

brought up. I realize that you do not know for sure. But it would help us a lot if we could have that projection so we can begin thinking about what is coming and when it is coming and provide for that.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield further, again let me thank you for your suggestion. We are again in a period where we are examining that schedule and we would hope to be able to give you that as soon as possible.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Finally, you have said that the House will meet at 10 a.m. Wednesday instead of 11.

I assume that you have the authority to effect this meeting time change. Traditionally as you know the minority has been consulted and agreed to changes in the meeting time. I would hope we could continue with that practice. I realize what your concern is. We will try to work with you in every way that we can. But it would be helpful if we could talk about that before it is announced.

Mr. ARMEY. Again if the gentleman would yield, let me say that I expect that we will work this out by unanimous consent. It is my anticipation that we will be able to do so.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

Finally, can the gentleman tell at this point when the tax reduction bill along with the budget cuts to pay for it might be coming onto the floor? Generally, I know you do not know the exact date but just the general time.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, we expect that to be very late in March. We anticipate that being the last of the contract items to be brought to the floor. So at this point, let me just say very late in March.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman. I have no further questions. We will be getting an answer on this possible unanimous consent request on the rule on Monday. As soon as we have an answer, we will try to make that request if we can.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield further, I am optimistic that the request might be made. I am confident it will not be objected to on this side. Let me just point out that we will put a whip advisory out immediately and I am sure your side will do the same.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Exactly. I thank the gentleman.

□ 1430

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

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

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I was called away from the House floor on Wednesday, February 22, 1995, due to an emergency in my family and missed several votes.

Had I been present I would have voted "no" on rollcall 152, "no" on

rollcall 153, "yes" on rollcall 154, "no" on rollcall 155, "no" on rollcall 156, and "yes" on rollcall 157.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a statement to this effect appear in the permanent RECORD following these votes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT BY CUTS

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the house this afternoon. I was so ecstatic this morning when I came in because I am only a second-term Member but I found out I had arrived. I found out that last night I was called by name on Rush Limbaugh, but the only thing he missed, he did not say I was GENE GREEN, he called me Mr. Green Jeans, and I am glad for that recognition even though he did transpose the names.

The reason he talked about it though was because I talked about how the breakfast and lunch program will cut children in Texas by 4 percent, and yesterday the House majority Republicans on the Economic and Educational Opportunity Committee voted to deny thousands of school children in the State of Texas their breakfast and their lunches.

Last year during the fall when people asked me what I thought a Republican majority would be in Congress I jokingly described it as nuclear winter. Well, if it is, then we are subjecting ourselves to the fallout now.

The Committee on Appropriations yesterday cut \$17 billion out of many programs.

Safe and Drug free schools cut by \$481 million.

School-to-Work cut by \$24 million.

Displaced Workers was cut by \$99 million.

In nondefense rescission bill this week job training was cut by \$200 million.

Veterans Administration will be cut by \$206 million.

NASA reduced by \$66 million.

Federal Highway Administration cut by \$421 million.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK DOUGLASS

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

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who was, by definition, a great American. Born into slavery in 1817, Frederick Douglass would become an abolitionist, orator, journalist, and advisor to Presidents.

Abraham Lincoln once told Frederick Douglass, "There is no man whose opinion I value more than yours."

His first autobiography paints a cruelly accurate picture of the conditions and circumstances he endured as part of his childhood. Nevertheless, Douglass learned to read and write at an early age, when the plantation owner's wife defied the law and began teaching him. This was the beginning of what would become an impressive self-education.

Eventually Douglass was put to work in a Baltimore shipyard. In 1838, Douglass escaped to New York and soon moved to New Bedford, MA, where he married.

Douglass soon became active within the Massachusetts abolitionist movement. After an impromptu speech at a rally in Nantucket, Douglass was immediately propelled to the forefront of the abolitionist debate then raging throughout America.

Many who heard Douglass speak began doubting his story. At the time,

people refused to believe that a former slave could speak so eloquently, so passionately and with such command of the English language. This prompted Douglass to write his first book: *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*, which Douglass wrote while living in Lynn, MA.

One hundred years ago this week, Frederick Douglass died. His legacy should serve as a source of strength and hope for all Americans regardless of our own ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Desire for freedom and social justice is not limited to any race, gender, or political party. And desire to bring about positive change in our society should never be stifled by those who stand in the way of progress.

Later in life Douglass was asked by a young man, what could be done to change things. Douglass said, "Agitate. Agitate. Agitate."

In our efforts to fight for meaningful change we should remember these and other words of Frederick Douglass, "Fellow citizens, ours is no newborn zeal and devotion—merely a thing of this moment."

THE MEXICAN HOLDUP

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, the Mexican holdup continues, aided and abetted by the White House and the congressional leadership. Despite overwhelming opposition across the country, the Clinton administration sidestepped the people's House and handed the regime in Mexico City \$20 billion.

What did the American people get for this sweetheart deal between Wall Street and the one-party dictatorship south of the border? They got nothing, except of course laughs from the bankers and the politicians who once again put one over on them.

Mr. Speaker, you would expect that the Clinton administration would have the sense to demand something from Mexico in exchange for our money—such as denationalize every Mexican company, end wage and price controls, stop propping up Castro's brutal regime, or start patrolling the Mexican side of the border to stem the wave of illegals. Unfortunately, that is asking too much, because Wall Street, the international bureaucrats, and Mexico City want to ensure that they can maintain business as usual and continue fleecing the American people.

If congressional Republicans do nothing to stop this Mexican holdup, we will have fulfilled George Wallace's declaration that there isn't a dime's bit of difference between Democrats and Republicans.

□ 1440

A BREACH OF CONTRACT WITH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BATEMAN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I met with 25 constituents from the eastern panhandle of West Virginia who were as amazed as I was and could not believe what had happened, and that is that this Congress, under the Republican Contract for America, honestly was proposing and, indeed, appears hell-bent to eliminate the School Lunch Program by putting it into a block grant, a program that has been with us now since 1946.

Let us talk about what the School Lunch Program does for West Virginia and, in so doing, for the Nation.

The School Lunch Program serves 180,000 lunches per day in our State. It serves 77,000 breakfasts per day. The Child Care Program serves facilities such as Head Start and day care, serves 38,000 meals per day. Fifty-seven percent of school lunches in West Virginia go to those eligible for free or reduced meals. Seventy-seven percent of school breakfasts in West Virginia go to that same category. The West Virginia school lunches cost \$98 million, of which \$55 million is Federal. The balance comes from students and their parents, from county and State contributions.

Twenty-one of our fifty-five counties in West Virginia are severe-need counties, meaning that 60 percent or more of these students qualify for free or reduced lunch. In my district alone, the Second District, the severe-need counties include Braxton, Calhoun, Clay, Gilmer, Lewis, and Randolph.

The average price for a school lunch in West Virginia is 85 cents for breakfast. It is 50 cents, the actual cost per meal being \$2.12, making the Federal subsidy per meal \$1.36.

The history of the National School Lunch Act enacted in 1946 was done under the national security heading in the Constitution. And why? Because so many young recruits were failing their draft physicals due to nutrition-related diseases.

In 1966 Congress enacted the Child Nutrition Act in recognition of the demonstrated relationship between food and good nutrition. Today that program serves 25 million students a day. The School Breakfast Program serves 5 million a day.

Now, let us talk about what this means. They say they want it in a block grant. What that means is you take the School Lunch Program and the School Breakfast Program, now you mix it up in a pot, you put it in with WIC, Women, Infant, and Children Program, put it in with the Child Care Nutrition Program, cut the money, but say you are giving flexibility and send it all to the States, and then you let the States decide which of the children

do we feed. Whom do we feed? Do we feed the WIC child, do we feed the toddler, or perhaps the 6th grader? Which child gets it? Which child does not?

There is something else that is not talked about in this legislation, the reality of the matter is that you will close hundreds, if not thousands, of school lunch programs across the country. Why? Because in order to make enough money to keep the program going, you are going to have to charge far more to those who are able to pay the full cost, thus pricing it further out of the market.

We saw this happen already. If you remember the halcyon days of President Reagan, when catsup was going to be a vegetable back in 1981 or 1982 in the School Lunch Program, and we saw, because of the new regulations then, we saw many lunch programs close down.

And so I have a great concern, and obviously total, opposition to this measure.

Well, I hope that people across this country, Mr. Speaker, will rally on this. Send in those, tear off the lid from the milk cartons from the school lunches, send them in to those who think this is such a good idea. Let your legislators, your Representatives, your Senators know, your Members of the House of Representatives. There are lots of things we can have legitimate arguments about. But taking apart the School Lunch Program? Ever try to educate a child who has a rumbling tummy? Ever try to educate a child who has nutrition or protein deficiency? Ever try to educate a child who does not get enough to eat?

In many areas of our country this is the way children get enough to eat.

We did not talk about the Summer Lunch Program either, because that is another one that will get pitted against all the others. We are going to make our children in our States compete for food. That is what this is all about.

This is one that I think everyone can say that is not a part of the contract we want. This is a breach of contract with the American people, and I urge there be strong opposition to this provision in the Contract for America.

I am counting on America, Mr. Speaker, to respond and say we want lunch in our schools.

PROCEEDING WITH GENERAL DEBATE PENDING A VOTE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 96

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House may proceed to general debate in the Committee of the Whole as though under House Resolution 96 during any postponement of proceedings on that resolution pursuant to clause 5 of rule I.

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