

all know that when push comes to shove, kids are going to be left out in the cold.

Republicans claim this new formula will reduce bureaucracy. But they seem to forget that by turning this program over to the States, you are in effect opening the door to 50 different sets of guidelines—rather than one standard. And that means 50 new bureaucracies.

Mr. Speaker, there's no reason why kids in Michigan should get any less for lunch than kids in Texas.

But by turning this program over to the States, that's exactly what we'll get.

The reason this program was instituted in 1946 was because many recruits to the military were found to have nutrition problems.

But over the past 50 years, this program has helped make our kids healthier and stronger and fed those who would otherwise go without.

I can understand fixing a program if it's broken. But this program is working fine. It's feeding hungry children. And there's no reason why we should put that at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentlewoman from North Carolina for her leadership on this.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I was just wondering, as you say, less kids would be fed. I have records from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and you will suffer 279 less young people being fed under your program.

I did not know whether you were aware of that, to back up your statement that kids would not be served, the impact of that.

Mr. BONIOR. I know the cuts in dollars to the State of Michigan and as it will affect other States in this country, that there will be hundreds of thousands of youngsters in America who will not get the nutrition they need to perform well in school.

#### SUPPORT UNRESTRICTED LEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, my parents and I arrived in this country in the early 1960's after escaping the totalitarian dictatorship of Fidel Castro in Cuba with the dream of starting a new life in freedom. Soon after arriving, my family and I were able to learn why this great country was seen around the world as the land of opportunity. After much hard work, my parents were able to settle into their new home and provide us children with the foundations for our future prosperity. That same dream of freedom and democracy that my parents had is still shared by the immigrants who arrive to this country today.

Unfortunately, I am afraid that today, across the Nation and in some of our political leaders, there is a current which runs against this desire. The current, instead, runs in favor of severely restricting and even ending legal immigration. This movement is fed by the incorrect notion that immigrants are attracted to the United States because of our social programs and soon after arriving, they become a burden on the State.

Mr. Speaker, the facts do not back this notion. The reality is that immigrants have made positive contributions to virtually all sectors of American life. In the economic spectrum especially, immigrants have clearly been prominent participants in the growth of the U.S. economy. For example, in my hometown of Miami, the number of businesses, large and small, owned by Cubans has grown from barely 900 in 1967, to over 28,000 in 1990. As a matter of fact, 18 percent of all small businesses are started by immigrants. This is the entrepreneurial spirit and personal initiative we in this country admire, and which the Founding Fathers of the United States tried to instill to future generations.

Moreover, it has been estimated that legal immigrants pay a combined \$70.3 billion a year in taxes while receiving \$42.9 billion in services. Add to this the immense amount of human capital which legal immigrants bring to this country and there is little doubt that refugees have been an integral part of the U.S. economic success story.

Mr. Speaker, it will be a sad day in U.S. history when we no longer look at immigration as positive for our Nation's prosperity. No other country can share stories like that of Pablo Fonseca, a Cuban who arrived in the 1980 Mariel boatlift and just 2 years later had already graduated from Miami-Dade Community College with high honors. He then proceeded to the University of Florida and later obtained his dentistry degree from the University of Indiana while winning numerous honors and awards. Today, Dr. Fonseca is a practicing dentist, full of admiration and gratefulness for this country. As he himself said, "This great country is a place of unlimited opportunities. As long as you try hard and you know where you are going, the sky's the limit."

Or the story of Edith Bolt, a Nicaraguan who arrived in Miami in 1985 as a teen with no knowledge of English. After graduating from Miami Beach Senior High School in 1989 and attending Miami-Dade Community College for 2 years, Edith proceeded to graduate magna cum laude with a bachelor's degree in finance from Florida State University. Today, she works in the action-packed world of finance as a credit analyst for a Miami bank.

Or the story of Winy Joseph, a young woman from Haiti who also knew no English but through ESL courses was able to learn the language. Today, Winy attends Miami-Dade Community

College and plans to continue her studies in the field of international relations.

And finally the story of Jorge Sierra, another Cuban who emigrated in 1992 to the United States at the young age of 21 without knowing a word of English. Today he is a fluent English speaker who has successfully obtained a degree in computer science and works as a software developer.

Mr. Speaker, these are just four stories of the thousands which show the determination and hard work of immigrants in their drive to forge a new life of success. More importantly, these are the stories that make America great, that separate this country from all others. Where else can the daughter of Cuban refugees who fled their homeland in search of a new life become a member of the National Government? Only in America.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say that all my colleagues in this body know of many immigrant success stories. Whether it is the small businessowner, or the son or daughter of an immigrant who is now a doctor or a lawyer after much hard work from the parents; all of us know of immigrants who have succeeded through honest, hard work. To turn our backs on these American residents who share the same dreams and hopes as native born Americans would be detrimental to this country and would betray the spirit of freedom and opportunity of which we are so proud.

□ 1000

#### CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to my Republican colleagues over the last several days get up here and tell the American people that by cutting the School Lunch Program that they will be able to feed more children. I think it is time to set the record straight.

In the fantasy world of the Republicans, higher food prices and larger school enrollments simply don't exist. But they do exist in the real world and current law allows funding for child nutrition programs to keep pace automatically, especially during difficult economic times. This is where the Republicans' block grant proposal fails and where our kids would get hurt.

Republicans argue that their proposal would increase child nutrition program funding by 4.5 percent every year. But this is deliberately misleading. Their so-called increases would not keep pace with food price inflation and rising program enrollments. Under the Republicans' plan, according to the Center for Budget Priorities estimates, school-based nutrition programs would be cut by \$190 million in 1996 and \$2.3

billion over 5 years. Family-based nutrition programs would be cut by \$680 million in 1996 and \$4.6 billion over 5 years.

The Republicans say their plan frees up more money for food by making the programs less bureaucratic. This is preposterous. The Republicans' proposal would actually make the programs more bureaucratic by creating 50 new bureaucracies to administer 50 new programs. This will only increase administrative costs for the States, and ultimately mean less food for children. The fact is the Republicans would not be cutting Federal bureaucracy, they would simply be cutting Federal funding.

I am especially concerned about the impact this block grant proposal would have on the School Lunch Program—a program that serves free and reduced priced lunches to over 104,000 children in my home State of Connecticut every day.

I met today with two special people who run a program in my district called Boys Village. This program provides community-based and day treatment services for at-risk children. Every day, Boys Village feeds breakfast and lunch to all the children enrolled in its program. To help do this, they receive \$30,000 a year from the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs.

The budget for this remarkably successful program is small. If funding for its nutrition programs was substantially reduced, or eliminated, which is possible under the Republicans' proposal, Boys Village would have to make some tough choices.

Those are not pleasant choices, Mr. Speaker. And they're choices that all School Meal Programs will be forced to make. They will have to either eliminate meals, increase prices, or reduce the quality and quantity of the well-balanced, nutritious meals that kids currently receive.

Newt Gingrich, who spoke so highly of the Boys Town of yesteryear, should wake up and see what the Boys Villages of tomorrow will be like if he has his way. They will not feature the smiling faces of the movie version. It will be more like the Dickens' version, with hungry children holding out their tin cups and begging for more.

Child Nutrition Programs in this country will be a pale imitation of what they are today. Enrollment will decrease, nutritional standards will diminish, and the health of our children will suffer.

It is a vision of hungry kids who are not healthy, alert, and ready to learn—all this so the Republicans can pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. This Republican scheme must be stopped. I urge my colleagues to keep up the fight.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Would you just comment on the fact that most of the time when we think about changing things, we want to correct them; do you see anything wrong with the school lunch and the WIC program? Is there fraud or something we know that is going on that it is not effective? Why are we changing the school lunch program? Is there some reason that would help us understand? Are we improving it? Why are we changing it?

Ms. DELAURO. My colleague has put her finger really on the crux of this issue. I say do not listen to all of us tonight, listen to us, but talk to the people in our districts who run these programs. These are successful programs. They work. They are living up to the objectives that they were created for, and it is foolish for us to unravel these very fine programs and create difficult problems for our youngsters and, quite frankly, for our economy in the future.

And once again, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

#### REPUBLICAN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM INCREASES FUNDING

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the school lunch program under the Republican majority proposal will actually increase the current \$4.5 billion budgeted to \$4.7 billion for fiscal year 1996.

The other side of the aisle would have you believe the school lunch program will be eliminated. This is pure fiction.

Republicans propose to actually increase by 4.5 percent more on school lunches in 1996 and 4 percent for each year thereafter for the next 5 years.

They key to delivering more to our local schools is accomplished by eliminating the Federal bureaucrats and their involvement, and directly sending aid to the States for our local students. Through this block grant, the weight of the unnecessary Federal paperwork will be eliminated.

Now, the Federal Government—

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I will when I complete my statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will not yield at this time.

Mr. POMEROY. The full 5-minute statement or the sentence?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Now, the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, wastes 15 percent of the school nutrition money—

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, point of clarification, I am not sure when the gentleman is going to yield to me for my question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls the time, and he has declined to yield.

Mr. POMEROY. Does the gentleman yield? He said he would yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls the time.

Mr. POMEROY. The gentleman did not yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it wastes 15 percent—

Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania controls the time.

Mr. POMEROY. Does the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has repeatedly stated that.

Mr. POMEROY. He said he would yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I did not say that. I said I would yield at the end of my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls the time and has refused to yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Federal Government wastes 15 percent of the school nutrition funds for administrative costs alone, and under the majority Republican proposal, more children will be fed, and only the bureaucrats of Washington, DC, will be the ones disappointed.

The successes of our school lunch program at Penn Dale Middle School in Lansdale, Montgomery County, was observed by me firsthand on Monday.

Motivated students are involved in planning menus, dedicated faculty are working closely with home economics classes, and most of all, Dorothy Irvin, as our food service coordinator, is doing an outstanding job working with principal Donald Venema to make the program work.

They have understood that what we have discussed here is more money for the school district, more money for the program.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, we believe the key to the school lunch program and the proposal we have before the Congress now will have more dollars spent on direct services for children and less on the administrative paperwork that helps no one, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is in the best interests of everyone.

#### CHILDHOOD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, Americans want streamlined and efficient government, but they also expect Congress to be fair and responsible.

They did not ask us to achieve these goals at all costs, especially if it means