

cost, and that is what this block grant does that we are now proposing.

We are trying to send this money back to the State and say, bureaucrats in Washington are not close to the problem. The people in the State may be more innovative. Some governors around this State have shown in the last 10 years that they can come up with innovative programs to make a real difference in saving dollars and providing more benefits for the recipients, and that is what we are looking for in this block grant on this school lunch program.

Now, many speakers have already indicated today that our program provides 4.5 percent more nationally for this program each year over the next few years. But I want to, as we have talked about this program in very general ways, we have not been specific enough on how the program really works. And I want to take a moment this afternoon to talk about that.

First of all, in a school lunch program in America today, there are three basic programs. First of all, there are those children who receive free lunches, free breakfast and free snacks, and they receive it because they are somewhere between 135 percent and 185 percent of the poverty level, and they should receive free food because they are not going to get a nutritious meal anywhere else and our program is going to see to it that they continue to receive it.

Then the second group of students, in my home State of Kentucky, the average meal at lunch time on the school lunch program costs \$1.60 approximately. And this second group, they pay 40 cents for that lunch.

Now, the Federal Government each month writes the local school board or school nutrition program a check. For those students who paid zero for their lunch, the Federal Government writes a check for \$1.60 for every meal served, and by the way, 25 million meals are served around this country everyday. And for those students who paid 40 cents, the government writes a check each month for \$1.20 to the local school program.

Now, there is another group of students and those are students who belong to their parents, may be doctors, may be lawyers, may be businessmen, coal operators, coal miners, but they can afford to pay for their lunch and they pay \$1.20, still 40 cents below the cost of the lunch. And then on top of this—the Federal Government writing a check for the balance between 40 cents and \$1.20, we also sent an additional 17 cents for all meals served.

So all I am saying is that we can provide a program where the wealthy children in this country pay their full share and we can benefit more poorer children, provide better nourishment, more nutrition, and I think that the entire country will benefit from this innovative approach to the school lunch program.

#### BLOCK GRANTING THE SCHOOL-BASED NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I had to participate in this particular debate because it has grated on me, quite honestly, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee and a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee. I see a couple of my colleagues here, Mr. GOODLING, the chairman of the full committee, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of the subcommittee chairmen, and it has grated on me to hear these repeated falsehoods and exaggerated claims coming from the other side of the aisle.

It has also reminded me of that wonderful statement that there are really three kinds of lies. There is lies, there is more lies, and there is damn lies, and we have been hearing an awful lot of damn lies and out and out falsehoods propagated by our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle regarding our plans with respect to block granting the school-based nutrition programs back to State and local education agencies and our plans to dramatically overhaul and reform the American welfare system.

Now, I am a former school board member. In a sense, that is how I cut my political teeth, because believe me, school boards remind one of the old saying of I think the late Speaker Tip O'Neill, that all politics are local, and I have a great deal of confidence and faith in those men and women who come forward, purely in a volunteer capacity, to serve on the school boards of their local communities.

I am fully confident that they will provide for the nutritional needs of our school kids at the local level and that is obviously the best way for government to function.

Now, we believe that block granting the school lunch and breakfast programs, obviously, as this chart indicates that my colleagues have made repeated reference to tonight during special orders, we believe that our block grant programs to State and local education agencies obviously does not mean the end of nutrition assistance to needy children. Instead, what it means is the end of funding to Federal bureaucrats.

Some facts to go with the chart as we have attempted to reinforce tonight with our colleagues, and also to the American citizens who might be viewing these proceedings, some facts. Number one, funding in the nutrition block grant will increase 4.5 percent per year, as the chart indicates.

Number two, at least 80 percent of the funds must be spent on low-income children, that is to say, the neediest of children in local schools around the country.

And number three, not more than 2 percent of the block grant funds can be

spent on administrative expenses at the State government level, ensuring that more funds are spent on nutrition services for children.

And, ladies and gentlemen, let me just stress that this is part of an overall approach by Republicans in reinventing and downsizing the Federal Government. We are attempting to respond to this patchwork that we have today of over 600 separate Federal categorical programs that have been authorized by past Congresses over a period of many years, and as a consequence, we are putting forward proposals to radically reform this current maze of congressionally mandated government human service programs.

We are considering proposals that we will be bringing to the House floor in coming weeks to consolidate block grant programs in the areas of education, job training, nutrition, child care, and welfare.

And why the block grant approach? Well, the obvious reason. This is a fundamental and long overdue reform necessary back in Washington because these Federal categorical programs are too proscriptive. They are overregulated. They are incredibly fragmented. As my colleagues on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities will attest, when you are talking about 153 federally mandated job training programs for adult and youth, we are obviously talking about government gone amuck and creating far too many programs that can be reasonably administered for productive results and actual benefits to recipients.

So these programs are fragmented and many times often duplicative with the programs at the State and even local government level. We think block granting will actually encourage flexibility, local control, innovation, and ultimately greater accountability.

And why are we taking this approach? Because we want, by cutting down on Federal bureaucracy here in Washington, to apply those cost savings to reducing the deficit and ultimately balancing the Federal budget, as we have promised our fellow Americans we will do by the year 2002.

The only way we can do that is to decentralize authority and responsibility, and, yes, funding and revenues back to the States. In turn, we will be dispersing power to our fellow citizens and will be empowering those Americans who are most in need of government services and encouraging them to take greater responsibility for their own lives and their own destinies.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I wish the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here cared enough about our children to balance the budget. I want to say that one more time. I wish our Democratic colleagues cared enough about our children to balance the budget. That is simply not the case.

In conclusion, we believe that we have a moral imperative to balance the

budget, and that is exactly what we intend to do by taking these innovative approaches here despite the opposition.

□ 2000

#### THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM AND BASIC MATHEMATICS

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has got a Ph.D. in economics, and the Dick Armeay formula for basic math says, "If you increase spending by more dollars the following year than you have spent on it in the current year, that's an increase. If you spend less dollars the next year, that's a decrease." That is Dick Armeay basic math. I would offer a book called "Basic Mathematics" for my colleagues on the other side because I am the subcommittee chairman that went through the process, and we sat and figured out what is the best way to improve programs that work good, but yet we can still improve them.

Mr. Speaker, I had a Democratic page come up to me and say, "Mr. CUNNINGHAM, we see the rhetoric on this issue. I'm a Democrat, but why are my own Representatives lying about the facts over and over again?"

We are adding dollars to the children's nutrition programs. What we are cutting is Federal bureaucracy, and the Clinton Democrats will do anything they can to protect those bureaucracies.

Is the school based program, the children based program and family based program; are they fairly effective? Yes, they have been worked on with bipartisanship by my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and Mr. FORD who was his predecessor. And have they worked in the past? and do they work presently? Yes, but, if we can remove the mounds and mounds of paperwork, the Federal reporting that we have to go through every day. And back here in Washington we have got those Federal bureaucrats that have got to receive all those reports and justify their existence with those reports.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the Democrats will fight to do, anything they can in their power to spend and be elected.

Let us take a look at what President Clinton projected in the 1995 budget. He projected a 3.1 percent increase. We are increasing it by 4.5. If I was a Democrat, I would say, "Well, President Clinton is cutting children's nutrition." He did not cut it; he increased it by 3.1 percent, and in the budget that he just spoke right up here, Mr. Speaker, in your chair, and pronounced to the American public, he justified a 3.6 percent increase, not a 4.5 like we did, but a 3.6 percent increase.

And again we could say, "Well, the President is cutting children's nutrition." He did not. But what we are doing is taking a look at how we can make it more effective. Republicans believe that government works best that is closest to the people.

I spoke yesterday to seven of probably the most liberal school superintendents in existence from Los Angeles, from San Francisco, from San Diego, and Oakland, and Fresno, and do my colleagues know what they said? "DUKE, we not only want you to block grant it, we want you to get the money to us directly in the LEAs so we can use it in the local school district, so we can disburse it and cut out the State bureaucracies, let alone the Federal rules and regulations. We want to get it to our kids, and, when we've got only 23 cents out of every buck that gets down to the local school district, something is wrong. There is too many bureaucracies, too many regulations, too many reports."

Mr. Speaker, that is what my colleagues on the other side will protest, and let me tell you something we did do in this committee.

In California we have 400,000 illegal immigrants, children, K through 12, 400,000. That is 800,000 meals per day to illegal kids. That is over a billion dollars a day. At \$5,000 each to educate those children, that is \$2 billion a year, and they want to feed kids.

Do we want to feed all the kids of the world? Yes. But do we want to do it at the expense of American citizens and American kids? The answer is no on our side of the aisle. We cannot afford to feed the world. We want to feed American kids and make sure that the dollars get down to the people, and we are increasing those funds, not decreasing those funds. We are eliminating bureaucracies, not increasing bureaucracies and making it much more effective to do that.

Now in practicality are schools going to go in and eliminate those kids? No, they are not.

#### TIMBER SALVAGE

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up consideration of the emergency timber salvage sales amendment. This is an amendment designed to make use of timber that would otherwise be left to rot in the forest. The Forest Service estimates that over 20 billion board feet of dead, dying, and downed timber is now in the forests of America.

I am going to tell my colleagues the story of just one tree, one of thousands in western Washington alone. This tree, and many others like it, blew down on the Olympic Peninsula. This is not an uncommon occurrence on the Washington State coast. While this tree grew in a region that is perfect for

its growth, the unique combination of heavy rainfall, wet soils, and frequent high winds cause trees like this giant 500 year old Douglas fir to blow down. Thousands of these blown down trees are rotting on the forest floor right now. This tree had the chance to be different. Mr. Jim Carlson can be seen in this picture. He tried to purchase this tree from the Forest Service to be cut up in his sawmill, which used to employ about 100 people. The Quinault Ranger District refused to sell this tree to him. Mr. Carlson then came back to the Forest Service and asked that he be sold this tree and two other downed trees for use in construction of an interpretive building that he wished to construct at his ranch as part of an economic diversification project. This would have allowed Mr. Carlson to get into the tourism business, which, if we had put him out of the sawmill business, is the least we could do for him. The request was denied in spite of the fact that a provision for this type of sale was contained in the Grays Harbor Federal Sustained Yield Unit Agreement.

The taxpayers are the big losers in this story, though. This tree would have produced approximately 21,000 board feet of lumber. To put this in a better perspective, 800 board feet equals one cord. The sale of this tree by the Federal Government to Mr. Carlson would have brought the taxpayer between \$10,000 and \$20,000 for that one tree. Mr. Carlson would have been able to sell lumber from this tree for approximately \$60,000 at retail rates. Conservatively this would be enough lumber to build two modest homes.

The sad end to this tree came in a perfectly legal, though terribly wasteful, manner. An out-of-work timber worker, armed with a firewood permit, cut up this grand old giant for \$5 per cord. This amounts to about \$120 to the taxpayers of this Nation instead of \$10,000 to \$20,000.

The rest of the story, as Paul Harvey likes to say, is that this past year, this timber worker had his home sold on the steps of the county courthouse for \$931.91 in back taxes. At the same time, while the Quinault Ranger District would not sell this tree for lumber, they did not have enough money to purchase the diesel fuel to run their road grader.

Now environmentalists claim that these trees are necessary for the nutrients they provide for forest floor. Yet forestry scientists say that 90 percent of the nutrient value is found in the crown of the tree, while 80 percent of the fiber is found in the trunk. The 80 percent that we need and can be put to good use contains less than 10 percent of the nutrient value. It is possible to have the majority of the fiber we seek from these trees, and at the same time leave the majority of the nutrients behind. This is a case where you can have your cake and eat it, too.