

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

the proceedings on this floor, say farewell, farewell to a valued member of their staff, and of ours.

For the past 17 years, Marian Van Den Berg has been a transcriber with the official reporters. As we all know, working with the official reporters is not a 9-to-5 job. It often entails long hours, demands devotion far beyond that called for with ordinary jobs, and requires a high degree of competence. Marian has met all these criteria and more. She has been an outstanding, hard-working, always cheerful, always devoted member of our staff.

She is now leaving to pursue a new career.

Marian is a native of Annapolis, MD, I tell my friend, Mr. GILCREST, one of his constituents. The daughter of champion swimmers, her mother was a swimmer of Olympic caliber. Marian herself lives near the bay in Annapolis and has had a lifelong love of the water and water activities.

She attended the University of Maryland, and then Strayer Business College and Strayer School of Court Reporting. While living in California, she worked at IBM. At home in Annapolis, she worked at the Naval Academy.

In addition to her work with the reporters, Marian worked 2 years with Representative Clark Thompson of Texas.

Her children are Susan and Rick, son-in-law, Tom, and she is the loving and proud grandmother of young Patrick—whose picture she shows at every opportunity.

Marian loves music of all kinds, is a jazz aficionado, is especially devoted to rock and roll, and plays a mean piano, I am told.

This exemplary employee of the House of Representatives will be greatly missed by her colleagues and by each and every Member of the House of Representatives and the American public whom she serves. Marian has touched the hearts of everyone who has had the good fortune to meet her and to work with her.

Marian, there are just a few of us on the floor, but if you would please rise we would like to give you a hand and thank you so much for all you have done for all of us.

Marian, God bless you and Godspeed.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following: On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the congressional budget. We kept our promise.

The contract continues and in the first 100 days, we promised to vote on the following items: A balanced budget

amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; national security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; common-sense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we kept our promise; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence—we're starting this today; family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children; tax cuts for middle-income families; Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty; and congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today we take up the welfare reform bill sponsored by our Republican colleagues. This would end cash assistance for mothers, children, and legal immigrants.

Last week my own cardinal for the archdiocese of Detroit said this: "The measure of any such reforms will be whether or not they enhance the lives and dignity of poor children and their families."

The truth is that these welfare reform proposals fail the cardinal's test and they fail the test which was set forth by the Catholic archbishops and bishops last week. Almost \$70 billion will be removed from welfare programs; \$2.2 million legal immigrants will lose eligibility; 6 million needy children will lose their cash support; 65,000 children in my own State will lose their lunch money.

The Republicans cut money but they do nothing to improve the way the welfare reform programs operate. That is not reform. It is wrong. It is mean-spirited.

These programs have flaws. They should be corrected. Protect the children. Be fair. Respect the dignity of human beings.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SUPPORT FOR TERM LIMITS

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce to all of my colleagues that I intend to support our term limits section of our Contract With America. This is a decision that did not come easily nor have I taken it lightly.

Many of my colleagues know I have long believed that term limits were not necessary, that the voters of our districts every 2 years could make that

decision about whether they should send us back here or not.

But the fact is that some 22 States now have enacted term limits, not by polls, not by letters, but by actually going to the ballot box and casting their votes in favor of it. In 1992 my district voted overwhelmingly by 70 percent to support term limits. I believe that I have to respect the judgment of those in my district.

But when all of this became crystal clear to me was watching the Senate debate over the balanced budget amendment and watching the arrogance of six Democrat Senators who have voted for a balanced budget amendment 1 year ago, the identical language, thumb their nose at the American people.

We, ladies and gentlemen, do not have the right to thumb our nose at our constituents. We have a responsibility to respect their opinions, and I am proud to stand here as a new supporter of the term limit movement in this country.

WELFARE WEEK

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is welfare week. For me it started not in the abstractions of bill language. It started on Sunday when I picked up my mentee, a 13-year-old who lives in a D.C. housing project, to bring to Sunday's school lunch rally at the Capitol. She gets her breakfast and lunch at school.

Welfare week continued for me at noon today when I went to the elementary school I attended as a child. Then we brought our lunch or went home to eat it. Today 95 percent of the children in my elementary school each lunch at school.

You can talk until you are red, white, and blue in the face about only cutting the growth in school meals. The truth is the School Nutrition Programs will lose \$2.3 billion over 5 years under the contract. A cut in kids' lunches is a foul. Let us stop playing kids' games. Pick on somebody your own size.

REPUBLICANS CLEANING UP OUT-OF-CONTROL WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Liberals continue to exploit the hard work and innovative ideas of the Republican Party. The latest assault is our welfare proposal. They claim it is unfair to children, mothers, and other recipients. Wrong. What we are doing, is cleaning up a system, which has spun out-of-control for years. Spending for this bureaucratic-laden system has