

And when you combine these cuts with cuts in the funding for the child nutrition programs under the family-based block grant program, which amounts to \$4.6 billion, child nutrition programs will be cut by \$7 billion over the next 5 years.

What the American School Food Service Association—don't take my word—the American School Food Service Association says, and what our Republican colleagues do not tell us, is that inflation with regard to this program rises 3.5 percent every year and school enrollment rises 3 percent every year. That is 6.5 percent.

My Republican colleagues tell you that they are going to increase the program 4.5 percent. And it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that 4.5 from 6.5 is a 2-percent cut in this program. What they do not do is to include increased school enrollment, the increased cost of food prices, and a downturn in our economy.

Also, according to the American School Food Service Association, the bill cuts funding for school meal programs and places our children at risk in the following ways: First, the Republican plan means an end to free meals for the poorest children in America.

Currently children from the lowest income families receive their meals free. In my State of Connecticut, more than 13 million free meals were served last year. I went to the Simon Lake School in Milford, Connecticut, yesterday. In that very small community they served 96,000 free meals last year.

The Republican bill states that these children in the future may or may not receive free or reduced priced meals. And then it requires the States to spend only 80 percent of the money that they receive under this block grant toward providing free and reduced meals. They cut back the cost, then they say to the State: If you want you can spend only 80 percent; 20 percent of that money you can spend on anything else that you would like to.

The bill also eliminates current requirements that low-income children pay no more than 40 cents for a reduced price meal. Schools would be able to charge these kids any price they choose, 50 cents, 75 cents or even \$1 per meal. This is a hardship that many working families simply could not afford.

Second, in addition to cutting \$2.34 billion from the program, the school nutrition block grant would allow Governors to transfer up to 20 percent of the funds they receive to another block grant program. Further, Governors would no longer be required to make a State matching contribution to the program.

I will give you my own State. If the Governor of my home State of Connecticut had this kind of discretion and he chose to exercise it, the School meals program in Connecticut could lose \$2 million this year.

Let me conclude. As my colleagues have said, school lunches are an essential part of every child's day and benefit every American child in the public school. We should not be tampering with a program that works. I say, leave the school lunch program alone and protect the children of America.

#### NATIONAL SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, since the death of Chairman Carl Perkins, I have proudly accepted my role as the son of school lunch and child nutrition. He was the father.

I am really disappointed with the press accounts of the last several weeks, with the accounts of some of my colleagues, with those who are inside the Beltway as nutrition lobbyists. I do not take exception to the fact that perhaps their philosophy is different and they want to defend their philosophy against mine. But I do object to the fact that if they had read what is in H.R. 999, I do object to the fact that they are being Herman Goebbels, who was Hitler's propaganda expert. And he basically said that if you tell a lie enough times and big enough and long enough, you will get a lot of people to believe it.

And that is very discouraging to me because, as I said, if it is a philosophical difference, I do not have any problem with that. But if you will not read what is in H.R. 999, I do have a problem with that. Or if you have read it and you mischaracterize what is in it, I really have a problem with that.

Since the death of Chairman Perkins, I have shepherded, protected, and guided these programs in Congress. I heard someone say this evening that they have a vision of the future for children. I have a vision for the future of our children. And that vision is to have the healthiest children in the world.

But my vision goes beyond that. Because my vision is I want them to have a guaranteed hope that they can grab a piece of the American dream.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot grow a debt by millions and trillions of dollars every couple years and expect that these children will ever have an opportunity to grab a piece of the American dream.

I heard someone else say, Terrible, no counseling in H.R. 999. I do not know what bill he was referring to. He was not referring to H.R. 999. That I am sure of. But he said there was no counseling for WIC. The very first goal they have to meet in WIC is that of counseling.

The last speaker changed her tune a little bit later, but initially said, And then they can use the 20 percent for anything they want to use it for. Obvi-

ously, she either had not read H.R. 999 or is not interested in knowing what is said in H.R. 999.

I would like to do a couple things this evening. First of all, I would like to talk a little bit about the program that we now have. Because I have a feeling that there are not too many people out there that really even understand the present national school lunch program and that is what we are talking about.

If you do not participate in a national school lunch program, you do not have to feed free and reduced-priced meals except in three States, and that is why I have worked so hard to protect the national school lunch program.

2030

But the existing program, you get reimbursed from the Federal Government for free meals. Children of families below 130 percent of poverty, \$19,240 for a family of four, they receive \$1.76, plus 14 cents in commodities, \$1.90 subsidized by the Federal Government.

In the present program, if you receive a reduced price meal, you come from children of families between 130 and 185 percent of poverty, which is up to \$27,380 for a family of four, and you receive \$1.36 in cash and 14 cents in commodities.

If you are a full-program participant, your parents believe they are spending the full price for your meal. These are children of families over 185 percent of poverty, over \$27,380 for a family of four. The Federal Government subsidizes, the taxpayers subsidize, 18 cents cash, 14 cents commodities. You are not sending the full amount to school for your children who are participating in a paying meal program.

We did that for many reasons when we were able to afford it. We did it, as I said earlier, to try to keep the school lunch program going, the national school lunch program going, so free and reduced price meals would be available.

We do not have the luxury to say that we will continue to do everything the way we have done it in the past, because as I mentioned, if you are growing trillions of dollars of debt in a few years' time, you are denying these same children any hope for a decent future in this country.

Now, at the present time the Clinton budget called in 1995 for \$4,712,000,000. Our proposal for 1996 is \$4,712,000,000.

In the President's budget, he proposes \$656 million in commodities. We have \$638 million in commodities.

The President proposes for State administration \$92 million. We propose \$98 million. That is the school lunch program as it is today.

Now, let us take a look at what we have done in committee. The first thing I want to talk about is the difference between H.R. 4 and H.R. 999, because I am giving some people who are standing up here saying incorrect things and I am giving the press the

benefit of the doubt, the fact that they did not read H.R. 999, and are only talking about H.R. 4. Let me point out the differences.

H.R. 4 is one block grant to the States and combines all the programs. H.R. 999, because we in committee did not accept what was in H.R. 4, the one block grant proposal, created in nutrition alone two separate block grants, and then we created two additional block grants for child care and other programs.

H.R. 4 distributes funds to the States based on the lower living standard, and does not take into consideration current participation rates. On the other hand, H.R. 999 provides States the first year funding based on participation this year, a hold-harmless. However, in the next several years, it is based on participation, which is exactly the way it should be based. And that is what we do in H.R. 999.

H.R. 4 eliminated the entitlement status of all programs included in the block grant. H.R. 999, the program we are talking about, makes the school nutrition block grant a cap entitlement to the States, thereby ensuring a level of funding for each fiscal year.

H.R. 4 eliminated support payments for children in the school lunch program with incomes above 185 percent of poverty. H.R. 999 does not limit a State's ability to support meals for the paying child. It provides that 80 percent, and that figure was chosen because that is the figure at the present time for those who are receiving free and reduced price meals, it provides that 80 percent must go to those who are receiving free and reduced price meals.

The other 20 percent can be used for those who are below the 185 percent level of poverty, if that is what they need it for, or it can be used for the infrastructure of the school lunch program, if that is what they need to keep the school lunch program going, or they can transfer it, not to anything they want, as some people have said; they can transfer it to one of the other block grants only, only after the person who runs the program certifies that they have met all of our goals.

This is the difference between revenue sharing and block granting. We have set the goals. We have told them what the outcome has to be, and we have a way to assess that.

H.R. 4 set aside 12 percent of available funds for the WIC program. H.R. 999 creates a family nutrition block grant and reserves 80 percent of available funds for WIC. H.R. 4 contained no guidance to the States regarding the use of funds. H.R. 999 establishes program goals, specifies the uses of funds in each block grant, and contains reporting requirements which allow us to determine whether or not States are meeting such goals.

H.R. 4 did not require States to establish nutritional standards for assistance offered under the block grant. H.R. 999 requires States to develop

their own nutritional standards based on the most recent tested nutritional research, or to adopt the nutritional standards developed for each block grant by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences.

A big difference, folks. If you have not read H.R. 999, I would suggest you do it, and perhaps you would not come and make statements on the floor that are positively incorrect in relationship to H.R. 999.

It was mentioned by my colleague who is the chairman of the subcommittee that these programs have been good programs. There is no question about it. Are there any programs that cannot be better programs? Well, I will guarantee you, every program that the Federal Government runs can be a better program if Federal Government is not running the program.

What program do you know that is totally outstanding because the Federal Government has run it? I do not know of any.

What are the concerns of the existing program? There are several. The complaint that we have heard over and over and over again by the people who are on the front line, the people who are serving these meals, the people who are preparing these meals, the people who are administering the program back on the local level, is the complaint that there is so much Federal bureaucracy, so much red tape, so much paperwork, that they spend hours and much, much money doing this paperwork, meeting the bureaucratic requirements, rather than feeding needy children.

Let me tell you what the American School Food Service Association just recently stated. This is the American School Food Service Association. Somebody in one of the previous speeches referred to them.

"School nutrition programs have become increasingly complex and more costly, due to overly prescriptive, intrusive and restrictive Federal regulations." BILL GOODLING is not saying this. I am quoting this from the lobbyists who are the most active when you talk about school lunch programs.

I quote again, and complete the quote:

School nutrition programs have become increasingly complex and more costly, due to overly prescriptive, intrusive, and restrictive Federal regulations. Although there has been extensive communication with USDA, little progress has been made in simplifying regulations and limiting regulations to those specifically required by law.

The second concern we have with the existing program is there is some abuse. Unfortunately, there is some fraud. A program that is as big as this, I suppose one can expect that to happen. But let me tell you what I heard on a talk show the other day. A gentleman called in. He said he was a superintendent of schools in Texas. He asked to remain anonymous, and he asked that his school district remain anonymous, for good reason, because

the auditors would just love to catch up with the gentleman.

What he said was that it is to our advantage, as I pointed out before, not to look too closely at who should get free or reduced price meals, because we get much more money for free and reduced price meals. You can understand why he and his district want to remain anonymous. The auditors would have a field day, and hopefully they will catch up with whomever it was that was speaking.

The third concern we have and why we think there needs to be change, only 46 percent of those students who would be paying customers participate in the program. Only 46 percent of those eligible to be paying customers participate in the program. Part of the problem is that one size does not fit all. You do not feed Pennsylvania Dutch what you may feed an Italian community or an Irish community. They determine, going by nutritious guidelines, what it is that these young people will eat, what will cause them to participate. But only 46 percent at the present time do.

We have to do better. You cannot support the program if you have a district that has 65, 75 percent free and reduced price. You have to get the paying customers participating. And we believe by giving the kind of flexibility that we do in this legislation, that that local district will have an opportunity to meet the nutrition standards, and, at the same time, cause an influx of the paying customer coming through that line because she will eat the meal that will be served.

Let me talk a little bit more about H.R. 999. Often times you get people who have not read it who are telling us, this is what is wrong with your program.

First of all, they say it is less money. Now, you know, I wish that chart were still there, because I would like them on that chart to put the 3.1 percent that the President recommended for 1995's budget, and then see how it comes out. I would like them to put the 3.6 percent that the President suggested for an increase for next year on that chart, and then show me a little bit about who is saving and who is paying and who is cutting and who is giving more. I think they would have to turn to this side to look at the charts on this side.

Do not talk about what your dreams may be or what you think should be. That is not what your Commander in Chief, that is not what the leader of your party has recommended 1995 budget, or the 1996 budget.

We grow children, and I think it is important that we understand that. We are growing children at a greater rate than the President does in his 1995 budget, than the President does in his 1996 budget.

Let me talk about a couple other most frequently mentioned untruths. They say how about an economic downturn? Well, do you know any time this

Congress has walked away from those in need? What do we do when there is a flood that we have not budgeted for? What do we do when there is an earthquake that we did not budget for? We come back for supplementals.

But we built into H.R. 999 help for this same situation, because we say you do not have to return your money at the end of the year if you have a surplus, because you had a good year. You have a two year carryover. You had a good year in 1996, you saved money; you have a downturn in 1995, you have that extra money.

Now, let me tell you what we do beyond 4.5 percent. We probably get to the 5.2 CBO that they like to put over there. We may even go above it, I am not sure. Because when you think of the cost of the bureaucracy, when you think of the cost of the red tape, when you think of the cost to the local school district to meet all of these nutrition paperwork programs coming from the Federal level, there is a great deal of money to be saved, to be used not to feed bureaucrats, but to be used to feed children.

□ 2045

That is what we are in the business to do.

We heard a couple of people be awfully cute. I mean, they wanted to be cute. Unfortunately, they were not too cute, because they did not read what this administration is doing.

You had the President of the United States hold up a bottle of ketchup. You had the minority leader hold up a bottle of ketchup. And they were trying to bring up this old game they played back in 1982 or 1983, which was overplayed, which had nothing to do with reality, saying that somehow or other if you had those nutritious standards, the people back there who run these programs would feed a child a half cup of ketchup.

First of all, let me say, they could not afford to feed every child a half cup of ketchup. It is much easier and cheaper to feed the child a half cup of vegetables than it is to feed them a half cup of ketchup. So it had nothing to do with reality.

But how did they get ketchup on their face? They did not check what the nutrition standards are now in their own administration, because would you believe it, they can count ketchup in their calorie count?

This administration, who was second-guessing the people back home saying that you are feeding too much fat, what the people back home were doing was following their rules and regulations, their nutrition standards.

Now, why should we trust them to continue to tell the people back home what is the best nutrition that children should have when the very standards that they set out, then criticized the people who met their standards and said too much fat.

Again, I am afraid the two got ketchup on their face.

Let me just move on to one or two other areas. We build into our program a reward for participation. That is the way it should be. As I indicated, you have to attract the paying customer in there. You have to attract them to keep the program going.

What we say is the first year, you are held harmless and you will get, your State, the same amount of money. After that, however, it is all on participation. It goes down slightly each year, where you will get 95 percent based on your previous year, but you get 5 percent if you have an increased participation. The next year it is 10 percent. That is an encouragement to get them to do a better job. That is an encouragement to get more children participating in the program.

I have spent too much time, and I always have to laugh when people say, people who wrote this ought to get into the schools and see what is going on in the schools. For 22 years, I participated in school lunch every day, every day, sitting with the students, eating a school lunch, and for the 20 years here, I have tried to improve on that program year after year. Then I become most upset. Even a good friend sends out a "Dear Colleague" totally distorting what happened in 1982-1983.

In 1982 and 1983, it was not that side of the aisle that stopped some of those revenue-sharing block grants. It was this side of the aisle, those of us who were on this committee, because they were revenue-sharing. They were not block grants. It was revenue-sharing.

I have always said if you are trillions of dollars in debt, it is pretty tough to go back home and say, "We're revenue sharing." The only thing we had to share is debt.

These block grants set the goals, say specifically what has to happen, and then give enough flexibility so the local district can make them work even better than they presently do.

Let's not mix apples and oranges. There is no comparison to what is in H.R. 999 and a revenue-sharing, massive block grant. That is why we designed H.R. 999, rather than go on with H.R. 4.

I would hope that those of you who were listening this evening are beginning to understand exactly what we have done, and what we have done is given an opportunity to grow more children than the President has requested, more children than would have been appropriated, and make sure that that increase is there year after year.

I am proud of our end product, very proud of that product. I know that people are fearful of change. Nobody likes change. You fear change. Folks, change is inevitable. Not only is it inevitable, it is positively necessary if we are going to give these children, as I have said several times, an opportunity as adults to grab a part of that American dream.

Is there anyone out there who really believes that in the last 35 or 40 years

we have helped these people grab a part of that American dream? We have done just the opposite. What we have done is enslave them. We have put them in shackles, Federal shackles, to make sure that they never have an opportunity to get a piece of that American dream.

We are going to change things so they do have that opportunity, so that they too can be participants giving to this Nation, participants who can grow independently and not depend on the Federal Government.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, you will not hear of a Republican or at least even very many Democrats that will say that the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], has ever attempted to hurt kids. He has spent his life protecting them, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the honorable chairman, how many children can we feed on a bankrupt country? And today we are looking, where every child over their life, lifelong interest and account on the national debt, will be saddled with a \$180,000 debt. Yes, it will be indexed. You will have to pay the increases with inflation. That is before you buy a car or a home or everything else.

We are also looking at a Medicare system that is going bankrupt and will be in the near future. If we do not attack waste in government by bigger bureaucracies, then it is going to affect that.

I would just like to make two quick statements and I have a lot of my colleagues that want to speak, and I would yield back to the gentleman.

One, when the other side of the aisle talks about cuts, I have been here for 4 years. The rhetoric was confusing to the American people, where Democrats were saying, Well, look what we have done, we have cut this budget, but yet the American people could not figure out how we keep spending more.

I have an example, Mr. Speaker, that if my mom in San Diego, California, Escondido, said, "Son, we have a turkey this Thanksgiving and next Thanksgiving, your brother and family is coming over. I am going to project that I need 10 turkeys for next year."

Well, a few months before Thanksgiving, Mom calls up and says, "Son, your brother can't come, he's got to work, but the family's coming. I'm only going to need 7 turkeys instead of 10 turkeys."

Under the Democratic accounting principles, I have just cut 30 percent of the turkeys, when in essence I have increased it by 60 percent. I have gone from 1 to 7. I have not cut 30 percent. That is what they are trying to confuse the issue with, with the other chart.

The second point is that I would like to finish a statement on what the committee did on illegal immigration.

Would American citizens like to feed the world? Probably the answer is yes. If you asked them the question, Would they like to do it on the backs of our children, the answer would be most definitely no.

We have eliminated illegal immigrants from all 23 programs that they previously held. We have 400,000 illegal children in California, just in California schools, K through 12, at over \$1.33 a meal. That is over \$1 million a day, 800,000 meals a day, just for illegals.

Mr. GOODLING. I would imagine they are receiving \$1.90 a day.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No, I am trying to do it on a conservative basis. Then if you look at an average in California, it takes a kindergartner through high school, 12th grade, \$5,000 a year to educate that child. That is \$2 billion a year. Yet we are decrying that we do not have enough money for nutrition.

We have added money for nutrition. We have cut the bureaucracies. But what we also did is said, our priority in this country with limited resources, with the national debt getting out of shape, with the national deficit, and the President's budget increasing the national deficit by \$300 billion, our priorities are American children, and we want to feed those children. We want to make sure that no child under any circumstances goes hungry.

Should a high-income parent be subsidized by the Federal Government? Absolutely not. But the chairman has provided for those children 185 percent below the poverty level that we are going to make sure that they are fed. Again, the priority of disestablishing big government and who should receive the support are the kids that most need it.

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities for yielding. I especially want to thank him not just for his leadership this year but for a countless number of years.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has lived the life that many of us do not have or did not have the opportunity to do in terms of looking over the lunch programs from a perspective of a couple of feet. Most of us get most of our information from a book, a newspaper, from a pamphlet, from charts, information such as this.

I want to talk with my colleagues for a moment about the school-based child care block grant contained in the House Republican welfare bill. It has been subjected to vicious attacks by the White House and other defenders of the status quo, and I say defenders of government bureaucracy, of Federal bureaucracy.

I appreciate this opportunity to take just a moment and, with my colleagues, tell the truth about the House Republican welfare bill. I believe for the last few weeks, the American peo-

ple have been deceived. Some would say maybe more strongly they have been lied to. But the Democratic Party, some of those who preceded us here this evening, have distorted the facts and attempted to use children to promote the political agenda, and one by one they have paraded out on the House floor to tell the story, make the claims that House Republicans are taking food out of the mouths of children. I have to say that nothing could be further from the truth.

The House Republican welfare bill actually expands the Federal commitment to child nutrition.

I will admit, maybe our block grants are a bad deal for Washington bureaucrats.

□ 2100

But they are a great deal for the local administrators of school lunches who no longer will have to wade through tons of redtape to provide nutritious meals to schoolchildren.

I would like to reaffirm what has already been brought out this evening that I would like to inform the American people and reaffirm that our proposal, the Republican proposal, increases funding for school lunches, as has been said, by 4.5 percent each year.

The other thing that is important, I think, to remember is that the total Federal funding for the school-based nutrition block grant over 5 years is real money. It is \$36 billion, and despite this strong commitment to school-based food programs, Democrats are trying to convince the American people that the Republican Party has turned its back on the poor, and I think it is time the American people know the truth.

The school-based nutrition block grant proposed by the party, by the Republican Party, will greatly improve the way we provide school meals to needy children. It returns decisionmaking back home and removes the one-size-fits-all mandates that will allow States to provide nutritious meals to kids.

Now, one of the things that I really do not understand is why the Democratic Party, certain members, are so distrustful of the States. The Federal Government does not have a monopoly on compassion and, contrary to popular belief in this body by some, Congress does not have all the answers, not all of the answers to our Nation's problems. Governors and State lawmakers also have concerns about the well-being of children, and they live closer to the fact, to those children. They have a direct interest in promoting the health and development of the children in their States. They are not going to walk away from those responsibilities.

Just yesterday I had a chance to talk to the Governor of my State, Governor Engler, from Michigan. He is excited about this new majority in the House of Representatives. He is excited because they are willing to give him the flexibility that he wants and needs to design and craft some of the innovative

solutions that will make a big difference, a positive difference, in the lives of those persons that are trapped in the current welfare system. He understands, and he assured me that he and the other Governors understand, that there is importance in providing nutritious school meals, and they do not want to shortchange the kids.

I truly believe that the States can do a better job with welfare reform, that welfare reform over and above what the Federal Government has done, and the House Republican welfare bill will encourage creativity at the State level instead of stifling it, and as a result, I am confident that we have offered a positive alternative to the current wasteful welfare system.

I urge the American people to search out the truth, listen to both sides. I believe that you will find there is no reason that you have to be lied to, to be deceived.

In closing, I just would like to reaffirm, restate, and it has been stated several times, but I do not think it hurts to drum it a few more times, the Republican bill increases funding for school lunches by 4.5 percent per year. By the year 2000, we will be spending \$1 billion more on school lunches than we spend today.

We are not taking the food from the mouths of hungry children. We are streamlining the administrative costs and allowing more money to be spent on lunches instead of paper, paper-shuffling.

So I think it is time, and I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, that you have taken the leadership again to promote the facts that should be aired so that the American people can sort through the rhetoric and look at truly what is in this welfare bill, this child block grant bill and, frankly, I say again it is shameful that individuals would use children as political props.

I thank you for yielding, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for participating, a member of our committee, and I yield to another gentleman from our committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Before I get into my remarks, I want to congratulate you on an excellent presentation of the true facts about the Republican proposal to reform our school lunch program, our child nutrition programs, in ways that put more food in the mouths of kids and helps more people in this country, and you clearly, in your presentation, dispelled the falsehoods and the untruths that are being stated not only by people in the opposition but as well by people in the media who do not understand what we are trying to do here.

When I won my election, and this is my first time in Congress, I am one of the new freshman Congressmen, I had a lot of people tell me, "DAVE, you have

got a tough job ahead of you. You face some real serious challenges up there in Washington, and the biggest one of them all, the budget deficit."

How do we rein in this budget monster? Clearly there was no other issue that Republicans and Democrats came together on more clearly than that issue. They all recognized it as being a serious problem, and how do we deal with it, particularly when we look at so much of the money that is spent up here in Washington is going to so many very, very good causes.

When I first was delighted to find that I was going to be on the Education and Economic Opportunities Committee with Chairman GOODLING, I was very challenged to see what we could do to make the system better and help us move our Nation towards a balanced budget so that we could have our children, instead of inheriting bankruptcy and debt, inheriting prosperity, so that our children would be able to have the opportunities that I had as a young man growing up in our Nation.

And there was probably no program that I saw a bigger challenge than our school nutrition and our childhood nutrition programs, because I have been able to see firsthand the benefits of so many of these programs. And I was very, very intrigued to see in the hearings that we held in our committee that many of the people directly involved in these programs were able to recognize that there were some very, very clear inefficiencies. We had witnesses come before us telling us how they were just burdened with too much bureaucracy and too much redtape and how there is a separate application program for the breakfast program, and a separate application for the lunch program, and a separate accounting process for the summer nutrition program, and how much better it would be if we would block grant these programs and eliminate bureaucracy.

After we held those hearings, I was so delighted to see you, Chairman GOODLING, come forward with a program, a solution to this problem, that would allow us to eliminate bureaucracy, eliminate redtape, and put more resources in the hands of State officials that would allow them to feed more kids, feed more of the hungry, and at the same time help us move towards that desired goal of reining in this deficit monster and moving towards a balanced budget. And we were able to do all of this in the framework of actually modestly increasing the funding for these programs at 4.5 percent per year.

We had Governors come before us and tell us that in that type of an environment they could feed many more children than what we were able to do with the current system.

I think what we have seen coming from the opposition for the past 2 weeks, the past 3 weeks, as well as liberal members of the media, in my opinion, is just fear of change. The American people are the people who are asking for change. They voted in change on November 8, and we are coming up

with innovative ways to change the system for the better and, yes, there are people who are stuck in the past, stuck in the old ways of doing business who are making claims that are not true.

But I am very proud to be on the committee with you, Mr. Chairman, and to be able to support you in this effort, and I can say that the other freshman members of the committee, the Republican members of the committee, stand with you and are ready to help you get this program through and make sure it does what we desire it to do.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for participating.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], who is also a member of the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, have enjoyed the committee. We are dealing with tough issues, but I think in a responsible fashion.

The frustrating thing is to be on that committee at 2 o'clock in the morning sometimes to deal with this legislation and get up and read the paper the next day and wonder, "Is that the committee that I was on?" It has been very difficult back home to get the truth out. So I had a news conference at the statehouse with my Governor and superintendent of education where we got together and kind of held hands and said we can handle this at the local level if you give us a chance, and I think our new Governor, Governor Beasley, and the superintendent of education, Mrs. Nelson, we can handle it if we give them a chance.

The thing that struck me the most about this debate, there have been a lot of charts put up. There are, I guess, two or three sides to every story. I am willing to concede something. I am willing to concede the people on the other side of the aisle care about children. I think people on our committee care about children, the Democrats. They just have a different view of how government should interact in taking care of real problems. It is OK to differ. That is what makes this country great.

I just wish certain people on the other side of the aisle would admit that LINDSEY GRAHAM cares about children, because I do, and that David Beasley, my Governor, cares about children.

When it comes time to figure out how to change things, I would like people to think of concepts. Block-granting is a concept that is not that hard to understand. If you believe in a basic principle that everybody cares about children, that the people in South Carolina maybe care more about the children in South Carolina than the people in the Department of Agriculture, and I am willing to concede the bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture care about people in South Carolina, but when you come up to Washington, drive by the Department of Agriculture building and ask yourself this, do the

people in that building know more about the children in my district than I do? Do they care more about the children in my district than I do? Do they care more about the children in my State than my Governor? I think if you are honest with yourself that the answer would be no.

I live in an area that in the recent past in my lifetime, we have had abusive policies toward our fellow citizens. There has been discrimination in my State and other States in the South and throughout this country just not based on region where people did not get a fair break because of the color of their skin. That was wrong.

I have experienced change, and change is good. States' rights is something we talk about a lot. We have got to remember in the past the States have been irresponsible at times in treating their citizens fairly.

I can tell you this, that LINDSEY GRAHAM is not one of those politicians. My Governor is not one of those politicians. We have matured as a society.

The biggest fear and threat I think minority citizens have today is a Federal Government that does not allow them to get off welfare and get a job. The whole idea about caring has been talked about a lot tonight. I just wish people would admit that I care about the people in my district as much as anybody in Washington, DC, that my Governor cares about the children more than anybody in Washington, DC, in South Carolina, and block granting has a basic premise that that is the truth. If you believe that, you support block granting.

Cost, we talked a lot about cost. Right now, 25 percent of the money in the WIC Program goes to administer the program. We are trying to reduce the administration of these programs to get more money into the hands of the State people with less cost to feed and take care of more children and more new mothers, and one way you can do that is cut out the Federal middleman. Every business in America works on that concept of trying to reduce costs by streamlining the efficiency of delivery. That is all we are doing here.

And one thing I would like people at home to realize, why would Bill Clinton propose a 3.1 percent growth in this program, get on television, have his picture made in a school lunch setting, and accuse the Republicans of cutting the program when we have added more to the program than he has? I think the answer is pretty obvious. He has no agenda. He has abandoned welfare. The Clinton welfare reform proposal is nothing.

We are doing something, and the only way he can get out of this box is to criticize others who are taking an active role.

AL GORE's Reinventing Government, in my opinion, is a joke. Nobody has come to my office and said, "Congressman GRAHAM, AL GORE is going too

far." I have not had one bureaucrat complain about AL GORE's Reinventing Government.

□ 2115

I have had everybody and their brother in Washington complain about what we are trying to do to reform welfare, and to me it is working because the right people are complaining. If you want to change something, somebody is going to complain and the people that are complaining are the right people. That is the bureaucrats in this town.

The people in my district, when they are told the truth, are not complaining. They do not want somebody making \$100,000 a year to get a subsidized school lunch program. They do not want someone going to day care getting a subsidized school lunch program if they can afford to pay for it because we are broke up here.

The reason I am optimistic, Mr. Chairman, that we are on the right track is because the right people are complaining, those people that believe in big government, those people that care about children, but believe the only way you can care is spend from Washington, DC. I believe you can care and allow people to take care of their own at home and save money at the same time. I believe that very deeply and that is why I am supporting what you are doing and I will compliment you on that very reasonable approach to a real serious problem.

Mr. GOODLING. I would yield again to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the chairman and I would like the chairman, if he would, from his years of experience here, perhaps he could comment on why the President would do such a thing as accuse us of cutting these programs excessively when we, in reality, increased the funding for these programs over and above what the President had requested?

He requested, as my colleague from South Carolina very, very eloquently and appropriately pointed out, he requested a 3.1 percent increase and we on our committee, under your leadership, came in with a 4.5-percent increase, which is a 1.4-percent increase over and above what he himself had requested, and then he engages in the shameful act of appearing in school lunch lines claiming that we are cutting these programs too much.

I do not understand that, Mr. Chairman, and maybe you can explain that to me, and I took the liberty of putting up that chart there that I think shows our growth, and maybe you could explain that to us here and let us know what those numbers mean. That is a little complicated, but perhaps you could.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will yield, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], I am not a member of the committee and I want to make—I am really glad that I came down here tonight because this is the

most honest and healthy debate I have heard so far about this bill, because what I read in the newspaper and what I have heard on the news and what I have heard from some of the special interest groups does not match what we are seeing on these charts and what I have heard tonight.

Let me ask anybody here, and Mr. Chairman or Mr. WELDON or Mr. GRAHAM, if you want to respond to this, we are actually going to be spending 4.5 percent more in each of the years and the President only recommended what percentage increase?

Mr. GOODLING. He recommended 3.1 this year and 3.6 next year.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Three point one, 4.5. In other words, we are going to be spending about 30 percent more than the President recommended?

Mr. GOODLING. That is why I said I would like to see them put their chart up there and put his 3.1 and 3.6 over there rather than talk about what a CBO baseline is.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is interesting, because when we first came here, we are all freshmen, we were not part of accumulating this huge national debt, and I think we all made the pledge to our voters last year that we want to do something about that, and we need some change around Washington.

We came here to change the way Washington does business and yet what we have heard from many leaders on the other side, including the person down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, is that they want to fiercely defend the status quo, and I think the American people do want change.

In fact, it was less than a month ago that the President stood right up there and he said in his speech that we were not giving the American people enough change and now he had heard the message from the November elections.

I did not know until tonight though that we are actually going to be spending 30 percent more than the President requested. As somebody said when we first got here, people around here sometimes give the word "hypocrisy" a bad name.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GOODLING. And I yield back to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I just want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota, and I just also would like to share with the chairman that as a physician who practiced medicine up until I came here, that I had the opportunity firsthand to see the effects of malnutrition and the medical consequences of that and how it really is in our Nation's best interest to make sure our children are properly fed.

However, I do feel that it is the primary responsibility of parents to make sure that their children are properly fed and that we have had an erosion of responsibility in our Nation over the many years that the minority was in control because of an excessive tendency of the Government to take re-

sponsibility where parents should have been having responsibility.

And if I may go on a little further, Mr. Chairman, into this, I have seen the consequences of malnutrition and I expressed some of those concerns to you and to other members of the committee and I was very alarmed and shocked to learn that a substantial percentage of the program as it was devised up here actually was going to feed the children of people who really did not need this kind of financial support, that there were lots of middle class and actually children from affluent families who were getting subsidized meals in schools, and this is one of the very reasons why the Governors came to us and said that they wanted to take over managing these programs, because they, in their States at the local level, like the gentleman from South Carolina was describing, can better determine where the areas of poverty are, who would benefit the most from these programs, and I thought that was wonderful that you could design this program through this block grant to go make sure that the people who really needed it were getting it and the people who did not need it were no longer getting it.

I commend you and I commend the other members of the committee and the staff who were able to come up with this Child Nutrition Block Grant Program, and I think it is going to be a tremendous success.

Mr. GOODLING. One of the other tragedies, as I mentioned, that we had poor participation as far as paying customers are concerned in the School Lunch Program, but there is an even greater tragedy. We have about 46 percent of free and reduced priced people who do not participate in the program. So I am saying, just because someone says it is a good program, it has to be a better program because that 46 percent are in need of the program and are not participating.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If I may interrupt the chairman, could you explain why so many of those people who need it are not participating in the program?

Mr. GOODLING. I think I said part of that in my opening statement in that the one size fits all from Washington, DC, we know best what is best for this town or this city or this State, does not sell back home, and those people back home know what nutritious food they can serve the children will eat and then you get the participation.

Did the gentleman from Minnesota have any—I wanted to summarize.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. On that point, I want to say and it has been said tonight, it is very important. People do resist change and there is no institution that resists change more than a monopolistic bureaucracy, and what you are really trying to do is decentralize this program and that is what we have to do. It has to be consumer driven.

The people out in the districts and the Governors are not heartless people. They want their kids to get nutritious meals as well. I think this is a good plan. I think it is a first step. I think once we get more of these facts out here—as I say, if I did not know that we were spending 30 percent more than the President requested, if I did not know that as a Member of Congress until tonight, I will guarantee you that an awful lot of American people did not know that but they are going to know it sooner or later.

Thomas Jefferson perhaps said it best. "Give the American people the truth and the Republic will be saved." All we really have to do is get the facts out about this program. I think the American people will see the wisdom of it. I think it is a good plan. We ought to pass it.

I hope colleagues will join us in this because if the American people get the facts about this, they will buy into this idea.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me quickly say that I again do not argue with somebody's philosophy. If they have a philosophical difference, that is fine. If they believe one size fits all, that is fine. I do not happen to have that philosophy. If they believe that the Federal Government has all the answers to all the problems, I do not have any problem with their philosophy. I do not agree with it, but I do not have any problem with it. That is their philosophy.

If they believe that we have helped those on welfare in the last 35 years, go on dreaming. I do not happen to believe that. The only thing I request is, please read the legislation and then discuss the legislation.

Mr. President, we are not cutting and gutting school lunch and child nutrition programs. We are cutting bureaucracy. We want to grow healthy children. We are not trying to grow healthy or unhealthy bureaucracies. And so I hope that everyone from the Commander in Chief on down will read what is in H.R. 999 so that they actually can participate in a debate intelligently and talk about the facts. And again, as you pointed out over and over again, we are doing better to grow healthy children than the President has recommended.

I appreciate all of your participation this evening and I hope that the public has been listening and I hope that they will now better understand what the existing program is and what we are doing in the future to try to change to make sure that more children have an opportunity and more pregnant women have an opportunity to participate in nutritious meals programs.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-78) on the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

#### PEACE, JUSTICE, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, no discussion is more important than the one that is now under way here in Washington concerning the budget and all matters related to fiscal appropriations policies. The discussion that we have just heard is a very vital one. It relates to one small facet of the total budget and one small portion of the Contract With America.

The question of school lunches and whether they have been cut or not has been thoroughly discussed and we will have some more discussion on it. It is very important because in the process of trying to save money on school lunches, there has been some trickery. We are moving under the cover of a block grant and we are talking about giving additional money to take care of inflation. We are not discussing the fact that an entitlement is being taken away, an entitlement.

Every hungry child who has a certain income level is entitled now to a free lunch, which means that no matter how large that number increases and how great it becomes, the free lunch will always be there for the hungry child. In the block grant process, there is a finite number of children who can be fed. The Federal Government has only provided a finite amount of money. There is no supplementary budget at the Federal level that you can fall back on. You cannot go to the treasury of the Federal Government. They have washed their hands of the process once they give the block grant. So it is up to the States. It is up to the local government to pick up at that point and that is a part of the discussion. We can talk more and more about that but it is only a small part of the total picture.

Let us not talk so much about what has been cut so far, although that is important, the fact that school lunches are on the block and they are being squeezed in devious ways to save money. The fact that the summer youth employment programs, one of

the most basic, practical, and concrete programs ever devised by the Federal Government where teenagers are employed during the summer, that also is on the chopping block.

In the rescission process, they have put zero in the budget for the remainder of this year, reached into the current budget, money that has already been authorized, programs that have already been authorized, money that has already been appropriated is now being taken out of the current budget for the year which ends on September 30, 1995. That is called a rescission process. It is a cruel process of having people who anticipate that they are going to get certain kinds of programs and funding suddenly wake up and discover that it has been snatched away in this budget year, before we get to the process of the next budget year, 1996 budget year, which begins October 1, 1995.

So we are cutting programs which have relatively small amounts of money attached to them when you look at the total budget and benefit large numbers of people, programs that have been demonstrated to be workable, programs which go straight to the heart of the matter and serve the poorest people in the country. We are cutting them, and one of the questions is, why are we cutting these programs and not cutting other programs? And I will get to that later.

I think it is important to understand that the budget-making process is a vital part of a bigger process whereby we are defining our vision for America as we see it, as we go forward the year 2000 and beyond.

□ 2130

What happens this year will determine what is going to be happening in the next 10 to 20 years. This is a pivotal year. It is a pivotal year because the majority in the Congress that has just taken over has made it a pivotal year, and we should not back away from the challenge of making a lot of very basic decisions which will set the course of America for the next 10 to 20 years. We will not back away from it. Let us just understand that everything that is being done; those things that have dollars attached to them, and many of them that do not have dollars attached to them, are a part of a process to prepare America for a future that is going to be a future basically to serve a small elite group of people or a future America that belongs to everybody. I say it is a conflict, a battle, between the oppressive elite minority and the caring majority. I think there is definitely a cleavage here, unlike any we have seen before.

There is a group, which I call the oppressive elite minority, who have a great deal of education, a great deal of understanding about how to use power. They have a great knowledge of how to use information. They know how to control and make very good use of