

They have the votes. They will try to change these programs, but they can not crush the spirit that created them.

These programs were prudent when they were created, and they are prudent now.

Those who blindly push for change have not considered the wise words of Shelley, whose poetry is as penetrating in 1995 as it was in 1821,

I am the daughter of earth and water,  
And the nursling of the sky,  
I pass through the pores  
of the oceans and shores,  
I change, but I can not die.

If they want real change, they should change the minimum wage.

If they want meaningful change, they should change the tax cut they have proposed for the wealthiest Americans to focus on working families and the middle class.

If they want change that makes a difference, they should change their Personal Responsibility Act and restore school lunch programs for children.

If they want significant change, they should change their minds about cutting college student aid programs.

We will fight these changes to the long-standing effective college student aid programs.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in accepting the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, said, "The tortuous road millions are traveling to find a new sense of dignity, will, I am convinced be widened into a superhighway of justice."

Today's college student deserves to learn about Toffler, Karr, Patton, Shelley, and King.

Change for the sake of change is obviously useless. Secretary Riley had it right when he said, "Education is a national priority." Education of our youth is an investment in our Nation's future.

#### REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there a list of Members for 5-minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is.

Mr. OWENS. There is a list? Can we follow the list?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is endeavoring to go across the aisle, and the gentleman is on the list.

Mr. OWENS. Can we follow the list?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. We are following the list, but they are asking for unanimous consent. Is the gentleman objecting?

Mr. OWENS. Well, I thought the practice was to follow the list, and then after the list is finished to entertain unanimous-consent requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is just trying to recognize Members seeking unanimous consent to address the House by alternating recogni-

tion from side to side where Members are absent.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 31, two colleagues of mine, Representative GEORGE MILLER and Representative ANNA ESHOO and I did something that the leadership of this body does not want to do.

We held a hearing on the impact of the proposals by the Republican majority to cut the present system of Federal student financial aid.

We held a hearing to educate the public about these stealth proposals which would terminate investments in education to fund tax cuts for the wealthy.

We held a hearing in order that Congress may hear from the students, parents, and administrators who would be affected by these proposals.

We held a hearing because the Republican majority of this body does not want people to know the full impact of the Draconian budget slashing that the Republican majority needs to pay for their tax cut for the wealthy.

This body has passed legislation already, Mr. Speaker, which was proposed by the Republican majority which will rescind nearly \$200 million from our fiscal year 1995 student aid programs. This body will take up legislation later this week which would set in motion a series of budget cuts which will terminate what remains of it by enacting the largest tax giveaway to the rich that we have seen in recent memories.

What does the Republican majority propose?

They are proposing the elimination of the deferred interest of Stafford and Perkins loans programs which enables students to obtain loans without having to pay interest during the time they are in school.

The Republican majority is proposing eliminating campus-based programs such as college work-study which provides not only a job to help pay for an education but a job with purpose and meaning.

The Republican majority is proposing eliminating the supplemental educational opportunity grant which goes to help the most needy students for whom a Pell grant is not enough.

The Republican majority is proposing passing on to students, families, and administrators over a quarter of a billion dollars a year in increased educational costs just to the people of California. For our freshmen coming in this year, this coming year, this is a \$1 billion fee hike over the course of their education for 4 years that families, students, and schools must absorb.

In my congressional district, nearly 16,000 students would lost their Staf-

ford loan benefits at an increased cost of over \$11 million. Nearly 7,000 students would lose their supplemental education opportunity grants, an annual loss of \$2.3 million for those families.

Two thousand three hundred students in San Francisco would lose college work-study. And the majority, the Republican majority, would hand them a bill of \$2.5 million to make. All told, just for the students, families, and administrators in San Francisco, over \$17 million annually in costs would be passed back to the students, with no expectation on how those millions would be made up.

But the most telling points, the most poignant testimony, the most powerful arguments against this upside-down policy came from those who would be directly affected by those proposals.

We had an extraordinary panel of seven students and parents. The students were hard-working young men and women, bright, intelligent future leaders of our country and their parents who work hard and sacrifice to give their children every advantage, an education.

Here are some of their voices.

One senior at San Francisco State University testified. His name was Michael Rodriguez. Michael is 27, born and raised in San Francisco, and was a Marine for 9 years. He was assigned to both the Panama invasion and Operation Desert Storm and participated in the liberation of Kuwait.

During his combat assignment he was filling out his application and financial aid forms for San Francisco State. Here is what he had to say. Here is what Michael Rodriguez had to say:

For me, financial aid has allowed me to achieve my goals, for which I am thankful. I give thanks every day that programs like financial aid exist for students like myself. Students are cutting their time at school in half so they can work full-time in order to support themselves as financial aid money is becoming scarce. Financial aid, in my opinion, creates a win-win situation. Financial aid is capital investment for the future.

Diana Summy Hunt, a student at the University of San Francisco, said this about work-study: "This program has permitted me to work on campus at the financial aid office as a receptionist and file clerk. On the average, I work 18 hours per week, which allows me to pay for my books and supplies, not to mention it has also given me a variety of job experiences."

"It is not easy," she said, "juggling classes and a job. College work-study enables me to do both. If these programs were eliminated, I can honestly say that I have no idea where I will find these funds. My mother's and my finances are already stretched. What will people do to better themselves if education is out of the question?"

Perhaps one of the most heartfelt testimonials came from Ronelle Garibaldi, a member of a two-income family whose son, Michael, also attends

the University of San Francisco. She said:

Our children's education has been a family project. We all contribute as much as possible.

Our second son, who was also accepted here at the University, is instead attending a community college until his brother finishes here to help defer costs. We feel there are no extras in our life we can eliminate. However, because we believe so strongly in higher education, the sacrifices go almost unnoticed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to reject any of the ill-conceived proposals made by the Republican majority to eliminate this opportunity for higher education for our young people and thus weaken our country.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1271, FAMILY PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-97) on the resolution (H. Res. 125) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1271) to provide protection for family privacy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 660, HOUSING FOR OLDER PERSONS ACT OF 1995

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-98) on the resolution (H. Res. 126) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 660) to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain familial status discrimination prohibitions granted to housing for older persons, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1830

---

#### ANOTHER JEWEL FOR MR. MURDOCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I must say I rise tonight, and I am very saddened by what we now know happened last week. We know that we are going to be taking up the tax bill this week, but last week we took up a bill that we thought we knew what was in. We thought it was closing loopholes. We thought that it was going to shut off tax breaks to owners who were selling their broadcast stations or whatever to minorities, the infamous Viacom issue.

And today we now learn that tucked away in there was a nice \$63 million jewel for none other than Rupert Murdoch and, of course, Mr. Murdoch also happens to be the publisher of the Speaker's infamous book. Could there

be a connect-the-dots here? I do not know. Everybody is saying "Couldn't possibly be."

But I must say, as a Member of the House, I really feel we were all hoodwinked, because this did not come up in the House at all. It came up in the Senate, and apparently the Senate yielded, or the House yielded to the Senate in conference on this. None of us were told about this, and this was slipped in.

I was fascinated to read in the press reports this weekend that people were blaming Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN for this, and I love her quote in the press. She said, "If I had one bit, one iota of the leverage the Speaker said I do, then I would have kept the tax incentives for everybody," because Senator BRAUN has made it very clear she approves of these kind of tax incentives.

So is it not interesting that the tax incentives went down for every other person, every other person, group, or entity except Mr. Murdoch? Now, I suppose this could be just how the stars align, but we all know his long, longstanding tradition of having a book done by Margaret Thatcher when he needed things in the British Parliament, and, of course, he also published Ding Mao Mao's book in China when he was trying to get his broadcast license in there that we have been reading about even more this week, and I just think it is really time we blow the whistle on this kind of special-interest legislation.

Somebody who has got a crown like he has got does not need any more crown jewels, not at a time we are killing school lunches, threatening student loans, zeroing out summer jobs, taking on Big Bird and everything else. Why does he get this huge, wonderful jewel?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with her remarks.

This is simply an outrageous misuse of the public trust to have this item slipped into a conference committee with no notification of the House Members that this matter was in the conference bill, in fact, the appearance of deliberately keeping it from the House Members so this could be voice-voted on the floor last week when Members were concerned with the deductibility of the health care insurance for the self-employed, and then to find out that what we have in here is the most special of special deals for one person when the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and others strenuously objected to this kind of matter being brought forward, turned down amendments to try to make some rules that would apply to everybody across the board, now find out the 17 or 18 other similar deals were turned down, but the one for Rupert Murdoch, the

one involving the Speaker, was now somehow felt into this legislation.

We started out the 100 days with a book contract with Rupert Murdoch. Now we are ending it with all of the speculation about what that meant, and now, of course, the speculation is no longer speculation. Now we have the concrete treatment of Mr. Murdoch differently than anyone else in the United States at the behest of the leadership—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Absolutely.

Mr. MILLER of California. In the House and the Senate.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for raising this issue.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from California for bringing it up, because I really feel the Members were also led astray. Members on the conference committee on our side did not know this was happening, and I find it also amazing Mr. Murdoch stands there and with a straight face says, at least through his spokesman, he did not know about this; he did not seek it; and he did not particularly want it.

So I would say he ought to give it back. He ought to give it back.

Mr. MILLER of California. Since Mr. Murdoch is as successful as he is, when you consider all of the things that he has denied knowledge of that affect his business interests, over the last 100 days, but yet somehow he has tremendous success, and apparently it just falls on him.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. One of the other things I find really amazing is that he could be so successful, that this little \$63 million jewel could roll off the table, and he just did not even really have to pay much attention to it. It must be nice. Think of the school lunches it would buy and the student loans it would provide.

This is outrageous.

---

#### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I just happened to be walking through, and we should be accurate in what we say here on the floor of the House.

No. 1, the provision that was put into the health care deductibility for self-employed was engineered and pushed and implemented by CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN from Chicago, a Democrat Senator, and made its way into the conference report as a result of her compelling arguments that this in effect was a preexisting contractual obligation, a binding contract that was made before the effective date.

So we should fully understand that the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from California are just ill-informed about this particular provision.