

not even requested by our local highway departments or transportation department.

How is it equitable that we cut school lunches but not highway projects? The chief financial officer for the State of Texas has estimated that if this welfare bill passed today, this H.R. 1214 passes, it will cost the State of Texas over \$1 billion in our next biennial, 1996-97. The Department of Human Services estimates that if this bill passes, it would cost the State of Texas \$5.2 billion. The CBO has said that with growth in population and inflation, this reduction would be \$2.3 billion.

I know I am throwing out lots of numbers and some of them may disagree, but no matter how you cut it, the people who are going to pass this bill this week really do not know what it is going to do because all they are doing is running that train and saying we are going to pass a welfare reform bill, even if it does cut WIC or school nutrition, or it cuts a lot of other programs that are really important and have a great deal of support.

If any of these are reduced fundings, particularly the one from the Congressional Budget Office estimates for savings and administrative costs, we are talking about stopping children from having a hot lunch. Yesterday I was in my district at J.P. Henderson Elementary School in Houston trying to show that the claim of the welfare reform is missing the point. Those children are eating that hot lunch and that is at a school that has easily 80 percent of the children have a reduced and free lunch.

We should not continue to be playing games with our children's future. We need to do welfare reform. We can take school nutrition programs out of the welfare reform just like the majority took the senior citizens nutrition out of welfare reform 3 weeks ago. It is just that again it is too often popular to hit the easiest target and not the senior citizens.

We do not consider buying text books, computers, or desks as welfare. We should not consider school nutrition welfare.

#### PICK ON SOMEONE YOUR OWN SIZE: KID'S VOICES HEARD AT CAPITOL RALLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, Sunday was a beautiful day at the Capitol because 2,000 children from all over this area from West Virginia to Pennsylvania came to oppose cuts in the school lunch programs proposed by the Republican majority. It was reported as the children's crusade against Republican budget cuts. Despite bus rides for as long as 5 hours, the children were very eloquent indeed.

A 10-year-old with the distinguished name of Touissant L'Ouvertuo Tingling-Clemmons said, "Children have to say no to a lot of things. Food should not be one of them."

Chastity Crites from West Virginia, a daughter of a construction worker, said she does not eat if he, her father, does not work except for school lunches.

A sixth grader from southeast Washington said, Marche was her name, "The food tastes so good and sometimes when we get to school we are hungry. Why would they cut school lunches?"

Why would they indeed? The issue of hunger in our country has never been a debatable one and indeed feeding the hungry has always enjoyed bipartisan support. In 1946 President Truman signed the Federal School Lunch Program into law. President Richard Nixon later said a child ill-fed is dulled in curiosity, lower in stamina and distracted in learning.

Why then is the Republican majority putting on the House table a proposal which will take food off the cafeteria table for America's children?

The extreme Republican proposal will cut, I repeat, it will cut the number of poor children who benefit from the program. It will cut the School Lunch Program benefits because it says that States must spend only 80 percent of the Federal school lunch funds on school lunches because it removes nutritional standards and removes eligibility requirements.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal will hurt our children, weaken our future and dim the prospects for our future. I urge our colleagues to think again about the Republican proposal to cut the School Lunch Program.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, O gracious God, that the words we use will foster truth and be delivered with understanding. May our expressions promote knowledge and our statements advance a clearer realization of our concerns. Help us, O God, to keep our vision on the ideals of equity and justice so that all we do, in

thought, word and deed, be reflections of Your will for us and our desire to be faithful to that to which we have been called. Bless us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELAURO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DOOLITTLE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under Clause 4 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, in addition to Ms. Linda Nave, Deputy Clerk, I herewith designate Mr. Jeffrey Trandahl, Assistant Clerk, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me under the name of the Clerk of the House which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation, except such as are provided by statute, in case of my temporary absence or disability.

This designation shall remain in effect for the 104th Congress or until modified by me.

With great respect, I am

Sincerely yours,

ROBIN H. CARLE,  
Clerk.

#### FAIRWELL TO MARIAN VAN DEN BERG

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that today the official reporters of debates, the reporters who chronicle all