

Actually what was done was to try to end it as a Federal program and turn it into a State program.

This was done so that more money could be spent on food for kids and less on bureaucrats in Washington.

Most Governors have said they could take 80 percent of the money and probably operate almost any Federal program more efficiently and effectively.

However, in this instance, the Committee did not say take the School Lunch Program over with just 80 percent of the money—it said take 100 percent of the money with a built-in raise of 4.5 percent each year.

This is almost 50 percent more than what inflation has been since the Reagan years.

Yet some liberals saw a chance to use a political sledgehammer here, and beat us over the head with it, and with help from a supportive national media, they are creating a totally false impression.

I have always supported the School Lunch Program, and I can assure you there is not one member here, Democrat or Republican, who wants to take food away from any hungry children.

I do not serve on the Committee that is trying to change this program, but I do know that what the Committee is trying to do is make things better for children, not worse.

The School Lunch Program has gotten tremendous bi-partisan support in the past because it has worked relatively well. But anything can be made better.

And if there is a way to spend more on children and less on bureaucrats, then we should try it.

Too many federal programs today benefit primarily the bureaucrats who work for the program and really do very little for the intended beneficiaries.

This is true even in programs designed to help children. Every program up here has some beautiful motherhood and apple pie title, but you have to look below the surface, and below the headlines, to find the true story.

If we want to help bureaucrats, we will continue, and even increase, all our current federal programs, and even create new ones.

If we really want to help children, though, we will downsize government and decrease its cost, and give parents the freedom to spend more of their own money on their own children.

Apparently, though, with many liberals, if the choice is between giving money to bureaucrats or leaving more with parents and children, they will side with the bureaucrats every time.

There were two other main objections to the changes the Committee made in the School Lunch Program.

One was to the lack of national standards on nutrition, and one was to the fact that the Governors were given leeway as to 20 percent of the money as long as it was spent on other child welfare programs.

These were included because almost everyone today realizes that one-size-fits-all dictation from Washington is not working and has been harmful to even our best programs.

I am convinced that the wonderful people that we have running our school lunch program in East Tennessee do not need bureaucrats in Washington telling them what they can and cannot serve.

As to the 20 percent flexibility for Governors, this was done because some States need to spend more percentagewise on school lunches than others. But if this is a great concern, I certainly would support changes making sure all this money is spent for its intended purpose, which is school lunches.

I suppose the big point to be made here is that Republicans love children just as much as Democrats do.

Despite what some pious, holier-than-thou liberals would have people believe, no one has a monopoly on virtue—no one has cornered the market on compassion.

All of us are trying to do as much as possible for children. No one has voted to kill the School Lunch Program.

Many people around the country no longer think of the Federal Government as God. They know that some programs can be better run from the State level, or even by local governments.

And above all, they want less of their money being spent on bureaucrats and paperwork, and more being spent on children.

□ 2045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BROWN of Ohio 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLETTA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FOGLETTA 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 gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MINK 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 gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ESHOO 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 Kentucky [Mr. WARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

SAVE PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for continued Federal funding for public broadcasting.

PBS and NPR provide commercial-free entertainment and information that is always good for you, whatever your age.

PBS and NPR provide commercial-free entertainment and information that always brings the best of all our American cultures, the brilliance of our science and technology, the clash of our political opinions, and the natural beauty of our world, wherever we live.

PBS and NPR provide so much for so little: they cost only \$1.09 per person. Americans overwhelmingly approve a Federal funding for public television and radio, with 87 percent in favor of continued support. Although the Federal allocation is small—currently \$285.6 million—in the overall CPB budget, it is vital seed money that makes everything else possible.

To deny funding to PBS and NPR would be to truly damage the quality of our lives and our children's lives. Free market forces would not sustain the effort required to create and keep a show like "Sesame Street," which is watched by over 6 million preschoolers on an average of three times per week. Commercial stations refused to air "Sesame Street" when it was first developed. Can you imagine any network today airing the program for 2 hours straight without commercial interruption?

An article in last week's Washington Post, reminded me just how important PBS is to quality programming for our children; for shows like "Sesame Street," "Mr. Roger's Neighborhood," and "Ghostwriter" that make their lives richer not poorer. The Post story told this sad tale: ABC will cancel "Cro," a Children's Television Network production on its Saturday morning schedule in favor of something entitled—I am not making this up—"Dumb and Dumber."

This choice bit of children's entertainment is a television version of a full-length cartoon movie of the same name, which consists of "toilet jokes and exposed bottoms," said the Post but offers vast opportunities for those

big profit, toy spinoffs. "Cro," a show that treats science and technology through the eyes of an 11-year-old stone age child, it was decided, had no future at Toys 'R Us so it had to go.

Do we really for a minute believe that commercial and cable stations will do the right thing by our children and young people? My friends, our children's choices will go from dumb to dumber, from violent to more violent, if PBS goes!

Much has been said and written about public broadcasting and elitism. What nonsense! What condescension! Eighty percent of all Americans—your neighbors and mine—watch public television at least once a month and have access to literally the world of entertainment and the arts without leaving their family room couch.

Comparisons have been made—and rightly so—between saving public television and radio and the campaign for public libraries, which was led by Andrew Carnegie early in this century. His mission, to make sure every American had access to free books regardless of income level or place of residence, mirrors the contemporary mission of public television and radio to bring exposure to the world's greatest art, music, literature, and wonders to everyone. With your television and radio tuned to your PBS or NPR station you can sit in the front row at the Metropolitan Opera, watch the Bolshoi Ballet, or sit in your arm chair and travel the globe. It opens the world to all.

We are blessed in the Washington area with access to several public broadcasting stations: WETA, MPT, WHMM, and WAMU. The market in which these stations operate is large and its supporters and fans generous at fundraising time. But this is not the case across the country. The loss of Federal funding to radio outlets in rural areas, for example, would be devastating—in many cases radio stations would have to drop NPR programming and that means losing "Morning Edition," "All Things Considered," and "Talk of the Nation."

In many areas of the country, whole school systems rely on public broadcasting to supplement their curriculums. The president of Maryland Public Television has pointed out that "as we enter the information age, every community in America needs its public television station as an on-ramp to the information superhighway and to fight for the public interest so that educational usage doesn't get pushed onto the shoulder by commercial interests."

Mr. Speaker, to cut off federal support for public broadcasting is to do irreparable damage to a system that provides all Americans, regardless of age, race, ethnicity, party affiliation, or geographic location with riches that once belonged only to a very small elite. Public broadcasting is for all of us.

COMMEMORATING THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOTING RIGHTS CAMPAIGN OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight at this hour during this special order to commemorate the 30th anniversary of the voting rights campaign of 1965. Thirty years ago this day, March 7, 1965, was a turning point in the struggle for the right to vote in the American South.

In commemorating the voting rights campaign of 1965, we honor the great sacrifices many people made to secure voting rights for all Americans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you must keep in mind that during another period in our history, during the 1960's, there were certain political subdivisions in the 11 Southern States of the old South, from Virginia to Texas, where 50 to 80 percent of the population was black, and there was not a single black registered voter. The practice used by whites to keep blacks out of their political process ranged from economic retaliation to outright murder. In many instances brutal acts of violence were directed against those who tried to register to vote. Those few who were allowed to register were harassed, intimidated, and even beaten when they tried to exercise their precious right to vote.

One State, the State of Mississippi, had a black voting-age population of more than 450,000, and only 16,000 blacks were registered to vote. In one county in Alabama, Lowndes County, between Selma and Montgomery, AL, the county was more than 80 percent black, and there was not a single registered black voter.

In the little town of Selma, the county seat of Dallas County, AL, majority of black population, only 2.1 percent of blacks of voting age were registered to vote.

The drive for the right to vote came to a head in Selma in the heart of the Black Belt after a series of nonviolent protests and after people had been shot, beaten, and killed. A small band of citizens on March 7, in an effort to dramatize to the Nation and to the world the need for voting rights legislation, decided to march from Selma to Montgomery.

Young black children, some elderly black men and women, left the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church on Sunday afternoon, March 7, 1965, walking to twos. It was a silent, nonviolent, and peaceful protest, walking through the streets of Selma.

Crossing the Alabama River, crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge, when they reached the apex of the bridge, they saw a sea of blue, Alabama State troopers.

The Governor of the State, at that time Gov. George Wallace, had issued a statement the day before saying the

march would not be allowed. The sheriff of Dallas County, a man by the name of Jim Clark, on the Saturday night before the march on Sunday had requested that all white men over the age of 21 to come down to the Dallas County Courthouse to be deputized to become part of his posse to stop the march.

Sheriff Clark was a very big man who wore a gun on one side, a nightstick on the other side, and he carried an electric cattle prod in his hand. He did not use it on cows. He used it on peaceful, nonviolent protesters.

As we continued to walk on that Sunday afternoon, we came within the hearing distance of the State troopers and a man identified himself and said:

I am Maj. John Cloud of the Alabama State Troopers. I give you 3 minutes to disperse and go back to your church. This is an unlawful march, and it will not be allowed to continue.

In less than 1½ minutes, Maj. John Cloud said, "Troopers advance," and you saw these men putting on their gas masks. They came toward us, beating us with nightsticks, bullwhips, tramping us with horses, and using tear gas.

That Sunday, March 7, 1965, became known as Bloody Sunday. There was a sense of righteous indignation all across the country. People could not understand what they saw on television. They could not understand the picture they saw in the paper the next day coming from Selma.

Lyndon Johnson, 8 days later, came before this hall and spoke to a joint session of the Congress on March 15, 1965, to urge Congress to pass a strong voting rights law.

□ 2100

In that speech President Johnson started off the night by saying:

I speak tonight for the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy.

He went on to say:

I urge every member of both parties, Americans of all religions and of all colors, from every section of this country, to join me in that cause.

President Johnson continued by saying:

At times, at times history and fate meet at a single time in a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom.

He went on to say:

So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week in Selma, Alabama.

And the President went on to say:

There long-suffering men and women peacefully protested the denial of their rights as Americans. Many were brutally assaulted. One good man, a man of G-d, was killed.

A few days between March 7, 1965, and March 15, 1965, a young white minister by the name of James Reed, who came down from Boston to participate, was beaten by the Klan and later died.

In that speech here in this hall Lyndon Johnson said that night over and over again, "We shall overcome."