

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