

America than at any time in the past. However, even though there are more women and African-Americans in Congress than ever before, neither group is fully represented proportionately to their numbers in the general population. Blacks and women are still underrepresented even though we have begun to make progress. The voters of America should be outraged that a few people are trying to take away the representation blacks, Hispanics, women, and other minorities have been struggling for over 127 years to achieve.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

WHICH WAY AMERICA? ONE DOLLAR AND NINE CENTS A PERSON FOR PUBLIC TV OR ZERO DOLLARS AND A WASTELAND?

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, whenever a measure that affects a broad spectrum of America comes before the House, our offices are inundated with calls, letters, and telegrams. The proposed budget cuts to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting [CPB], National Public Radio [NPR], and the Public Broadcasting System [PBS] have sparked just such an outpouring. While we are all familiar with the various letter-writing campaigns that produce mail bags full of mass-produced—usually computerized here in Washington—letters and cards, this has not been my experience with those who write to tell of their support for funding public television and public radio. What I have received is letter after letter—personally conceived and written—each telling how the proposed budget cuts would affect them. As we all know, these are the ones that touch our heart and our conscience.

What these letters demonstrate is that public broadcasting opens the world to its listeners and viewers in a way that commercial radio and television have never been able to do. The letters show that funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is not an arts issue, nor one of entertainment or communications. It is far broader. The letters I have received tell me that funding for public television and radio is a seniors issue—an education issue—a children's issue—a community issue.

Most important, these letters are the voices of public broadcasting's viewers and listeners. They are the voices of America.

As for seniors, let's start with Mrs. Alta Valiton, 81 years of age, a resident of Long Beach, who observes that she:

Has been watching TV from its beginning. In some ways it has deteriorated, giving much time to sitcom after sitcom and shows appealing to the uneducated, but there is always public television to bring a breath of fresh air and mental exercise and aesthetic pleasure. What would our lives be without the Nature Series, the National Geographic features, and the great music—the Met, the concerts by the great trio of men singers, the Christmas Day program from the [Los Angeles] Music Center, and the scientific programs. Need I go on?

She closes.

Or Mr. Harold Weir, a 68-year-old from Downey, who wrote:

I am retired and living on a very limited income. I cannot afford cable TV. PBS is virtually the only TV channel I watch, other than for local news.

Mrs. Bernice Van Steenberg, another Long Beach senior, says:

PBS is my favorite station and I am not an elite, wealthy person. I'm a senior citizen on a limited income who doesn't have cable TV and who relies on the good programs PBS presents. I'd be lost without PBS.

These voices are also experienced parents who know the value that public broadcasting has brought to their children over the years. Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Collins of Long Beach recalled:

Because of "Sesame Street," the "Electric Company," "Mr. Rogers," and many other programs of the early to late 1970's, our son Philip—who is now 22—was able to read and count quite well before he began grade school. It was the only period since first having a television set in our home that we were able to watch daytime TV—we'd watch with Philip—without becoming bored, agitated, and having to turn the set off. I wonder how we would survive without public television.

And, an alumni viewer of such shows as "Sesame Street" and "Mr. Roger's Neighborhood"—Dr. Gregory K. Hong of Bellflower—noted:

*** those are the programs that I watched to learn English when our family immigrated to America twenty some years ago.

These voices are typical of the millions of people who enjoy and benefit from public broadcasting. With national public radio, for instance, almost 16 million people listen over the course of a week—that is 1 in every 10 adults in America. This audience has almost doubled in the last 10 years to include people from all walks of life. Many radio listeners work in a professional or managerial occupation; one out of every four works in a clerical, technical, or sales position.

Some say that shows elitism. What nonsense. More than half of public radio listeners are not college graduates, and 48 percent live in households with combined annual incomes below \$40,000 per year. My letters confirm this. Grandparent R.M. Dunbar of Long Beach wrote me to say that:

I'm not one of the elite that someone said all public television watchers are—I'm just a person who became full to the brim with soap operas and lousy sitcoms.

Long Beach residents Jim and Pat Bliss agree:

We have heard public broadcasting's fans described as an elite. Not so; if we were an

elite group, we would buy cassettes to entertain us en route to work, hire someone else to do those mindless chores, and pay the heavy subscription rates required for cable TV.

Public television viewers and public radio listeners are not just listening to entertainment; they are receiving programming that is enhancing the quality of their lives and that of their communities. Mrs. Shirley Freedland of Long Beach summed up this aspect rather dramatically: "Without PBS our brains will shrivel up and die." Across the country, public broadcasting is serving Americans. In Huntington Beach, CA, Channel 50, KOCE-TV offers teacher training workshops and television specials in both English and Spanish designed to promote parenting skills such as helping with homework and drug abuse prevention.

Mr. Speaker, a decade ago, I recall offering the first TV course of "Congress: We the People" over Channel 50. The public-spirited channel has a long record of bringing first rate educational programming to Southern Los Angeles and Orange Counties. The community colleges of Orange County have been pioneers in developing educational programming.

After the devastating Northridge earthquake last year, KCET-TV in Los Angeles—the region's premier public TV station—taped programs that reassured children and helped them to deal with the chaos around them. In Gainesville, FL, WUFT-FM radio provides a 24-hour reading service for the blind. In Evansville, IN, WNIN installed public access terminals in low-income housing areas so users could access local public libraries, and newspapers, and use Internet e-mail. Town halls and State legislature sessions are broadcast over public radio and television stations in Alaska, Illinois, and Florida. Prairie Public Radio in North Dakota is planning a native American language program to promote the continued use and study of native American languages. It is patterned after a similar public broadcasting program in Hawaii which has regularly scheduled Hawaiian language shows.

□ 2200

Karen Johnson, a disabled Long Beach resident, is at home all day. She subscribes to three southern California public radio stations: KLON-FM88, KUSC, and KCRW. She can hear "MacNeil-Lehrer" and a local show "Which Way L.A.?" which is carried by KCRW, a radio station based at Santa Monica College. Hosted by Warren Olney, this program has had a major impact as it daily brings together people across age, race, and ethnic lines to talk about the key problems facing America's second largest city and one of the major metropolitan regions in the world. Karen sums it up well: "Daytime broadcasting (commercial) is a wasteland. And commercial news' broadcasts lack any analytic depth."

In rural America, public broadcasting plays a special role in linking listeners to their communities and the world at large—particularly in areas where the local newspaper is published just once a week and where the economic base cannot support locally generated commercial broadcasting. Without National Public Radio, for instance, households in western North Dakota would be without radio news. Throughout Alaska's Prince William Sound, listeners—who frequently do not have telephone or television—would lose their messaging service, their only way to communicate to the outside world. At a reservation in rural Wisconsin, they would lose the service that records and broadcasts tribal meetings, the Head Start Program, and health and environment conferences. In the Chico area—80 miles north of Sacramento in northern California, there are no large cities—listeners would no longer be able to earn college credits by taking courses through the radio. Without public broadcasting in remote Pine Hill, NM, the area's farmers and ranchers would simply no longer have a radio station to connect them with the outside world. It would be very, very tough—if not impossible—for these communities to replace the services provided to them by public broadcasting.

The services provided by public broadcasting come cheap—a Federal investment of just \$1.09 in Federal funds per year for each American; let us repeat that, \$1.09 for each American. That's 80 cents for public television and 29 cents for public radio. And this money is a good investment. In public broadcasting, every dollar in Federal funding leverages \$5 in other funding.

Where do these Federal funds go? Twenty-five percent of the Federal funds received by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting are designated for public radio. Almost all of that money—93 percent—goes directly to local public radio stations. At these local stations, the Federal funds equal about 16 percent of the average public radio station's operating budget.

This 16 percent may seem to be a rather small amount over which to be fighting—but let me relate an interesting fact told to me by Judy Jankowski, general manager of KILON-FM 88—a public radio station that I brought to California State University, Long Beach, when I was president. According to Judy, this relatively modest amount of funding is what banks and other financial institutions use as a basis for loans to public stations. In other words, without Federal funding, public broadcasting stations would be severely hampered in their ability to borrow funds.

Some argue that public broadcasting provides a free, publicly subsidized platform for the promotion of Barney and "Sesame Street"-type products. As the parent of two former "Sesame Street" watchers, I can attest to the fond memories related to the char-

acters on that show. Friends with young children tell me that it is no different with Barney, the purple dinosaur. And the popularity of these two programs over the years has created a great market for products which are related to the shows.

When "Sesame Street" went on the air in 1969, the financial arrangements between the show's products—the non-profit Children's Television Workshop—and PBS were not commercial. They continue that way today. In 1973, the matter of income-sharing was discussed, and PBS agreed to allow the Children's Television Workshop to retain all of its income because the workshop agreed that all income from merchandising would be reinvested in "Sesame Street" and other of its productions and educational activities. This has allowed the workshop to produce four additional major children's series: "The Electric Company," "Square One TV," "3-2-1 Contact" and "Ghostwriter." Last year, the workshop received approximately \$27 million from its merchandising. From this amount, \$7 million paid the expenses associated with managing the workshop's merchandising business, \$13.5 million was reinvested into the production of "Sesame Street." And, the remainder went to other workshop educational activities.

In the 1980's, PBS and CPB had an income-sharing policy for all public television programs that brought them a share of revenues. However, until the "Barney and Friends" show, this was not a significant source of revenue for either PBS or CPB. With the advent of Barney's merchandising success, PBS and CPB took steps to obtain a share of the revenues. However, because the Barney show was developed and is produced by a for-profit organization—the Lyons Groups—the negotiations and agreements are much more complicated than those with the nonprofit Children's Television Workshop.

In 1991, the Public Broadcasting System made a commitment to increasing its children's programming. Because of the long development process involved in producing a children's TV series—between 12 and 36 months—PBS sought to acquire children's TV shows which were already being produced. At that time, Barney had appeared on Connecticut Public Television [CPTV] and briefly on Disney. So, in 1991, PBS, CPB, CPTV, and the Lyons Group entered into an agreement to bring the show to public broadcasting. Under the terms of the agreement, PBS and CPB each committed \$1,125,000. Connecticut Public Television agreed to commit almost \$700,000—mainly in-kind services entailed in establishing the liaison between Lyons and the public television stations airing Barney. Lyons and Connecticut Public Television had already worked out an income sharing arrangement which called for CPTV to receive 30 percent of the share of foreign broadcast and audio and video sales royalties. However, payments to CPTV

would not commence until after Lyons Group had recouped its initial \$2 million investment, as well as costs it incurred in making sales in the home video and foreign markets.

When PBS and CPB became involved, it was agreed that half of CPTV's income share would be split between PBS and CPB. Payments to PBS and CPB would not begin until after CPTV had recouped its initial \$700,000 investment. PBS tried to secure a share of the ancillary income with the Lyons Group, but Lyons refused, citing the \$2 million it had invested in producing "Barney and Friends."

CPTV continues to share in the Barney program sales and shares this money with PBS. To date, public television has received approximately \$600,000 from the Lyons Group. PBS, CPTV, and Lyons have reached an agreement on future book and audio-tape sales. PBS estimates that future revenues—based on the latest contract with Lyons—will be at least \$2.4 million next year.

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is very aware of the growing limitations on the availability of Federal funds. Its staff members are working hard to increase other sources of funding so that it can better support the stations for which it is responsible. But PBS is not a media investment company. Its mission is to maximize service to the public and to provide high-quality programs based on sound educational principles to benefit America's children. If the mission of public television were strictly to maximize commercial return, the program selection criteria would be quite different. Selection criteria would be based not on program nor educational value, but rather on retail market potential. Put simply, public broadcasting would cease to be the national treasure that it is today.

There have been many myths floating around about public broadcasting. Misstatements and incorrect perceptions have clouded up the real picture. I have already discussed the so-called elitist listener issue, as well as the program merchandising revenues situation. But there are others that need to be cleared up. Let me review some of them.

First myth: "Telecommunications companies could step into the funding role now played by the Federal government."

Reality: The Corporation for Public Broadcasting is not a network. There are no assets for a private company to acquire. Under statute, CPB is not allowed to own stations or sources of programming. It is a funding mechanism to shield the station from direct Government control. National Public Radio [NPR] and the Public Broadcasting Service [PBS], which do have assets, are private companies and are not for sale. The local stations are individually licensed by the FCC for non-commercial service. Noncommercial licenses are available only to not-for-

profit entities which provide non-commercial educational services, such as KLON-FM 88. Its entity that is a nonprofit one is the California State University Long Beach Foundation.

If the critics are referring to possible private donors, it is too bad that American commercial television and commercial radio have not stepped up to the plate and assured that public TV and public radio survive. The more public-spirited cableowners stepped up to the plate and funded C-SPAN—the Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network. If a Donald McGannon still headed Westinghouse—Group W—and Dr. Frank Stanton still headed the Columbia Broadcasting System, maybe that would happen. It should. But it hasn't.

Second myth: "PBS and NPR programs already feature advertising—known by the code word 'underwriting.'"

Reality: Sec 399(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934, which guides the policy in American television and radio, public and private, states that "No public broadcast station may make its facilities available to any person for the broadcasting of any advertisement." Public broadcasters are allowed, under the statute, to make statements on the air for corporate sponsors in exchange for remuneration, as long as the statement is in no way a promotion of the sponsors' products or services. The comment at the beginning or the end of a sponsored program—"Brought to you by the HPC Company"—is all the touting a corporate sponsor gets.

Third myth: "75 cents out of every dollar spent in public broadcasting goes to overhead."

Reality: This misstatement appears to come from a report called "Quality Time" which was issued by the Twentieth Century Fund task force on public television. The report stated, "Of the \$1.2 billion spent in the public television system in 1992, approximately 75 percent of the funds were used to cover the cost of station operations." The term "station operations" meant every activity a station undertakes besides national programming—such things as administration, community service programs, delivery of services, and the cost of producing or acquiring local programming, indeed, a lot of what a station does. Community service and local programming are a vital part of public broadcasting's role in the community—a responsibility many commercial stations ignore.

Fourth myth: "With so many television channels available—CNN, Discovery, the Learning Channel, the History Channel, Arts & Entertainment—there are plenty of substitutes for public broadcasting."

Cable channels are available without government subsidy because they have two revenue streams—advertising and subscription fees averaging \$40 per month. For the 40 percent of the American people who do not have cable programming, these programs are not via-

ble alternatives. Public broadcast services reach 99 percent of American households—for free.

In addition, there are no channels of this type for radio. There are virtually no other radio sources with the kind of in-depth news, public affairs, information, and cultural programming that public radio provides.

Fifth myth: "Direct Broadcast Satellite is now available everywhere in the 48 contiguous states with over 150 channels of digital video and audio programming."

Reality: This type of audio programming service is not yet widely available to the American public, nor will it be for several years—unless one has somewhere between \$600 and \$3000 for the equipment. It will be the late nineties before the hardware and infrastructure are in place to deliver the service. And, this will not be a free service.

Sixth myth: "If the 5.2 million PBS members were to contribute only \$55 more a year, it would equal the Federal share for CPB. It is clear that those donors are the very people who can afford to contribute an additional \$55 a year."

Reality: Not so. Not all public radio listeners can afford an additional \$55 per year. In fact, 41 percent of the 15 million people who listen to public radio earn less than \$30,000 annually, and 48 percent live in households with combined incomes of under \$40,000 per year.

Seventh myth: "Current public broadcasting formulas favor large urban, elite stations. They get most of the Federal funds."

Reality: Again, not so. In fiscal year 1994, more than \$5.7 million in additional support funding was given to unserved areas and underserved audiences. From 1991 to 1993, CPB expansion grants to markets with fewer than 25,000 people, to stations that provide the only full-power broadcast service to their communities, and to stations in unserved markets helped 3.5 million people receive public radio signals for the first time.

Eighth myth: "Public broadcasting is the mouthpiece of the liberal elite."

Reality: In response to Congressional concern in 1993, a joint, bipartisan project by two established research firms—Lauer, Lalley & Associates and Public Opinion Strategies—conducted a national survey to assess public perceptions of balance, objectivity, and bias in programming aired by public broadcasting. They found that roughly equal percentages agree that public television is too slanted toward liberal positions—28 percent—and too slanted toward conservative positions—28 percent.

The reality check to these myths shows us that America is getting quite a bargain for the modest support we in Congress give to public broadcasting. They do a lot with a little. We must do all we can to help further their efforts. While we all know that cuts must be made across the board in virtually all

federally funded activities, let us make sure that any cuts we make take into consideration the value of the activity to the American people.

So, when we vote on any cuts to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, let us keep in mind Americans such as Mrs. Ida May Bell of Long Beach who wrote, "I watch KCET-TV every day. I live on a small pension and can't afford cable, but with KCET available, I am able to enjoy excellent TV."

Let us recall the comments of educators such as Barbara Mowers of Long Beach who wrote about using public television as a classroom learning tool to expand the horizons of her students.

Or the remarks of Lakewood resident Donald Versaw who told me that he "doesn't think the country should make grants to individuals for inane 'art'—but, by and large, Public TV and Radio is something this country needs."

We must remember the words of CPB supporters such as Long Beach resident Glenn Skalland who wrote "Having recently suffered a back injury, I have viewed more TV than I'm proud to admit. I can attest to the desolation on commercial television. Sex and violence sell. Public TV needn't sell anything; consequently, their programming needn't appeal to our baser instincts. Shows are informative and, on the whole, family-oriented. Please don't throw the baby out with the bath water. Keep public television free and on the air."

And, the words of Allen Robinson of Long Beach will be hard to forget: "I've heard it charged that PBS is only watched by the cultural elite. Well, I don't have an elite bone in my whole body, but I do have half a brain which is twice as much that's required to watch the drivel served up by the commercial stations. This must be a nation of idiots judging from what 'sells.' Good taste, decency, and integrity can't compete with sensationalism, pornography, distortion, and push-your-button politically correct slices of touchy-feely liberal humbug or a race-baiting right-wing blowhard egomaniac. No wonder the kids are so screwed up. A democracy depends on a literate informed citizen. PBS is going its share."

Most of us in the House want to see a greater emphasis on personal responsibility. Some of the proposals we are considering in the Contract With America correctly focus on that. Welfare reform is an example. President and Congress claim to be of one mind on creating a framework of law which will encourage personal responsibility. In brief, most of us believe values are important. Most Americans who sent us here believe the same as we do.

Hamid R. Rahai, a resident of my district, put his finger on what all of us need to ask ourselves: He speaks "as a parent and an educator" and admits that he is "quite puzzled that at a time when Congress and its leadership

champion teaching of values and personal responsibilities, they plan to do away with educational tools needed to educate the public and specially young people." He sees public TV as "an excellent educational tool. It offers a fresh alternative to the mundane (at best), useless or sometimes outright destructive programming offered by commercial and cable networks that are being offered as an alternative. It is free and accessible to all, particularly to the underprivileged who need it most, and could not afford the cost of cable networks."

Mr. Rahai is absolutely correct.

We all know that for the last several decades most Americans receive their political information to decide presidential and statewide races from commercial television—the occasional debates, the ceaseless number of paid—by the candidates—misleading and shallow advertisements, the horse-race focus of the national commentaries. "Who's up?" and "Who's down?" The endless chatter leads many voters to ask: "Who cares?" Public radio and public television provide an island of sanity by sponsoring debates and in-depth interviews of candidates at all levels of our system.

As Pat and Jim Bliss of Long Beach wrote, "there is probably no dearer institution to the hearts of almost everyone who values education and the arts than public radio and television."

Mr. Speaker, we must, in some way, preserve this great national treasure. Margaret M. Langhans of Long Beach saw an analogy between our national parks and public television and radio: "To lessen access to public airwaves is akin to lessening access to our national parks. We hold both in trust for the benefit of the Republic."

I could not have said it better, Margaret.

□ 2215

THE SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise the Speaker that at some point in the discussion I will be yielding to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN], to enter into a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I had the opportunity to meet with young students at Kenilworth Middle School in Baton Rouge, LA. I had an opportunity to meet with them for breakfast and talk with them about the school lunch program and the breakfast program. At that breakfast meeting, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to see young students with real dreary eyes, and they were not Democrats, they were not Republicans. They were simply hungry. They wanted the opportunity to have breakfast and go

to class and start the class day. At lunch they had an opportunity, after staying in school for 4 hours, or so, to go to lunch.

But one student had asked a very significant question. He walked up to me after a briefing that we did at the school, and he asked the question, he said, "Congressman FIELDS, what is a rescission?" And I explained to him that a rescission was something that you rescind, something that you take away, something that you grant and then at a later time you take it away, and I guess I want to start tonight explaining what actually took place and what is taking place here in Congress and what took place in the subcommittee and the full committee as relates to the rescissions that are taking place in education.

Last year we had an opportunity to review the budget and review the priorities of this country, and we granted different budget items, and now we find ourselves in this Congress rescinding many of the dollars that we were able to allocate last year. Many local school boards, many local governments, and many people in many departments across the country find themselves in a very awkward position preparing for their fiscal year, relying on the confidence of Washington, the Congress, as a result of them approving a budget in 1994, and now we find ourselves here rescinding the very dollars that we committed to them.

Now, I rise tonight because I represent, Mr. Speaker, a very, very poor district. Last year I represented the poorest congressional district in the entire country, but because of redistricting, now I represent the second poorest congressional district in the country.

It really amazes me, because according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priority, 53 percent of all of the rescissions fall on the backs of poor people, low-income people in America, and I want to talk a little bit about how these rescissions will affect my own State, the State of Louisiana.

Nationally, \$5 billion will be cut from the school lunch program. How would that affect Louisiana? one hundred sixty four million dollars in the school lunch program, the nutrition program, will be taken away from the State of Louisiana.

Now, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that, "We did not cut funding for school lunch and school nutrition programs. We, in fact, increase funding." Increase is in the eye of the beholder.

Let us talk a little bit about the increase versus the decrease. I submit to you today, Mr. Speaker, there was an actual decrease, because last year we committed a 5.2-percent increase for 1995. This year we rescind that, and we only give a 4-percent increase. So according to my mathematical knowledge, that is a 1.2-percent decrease in the school lunch program. The difference in the annual increase will re-

sult in the loss of \$1.3 billion nationally and \$78 million to Louisiana. That is how much money the State of Louisiana will lose as a result of this rescission package.

Now, Louisiana has a very strong reputation in the area of school lunches. I am proud to stand on the floor of the House tonight and state that Louisiana is right at the very top as it relates to its nutrition program, and they should be commended for that.

Now, there is also the need to be some clarity as it relates to what type of lunch programs we are talking about, because many people when you say school lunch, many people think it is free lunch. There are actually three tiers of the school lunch, many people think it is free lunch. There are actually three tiers of the school nutrition program. First, there is the free-lunch students who can take advantage of the free-lunch programs. Students can take advantage of the reduced-price lunch program, or they can take advantage of just paying the regular cost.

And the way this program is set up under the current law, if a family income is 130 percent of the poverty level or less, they receive free lunch; 185 percent of the poverty level or less, they receive reduced lunches; and those families that are more than 185 percent of the poverty level, they receive a simple, regular lunch.

If you look at the statistics, you find most schools cannot even maintain their school lunch program based on the revenues from free lunch or reduced lunch and, therefore, those individuals who come to school every day and are able to have the wherewithal to pay the full price for lunch or breakfast actually help sustain the lunch program. Under this proposal, many of those individuals will be basically knocked away.

The other problem is 57 percent of all students actually participate in the school lunch program. In Louisiana 76 percent of the people, of the students, who attend public school, attend school in Louisiana, participate in the school lunch program. That is 622,000 students in Louisiana that take advantage of the school lunch program.

Why do we have such a disproportionate number in Louisiana versus the national average? The national average is 57 percent, Louisiana 76 percent. Well, because Louisiana is a poor State. That is one of the problems I have with this school lunch program, the revised version, the rescission package that passed the committee. What is going to happen is it is not going to award States that have a very, very high poverty rate. It only awards States based on their participation in the lunch program, based on the number of students who participate in the school lunch program.

In my State, I am going to be judged by other States that are very, very wealthy States. They do not have the