

here, 10 million there. How many millions before an independent counsel is named to investigate the Speaker's shady deals.

INCREASES, NOT CUTS, CLAIMED FOR THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we have been falsely accused by our opponents and by the media of cutting nutrition programs through the Contract With America. The GOP has developed a plan, and it is a good plan. I have a graphic representation of that here. It talks about proposed spending.

In fiscal year 1995 for the school lunch program we are increasing spending from \$4.5 to \$4.7 billion. That is a \$200 million increase in spending on nutrition programs. Yet we have been accused of trying to starve children.

Under the Women and Children's Nutrition Program we are increasing from \$3.47 to \$3.68 billion. This is a \$200 million increase.

I just want to tell the people in America that the Contract With America is not a contract on America. We have a plan to feed those who are truly in need. We have a plan to cover those who have problems in our society. I think it is a good plan. I intend to support it, and I encourage others to support it.

CHINA POLICY RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT INTELLIGENT LIFE IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that China is ripping America off. They now enjoy a \$38 billion trade surplus, laughing all the way to a Chinese bank.

To me that is unbelievable, but what is more unbelievable is that China is then rewarded with most-favored-nation trade status.

But what can even be more troubling in all this is that with that \$35 billion, China builds Silkworm missiles. Then China takes those Silkworm missiles and sells them to Iran. Then Iran takes those Silkworm missiles and threatens the gulf, and then the Pentagon says to Congress, "We need more money to protect the gulf from those Silkworm missiles that Iran has that were made in China."

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Now NASA is on an unmanned space mission to the moon. I think NASA should redirect and have an unmanned space mission to Washington, DC, and try to find out if there is any intelligent life left in the Nation's Capital.

A LOVE AFFAIR WITH THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, why the Democratic love affair with the bureaucracy? What motivates the Democrats to fight so hard to save it?

As part of our welfare reform package, we Republicans have proposed increasing money for school nutrition programs and giving it directly to the States, thereby cutting out the bureaucracy. Yet, the Democrats have lied about the Republican plan to save the bureaucracy. Why?

Well, a good investigator always follows the money. When we do, we find that the eight largest Federal Government employee PAC's in the last five election cycles contributed \$17.1 million to Democratic candidates, but only \$1.9 million to Republican candidates. That is about a 9-to-1 ratio favoring the Democrats.

Could this be why the Democrats fight so hard and misinform so much? Are they really committed to the children, or to the bureaucracy that fills their electoral coffers?

The Republican plan, Mr. Speaker, will put more money where it is needed most.

WELFARE—A COLOSSAL FAILURE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, with all the distortion, deceit, and deception coming from the other side of the aisle on the issue of welfare reform, I think it is time to remind my Democrat colleagues that welfare has been a colossal failure.

Since 1965, we have spent \$5 trillion on welfare, an amount greater than our total national debt. An amount greater than the cost of winning World War II—even in constant, inflation-adjusted dollars.

But far from winning the War on Poverty, we have spent \$5 trillion and poverty has won, or at least is winning.

Consider the sad facts. Since the end of World War II, poverty in America had been declining at a rapid and steady rate. But as welfare spending increased in the late 1960's and early 1970's, the poverty rate leveled off and began climbing, reversing a decades long trend in the other direction.

So why do the Democrats fight so hard to preserve a system that has been such a failure? Why do they want to perpetuate a system that has trapped so many in a cycle of dependency? Why are they so wedded to the old order?

SCHOOL LUNCHES

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, it is said in every war the first casualty is the truth and this is certainly the case in the Republican revolution.

While the GOP claims that its budget cuts will not hurt American children, the truth is that children are the ones in the direct line of fire.

Mr. Speaker, 43 percent of the children in my district—18,625 children—will be impacted by the Republicans' cuts in the School Lunch Program.

A lunch may be something my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take for granted, but for some of these children it is their only meal of the day.

This meal provides the nourishment they need to learn and perform better so they can become productive citizens.

The mantra of the day is block grants. Well this one needs to be closely examined. The truth is there will be less money in the block grants and the Governors don't have to use this money for school lunches.

To make matters worse, the Republicans have eliminated national nutritional standards which prevented ketchup from being counted as a vegetable.

Mr. Speaker, the mean-spirited attacks on our children must stop. I urge my colleagues to oppose these devastating cuts—for our children and for the future of our country.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS FEED CHILDREN, NOT BUREAUCRATS

(Ms. PRYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, to listen to the Democrats speak, one would think the Republicans are ogres, taking food out of the mouths of babes. They have called us cruel; they have called us despicable.

Mr. Speaker, what is despicable is their tactics. They are deceiving the American people, and they know it. There are absolutely no cuts in the School Lunch Program under the Republican welfare plan. Let me say that again. There will be no cuts in the School Lunch Program.

As a matter of fact, the funding for the program will actually increase by \$203 million, an increase of 4.5 percent. Furthermore, the Republican plan guarantees that 80 percent of the funds will actually go to feed hungry children, while 2 percent can be spent on administrative costs.

Our proposal will make sure that the money will go where it is needed, into

food for children, not pay checks for bureaucrats. Democrats seem more concerned about feeding bureaucrats than feeding children.

Mr. Speaker, the debate should not involve using scare tactics to defend the status quo. Our children are more important than that.

□ 1015

COLOR-BLIND JUSTICE

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I am overjoyed at all of the discussions that we are having about a color-blind society. A color-blind society starts with color-blind justice.

Yesterday, the U.S. Commission on Sentences released a study. That study said that crack sentences put more blacks in prison. It must be understood that the disparity in the law that allows for a person with 5 grams of crack cocaine to serve a term of 5 years versus a person who serves 5 years who has 10,000 grams of powder cocaine is an injustice. It is unfair.

I would call on my Republican colleagues and others in the Democratic Party to join with me. Let us work toward a color-blind society, but let us start with the reality that color-blind justice must be a part of what makes this process workable.

When we get to that point, I think we can all agree that we are moving toward the kind of society that was intended from the beginning. This American democracy is an inclusive one.

FEDERAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, finally, the truth has prevailed. For the past week, House Republicans have been accused of not caring for children and for future American generations. Opponents believe that we are going to dismantle the Federal School Lunch Program. That is simply not true.

We realize that children are better able to learn when fed a nutritious meal on a regular basis. Under our proposal, the program will grow by 4.5 percent, and in the current budget year we will spend \$4.7 billion, yet another increase for children.

Since January, we have been busy passing a balanced budget amendment, a line-item veto, and even a new and improved crime package for the benefit of our children. In the coming weeks, we will work on a welfare reform package, a commonsense legal reform measure, and finish streamlining the Federal regulatory maze.

We will continue to create a brighter future for our country's most important resource—our children.

NO FREE LUNCH

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have said "no more free lunches." But, to whom have they said this? To themselves or to the Washington special interests? No. To well-paid lobbyists or well-connected contractors? No.

Instead, they have said "no more free lunch"—no lunch at all—to the millions of children who depend on the Federal Government's School Lunch Program. Mr. Speaker, we need congressional reform, like a gift ban, because we can only represent our constituents if we share the experiences that they go through everyday. And this latest cruel cut shows that we have very little in common with our youngest, most vulnerable constituents.

Yes, it is business as usual in Washington, even though outside the beltway, belts will be worn a little tighter than usual.

Members of Congress and lobbyists can keep their three-martini lunches, while our poorest children can't even get three square meals.

So, I say to the Republicans, you defend your elegant lunches with lobbyists who make millions, and we Democrats are going to defend the modest lunches that feed millions of children.

THE EFFECT OF THE DEFICIT ON OUR CHILDREN

(Mr. MCINNIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, after hearing some of the comments earlier this morning, let me tell Members that the children that are in the direct line of fire are in the direct line of fire because they have got something called the Federal deficit which is about to explode in their lap.

If we want to help the children of the future, we better do something about this deficit and we better be prepared to address the bureaucracy on the food School Lunch Program.

Do not let the Democrats on the fringe left parade around and say we are taking food out of the children of this country. We are not doing that.

We are just saying we have got to change the status quo. We need to introduce something called business management 101 to operate that program.

That program is going to be run much efficiently under Republican control and a lot more kids are going to get fed under Republican control than the Democrats ever dreamed.

In addition to all that, we are going to get that next generation out of the Federal deficit like the Democrats want to end it.

WELFARE ISN'T A LUXURY

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled at the mean spirit of my Republican colleagues. I rise today to call on them to get over their stereotypes of welfare. They should listen to experts like Joe Livingston from southwest Portland:

As a medical student at Oregon Health Sciences University, I see poverty all of the time, and it reminds me of my own experiences growing up. I was the child of a teenage parent. There were times in our lives when my mother could not make ends meet and we went on welfare.

I find it terrifying that many in Congress feel it is good for the country to decide that if young women have children outside of marriage they should be abandoned. Teenage mothers do not need our government to punish them; they need help. Their young children do not need Congress to judge them as bastards; they need food and shelter.

THE TRUTH ABOUT REPUBLICANS AND CHILDREN

(Mrs. CUBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am standing here today, and I am going to come back and I am going to stand here every day until we get this bill passed or until they start telling the truth.

The truth is, if Members wanted to know who cares about feeding children in America, the Republicans care.

I am a mother. I have served school lunches myself. I have cooked the food. I have taken the food there to serve it. There is no one in Washington who wants to take care of the school children in Wyoming and across the country more than I do and more than my colleagues do.

The truth of the matter is, my colleagues, that we are spending more money for school lunches. We are allowing the people who really care about the people who knows what their needs are in the States to make the decisions that affect those children.

We are allowing families to take over feeding their children again. The School Lunch Program does not just feed poor children. It feeds people's children who do not need money in order to supplement the cost. That is wrong.

We need to take care of the people who need it, and that is best decided at the States.

THE EFFECT OF REPUBLICAN CUTS ON THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman in the well