

increased by 23 percent. During that period, the number of free meals served in child care centers increased by 45 percent. The block grants would not respond to the change in the school population, which is expected to increase by 4 to 6 percent. In the State of Texas alone we would lose 4 percent of our funding. Every September and all during the year we have new children who show up at our doors and qualify for these programs. We are not only cutting 4 percent, but if those new children show up, they would not have it.

Yesterday morning, before I left Houston, I went to a nutrition program in the Heights part of my district at the Field Elementary School. That is a school that has 90 percent of their children have free or reduced lunch. What 4 percent would we cut from those 90 percent of those children and next year when we have at least 20 more kids who show up or are qualified, are we going to tell that principal or that teacher or that food service worker, who does a hard job there, that they cannot serve those children?

There are reforms we can do in the program, but not cutting off the meals that those children have. I saw that meal. They had cereal. They had the option of orange juice and milk. A number of kids actually drank both the orange juice and the milk. They had some little sausages.

I noticed this last Friday the Committee on Agriculture cut the effort for the Food Stamp Program.

I am glad they are concerned about that, but I know we have some concern about the food stamp abuses. But I know I saw those children eating that food. I would hope that the Republican majority would see the err of their ways on school nutrition and also change that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 26, 1995]

SCHOOL LUNCH DEBATE SERVES UP HOT RHETORIC BUT FEW COLD FACTS—HOW KIDS WOULD FARE UNDER CHANGE UNCLEAR  
(by Wendy Koch)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam would no longer guarantee poor kids a free school lunch if a Republican measure now gaining momentum in Congress becomes law.

Instead, states would be free to decide who gets what.

Democratic critics say kids would suffer because funding would fall, and states won't have enough money in case a recession strikes. Republicans argue kids would benefit because the system would be more efficient.

But no one really knows—yet.

The GOP bill, which scraps the 49-year-old school lunch program, passed a House committee last week but needs the approval of the full House—considered likely—and the Senate—expected to be more difficult.

Even if it passes, its impact will depend on how each governor handles the new responsibility of feeding kids.

Still, there's no shortage of red-hot rhetoric.

Democrats have accused Republicans of trying to starve kids. "There are an awful lot of poor kids, and some not-so-poor kids, who will go home hungry," says Wisconsin

Rep. Dave Obey, senior Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee.

"Absurd," responds Michigan's GOP Gov. John Engler, a leading proponent of giving states greater flexibility to administer programs. He says it's "offensive" to say Republicans would harm kids.

The school lunch program serves 24 million children every day. Lunch is free for those whose parents earn less than 130 percent of the poverty line and is heavily discounted for those whose parents earn less than 185 percent. It sets a small subsidy, 20 cents a lunch, for all other kids.

The school breakfast program serves about 5 million children daily and operates similarly.

Every child who meets the eligibility criteria is guaranteed a free meal if his or her school participates in the program. If a recession hits, federal funding increases to meet greater demand.

The meals must meet federal dietary standards, nationally recommended for all Americans.

The Republican measure, part of the effort to reform welfare, would end the federal guarantee that poor kids get meals. With that goes the nutritional guidelines.

It would instead lump school meal programs together and give states a set payment, or block grant, to administer as they choose. It also would allow states to set their own dietary standards.

The measure would allow legal immigrants—but not illegal ones—to get subsidized meals.

Proponents argue that by cutting the middleman—federal bureaucrats—less money would be wasted on paperwork and more would be spent on meals for poor kids.

They say their block grants would increase funding by 4.5 percent annually—more than the rate of inflation.

Yet Democrats say the increase is less than they would receive under the current system, which adjusts for the rising number of eligible school-age kids. And thus, they call it a cut.

"Every state will get less funding," says Walt Haake, a spokesman for the U.S. Agriculture Department. Overall, USDA estimates funding will be \$309 million less next year and \$2 billion less over five years.

He criticizes the GOP bill for allowing states to use up to 20 percent of their school lunch money for other programs.

Critics also say governors of poorer states—even if they wanted to help kids—would have a tough time meeting the greater demand in a recession because their funding would not automatically adjust.

"That is the unknown, and the scary part," says Tami Cline, director of nutrition for the American School Food Service Association, which represents the administrators of school meals.

Yet Republicans bristle at the notion that governors, who face re-election, won't be responsive.

"Why would state and local officials do that?" asks Kelly Presta, majority spokesman for the House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, which passed the bill.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 26, 1995]

GINGRICH: FOES LYING ABOUT KIDS

ROSWELL, GA.—House Speaker Newt Gingrich lashed out at political opponents Saturday, saying anyone who claims Republicans want to hurt children is lying.

"They're going to argue meanness. They're going to argue Republicans are for the rich. And they're going to argue Republicans want to hurt children," he told a gymnasium full of loyal constituents here during a 2½-hour town hall meeting.

"It will be a deliberate, malicious lie. And they will repeat it, and repeat it and repeat it."

The Georgia Republican was addressing recent criticism from Democrats who charge that GOP proposals to end federal nutrition programs for children as well as Medicaid benefits for the poor would victimize the weakest members of society.

"Any liberal who tells you that we are cutting spending and hurting children is lying—L-Y-I-N-G-G," said the House speaker.

#### H.R. 1022, RISK ASSESSMENT/COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1022, the risk assessment cost-benefit analysis bill. This legislation very simply puts common sense into the way the Government regulates.

All of us have heard the horror stories from businesses and municipalities about the Federal regulations and the way that they have strangled their budgets only to have miniscule benefits result.

Earlier today I hope my colleagues had the opportunity to review a dear colleague I circulated to all of them concerning the city of Columbus, OH. In it I noted that Federal regulations currently require the municipal water systems keep atrazine levels in drinking water below 3 parts per billion. A human being would have to drink 3,000 gallons of water a day with three parts per billion atrazine to equal the dose found to be cancerous in rats.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, under its constitutionally mandated authority, sets this level by using the most exposed individual risk assessment model, which assumes a person is to be exposed to atrazine every day for 70 percent years. To show how absurd this regulation is, to consume enough water to come even close to causing any health risk, an individual would have to drink 38 bathtubs full of water every day. City officials in Columbus found that compliance with this regulation would require a new \$80 million water purification plant. For the same amount of money 3,700 teachers could have been hired at the average State teacher's salary.

To further show how wasteful this three parts per billion Federal requirement is, consider the following: The U.S. EPA developed a health advisory for atrazine which states that a child could drink water containing 100 parts per billion for 10 days or 50 parts per billion for 7 years with no adverse effects.

Mr. Speaker, it is for reasons like this that I am supporting H.R. 1022. I believe it is reasonable to ask our Federal regulating bodies to prepare a cost-benefit analysis of proposed regulations. I support the idea of providing alternatives without making expense

the sole determinant of the best strategy.

I believe that the peer review activities for more costly regulations are a good way to ensure the efficacy and the efficiency of our Federal rulemaking process. H.R. 1022 contains all of these provisions and makes the Federal Government a legitimate problem solver, not a problem maker.

Some of my colleagues who have opposed this legislation say it will create a new bureaucratic mess and will benefit lawyers more than individuals. I must say that I find their arguments to be basically an attempt to cover up the regulatory mess they instituted.

Risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis using the best available data and input will bring out the best governing decisions.

Mr. Speaker, this regulation protects the environment and public health because it means resources will be used to combat real environmental and public health risks and not be wasted on frivolous regulations and requirements.

#### MORE ON CUTS AFFECTING WOMEN AND CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to share a few stories with you that I think are appropriate when you look at the debate which we are facing here in Washington, not only this week but for the next several weeks.

They are about some children. They are kids that I remember but I do not know their names. Let me tell you why.

The first child I remember was in St. John's Hospital in Springfield, IL in my district. I was invited to come to the unit there where premature infants are being cared for and of course you put on a gown and a mask and walk in with the nurse and the doctor. And they pointed to a tiny little isolette with a little baby in there, no larger than the size of my hand, a baby that had its eyes taped shut and had more tubes and monitors in its small body than were imaginable.

The story of course was that that baby was born too soon and as a result would be in this intensive care unit for at least a month and maybe longer with the hopes that when she did come out at the end, she would then be able to grow like a normal baby and lead a normal life.

The heroic efforts that were being undertaken for that infant are repeated every day across America. Unfortunately, repeated too many times.

Several years ago we took a look at the incidence of low-birth-weight babies in our country and found some

shocking results. It turns out that the infant death rate in America was higher several years ago than in most industrialized countries in the world. Think about it. Our country, with the best medical resources, was still having children born of low birth weight with problems that really haunted them, many of them for the rest of their lives. When I talked to the head of the medical school, Dr. Richard Moy in Springfield, IL at the SIU Medical School, he said, "Congressman, the saddest part of it, this is entirely preventable; this is entirely preventable. If we can bring mothers in early in their regular pregnancy, give them prenatal care, we have the medical knowledge to deliver a healthy baby in virtually every case."

So the Federal Government, which is often the butt boy and the target of so many criticisms, decided to really invest money to reduce the number of low birth weight babies. The program we chose is one that has been around for awhile. It is called the WIC Program, the Women, Infants and Children's Supplemental Feeding Program. And we decided to take some of our precious Federal tax dollars and put it into our most precious asset, these children who will be tomorrow's leaders, our kids.

And you know what, it is working. It is working because now 40 percent of the infants in America are being brought into the WIC Program, kids especially vulnerable from low income families. I am proud to tell you that we are seeing the infant death rate in this country go down. Surely we still have low-birth-weight kids but not as many as we would without the WIC Program.

The reason I tell you this story and tell you the story about this little infant is that we are now debating whether or not to cut the money for that WIC Program. That is right, whether or not we are going to cut the money for the program that is trying to keep fewer low-birth-weight babies being born in America. In the name of a balanced budget, in the name of cutting spending, in the name of reducing the Federal role, we are going to cut this program.

My friends, the Republicans on the other side say it is the way to save money. Do you really save money with a low-birth-weight baby? Do you know how much it cost at St. John's Hospital several years ago for that low-birth-weight baby? At least \$1,000 a day. So a pregnancy, which ordinarily would cost \$1,500 to \$2,000 under normal circumstances ended up with a baby that costs us, as taxpayers, \$30,000 a month with the hopes that that little girl would come out of that experience and lead a normal life and not need more care afterward.

What a false economy. Yet the Republicans argue that reducing the money for WIC is what America really needs and really wants for its future.

Let me shift to another child, a child I saw in my own hometown again, at a

school breakfast program. A happy child, a kid who was having fun, who got to school early so that she could get that little lunch or little breakfast, rather, and have her day ahead of her. She was happy and bouncing around and having a good time of it. I talked to a teacher about the school breakfast program and school lunch program. I said, what do they mean to you? And she said they mean everything. Did you ever consider the chore that faces a teacher trying to teach a child who is hungry? That child is listless, stares at its hands, stares at the floor, cannot concentrate. I do not have a chance, she said, in terms of teaching that child.

So we invest each year in the basics of providing nutrition for school lunch programs and school breakfasts so that kids can go through that learning experience and come out happy, healthy, and learning. The Republicans have told us we need to cut that program, too. I hope we keep those images in mind as we get into this budget debate. We certainly cannot have a strong America without strong children. It is a false economy for us to cut programs for children, and I hope that the Gingrich Republicans will think twice before they make these cuts.

□ 1010

#### THE 2-PERCENT SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives passed the balanced budget amendment last month. Today, the Senate will decide the fate of this critical reform. Whether the vote is yes or no, Congress will still need a statutory mechanism to ensure that spending is put on a glide-path to balance by the year 2002. I propose the 2-percent solution.

Shortly, I will introduce legislation to establish caps that will limit overall spending growth to 2 percent a year. If this level is exceeded in any year, an across-the-board sequester will kick in and force the necessary cuts, excluding Social Security and certain other contractual obligations.

With 2 percent growth the Federal Government can balance the budget of 2002 and still spend \$1 trillion more over the next 7 years than it would under a 7 year freeze. Two percent growth will allow us to enact the tax cuts of the Contract With America and achieve the first balanced budget in 33 years.

Two weeks ago, I attended a Budget Committee field hearing outside of the beltway to hear the views of our constituents. Over 1,000 people showed up and the message was clear—cut spending. Just do it, balance the budget.