity, every boy and girl is loved and cared for equally, and every family has the hope of a strong and stable future.

Thank you very much.

God's blessings on you, your work and all who will benefit from it.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). 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:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DOUBLE STANDARD APPLIED TO PEOPLE IN GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, an unfortunate incident occurred this past week. A distinguished Member of the other body resigned from the Congress of the United States because of alleged sexual improprieties and advances toward members of the staff of the Congress of the United States. I think people who watched what happened in the news media over the past year to 2 years agree that that was the right thing for him to do, to resign.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that concerns me is that other cases of this kind have occurred in the past and nothing has been done about them. For instance, a former Governor of the State of Arkansas allegedly had a young State employee come up to his hotel room and not only made sexual advances, but they were very, very overt sexual advances. That gentleman has now advanced to a very high office in this land, and there has been almost no investigation. The lady in question has asked that her case be taken to court and because of this gentleman's position in our Government, she cannot even get a court case. That is not the only instance that happened with this individual.

So I would just like to say to my friends in the media, and I think they probably know to whom I am referring, Mr. PACKWOOD resigned, he should have resigned, he did something that should not have been done, obviously. But why, I ask, are we excusing or ignoring similar behavior?

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reminded not to make re-

marks about particular Members of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I stand corrected. But I would just like to ask the question, why is there this double standard? This double standard should not occur. People who are held to a high standard in one body of this government should not be singled out when people in other areas of our Government are able to get away with these things, or at least not be allowed, the people who accuse them, to have their day in court or have hearings on the alleged improprieties.

The media in this country in my opinion should show some balance. No one, regardless of what party they serve, no one, regardless of what branch of government they serve, should be allowed to get away with these alleged sexual improprieties, and yet it is obvious to me, and I think to other Members of this body, that a double standard does exist.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is also reminded that he is not to make personal references to the President as well.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I did not make any reference to the President, I do not believe, did I?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Any obvious references to the person are not to be made.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would ask for you to read the RECORD then and show me the obvious reference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman made references that could only apply to the President.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think that if you check, you would find that I did not make any direct reference to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will check the RECORD.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a double standard and it should be reviewed.

DISCRETIONARY SPENDING REDUCTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Americans really think that the Members of this body will have the gumption to balance the budget 7 years from now. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members of this Chamber think that we are really going to make the hard cuts that are going to be required that are called upon by the budget resolution that we passed earlier this year to balance the budget 7 years from now.

I want to talk about the bill that I have just introduced, H.R. 2295, that will help assure that we reach that balanced budget by the year 2002. Mr. Speaker, the vacation is over, it is

time for us to do what we were sent here to do, and that is balance the budget. In June we passed a historic piece of budget legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 67.

This budget resolution starts us on a glidepath to a balanced budget by the year 2002. If we reach that goal, it will be for the first time since 1969. But there is a problem. This glidepath is a resolution and it is not a binding law signed by the President. That means in effect, it is only a suggestion to future sessions of Congress.

In 1985, Congress passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, tying discretionary spending to deficit reduction. Unfortunately, the good intentions of that bill did not do much to reduce the deficit.

In 1990 we had another confrontation. In fact, in the 1990 confrontation with President George Bush, we increased the debt ceiling six times in about a 2-month period to encourage the administration to sign on to that particular agreement. That agreement did place caps on discretionary spending. Those caps are set to expire in 1998, and those caps are too high to allow us to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002.

If we are serious about balancing the budget, let us put into law the spending caps of this year's budget resolution. That is what H.R. 2295 does. H.R. 2295 is my bill and we call it the Discretionary Spending Reduction and Control Act of 1995. H.R. 2295 amends the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, it amends the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings amendments by updating and extending discretionary spending caps and the pay-go requirements laid out in this year's budget resolution. It establishes into law this year's budget resolution targets for spending. These caps required by law will help ensure that we will stay on target toward a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, is Congress going to have the willingness to continue to cut spending? Let me give you a verbal description of the glidepath to a balanced budget. We are asking for a reduction in spending, somewhat slight, not very much reduction, in the first year and second year. The big cuts in spending and those requirements and pressures on Congress will be in the outyears of the fifth, sixth, and seventh year. I mean with the complaints and the criticisms and the agony that we have seen this Chamber exhort with the slight budget cuts this year, it is going to be absolutely tough in those out-years.

We have to have legislation that keeps us on that glidepath. I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 2295 that will put into law this year's budget resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ON ACHIEVING A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with some sense of sadness, and probably quite a bit of outrage. The administration, in its zeal to protect the President's direct student loan program and hide their failure to really do anything about balancing the budget, has been using scare tactics to frighten and mislead the American people in order to, I suppose, to strap them from the need to balance the budget.

□ 2100

To do this, the administration has pulled out all stops. It has used Presidential public relation mechanisms at the taxpayers' expense to spread misinformation about our plans to balance the budget in 7 years.

Even the President has gone on the road with many of these misinterpretations of what it is we plan to do to balance the budget. So in an effort to set the record straight, I have sent a letter to the President asking that he publicly apologize to the America people for his scare tactics, and urging that he use all the methods at his disposal to set the records straight and level with the America people about what we are and are not going to do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight at this time. Republicans are preserving, I repeat, preserving the in-school interest subsidy for undergraduate and graduate students, even though its elimination was recommended by the President's Budget Director, Alice Rivlin, in her suggestions as to how to balance the budget. We plan to only touch the interest subsidy for the 6 month grace period following graduation, and during that time no payments are made. The grace period will remain intact. The borrower will repay the interest accrued during that 6 month period, which will add about \$4 a month to an average monthly student loan.

Republicans, on the other hand, are asking the private lenders to carry much of the burden for reforms in the loan program in order to achieve a balanced budget in 7 years. In fact, reforms to the student loan industry will save the taxpayers nearly \$5 billion. We will eliminate the President's direct student loan program in order to save the American taxpayers more than \$1.5 billion over 7 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which was the group that the President in his speech here on the floor told us we should be paying attention to.

We will not increase, I repeat, not increase, the origination loan fee paid by students, nor will we increase the interest rates on loans for students. We do not take away the interest rate reductions students are to receive for new loans effective July, 1988. We keep the President's budget proposal on Per-

kins loans, a revolving fund that perpetuates itself, adding no new funds, and therefore encouraging lower default rates by tougher collection efforts. Pell grant awards will be the largest in history in 1996 under our plan. The Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant Program, the work study program, will be funded at last year's level; no cuts.

We all know that the direct lending is a sacred cow to the administration. However, we cannot cling to a gold-plated direct student loan program and put welfare for the benefit of bureaucrats ahead of the needs of students.

One of the most outrageous statements I heard was that if we do not go the direct lending route, the Government will have to pick up 100 percent of the risk. Who in the world picks up 100 percent of the risk when you do direct lending? We not only pick up 100 percent of the risk, but we also have to borrow the money up front. We do not guarantee the loan, we borrow the money up front. We pay interest on the money we borrow so we increase what it is the American taxpayer has to do to carry that load.

We keep the President's budget proposal, as I said, on Perkins loans. Now, what is the administration so afraid of that it would resort to these scare tactics? Well, again, I want to review one more time what we do, so that the students out there and the parents are not misled.

If the Congress fails to act now, by the year 2002 the national debt will exceed \$6.5 trillion. That is a fact.

Another fact: Unless growth rates and mandatory spending are slowed, all Federal revenues will be consumed by a handful of programs.

Fact: Under the Republican budget resolution, the Federal budget will be running a surplus of \$6.4 billion in the year 2002.

Fact: According to the President's 1995 budget, unless we gain control of spending, the lifetime tax rate for children born after 1993 will exceed 82 percent. The most important thing we can do for the children of today is to balance the budget. If we do that, we can reduce interest rates by 2 percent. That affects everyone. That affects those who have student loans; that affects those who have a mortgage; that affects those who are buying an automobile on time.

Fact: While balancing the budget, the maximum Pell grant award will increase from \$2,340 in 1995 to \$2,444 in 1996. Even while balancing the budget, annual student loan volume will increase from \$24.5 billion in 1995 to \$36 billion in the year 2002, a 47-percent increase.

Fact: Even while balancing the budget, the average student loan amount increases from \$3,646 in 1995 to \$4,300 in the year 2000.

Fact: In order to balance the budget, Congress does not eliminate the in-school interest subsidy for college students.