

the number of cars going to and from work. This will cost up to \$210 million per year to enforce this unfunded mandate and that applies not only to the private business business but to the public sector.

This law is so ridiculous that it says to a high school that has more than 100 teachers and administrators, that those teachers have to car pool. But the students do not have to car pool, so we would have the incredible result of teachers walking to work, having to hitchhike there to be picked up by their students. And students would rather go to school without their teachers so that they will not have to be taught the subject for the first hour. It is crazy. It is insane. But that is how ridiculous this mandate is.

Data from Southern California indicates that forced car pooling costs companies over \$100 per employee and \$3,000 per vehicle taken off the road. And the EPA itself has estimated the tremendous cost into the billions of dollars annually to address a solution which itself calls minuscule.

□ 1900

I have introduced H.R. 325 to return the true meaning to the word "option." It makes the employer trip reduction mandate optional to the affected states. H.R. 325 is dedicated solely to correcting this single provision in the Clean Air Act. Nothing else. It does not decrease the quality of the air. This bill simply makes car pooling an option to reach the goal of clean air. This is not an environmental or anti-environmental bill. It simply makes car pooling voluntary in the menu of options available to achieve clean air standards.

This is why this bill has such wide support. It is bipartisan, has more than 152 cosponsors, and I would encourage my colleagues to become cosponsors with us.

#### SCHOOL NUTRITION AND FAMILY PROGRAMS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side insist upon trying to tell the country that a cut is not a cut. But the problem with their calculations are as we talk to more and more local school districts, they clearly realize that these are cuts. The School districts and school nutrition programs will have less money over the next 5 years to feed children than they have under the current services budget by CBO that will allow them to continue to serve the number of children that they are serving now.

Monroe County schools up near Rochester, NY, they are talking about serving 7,800 fewer children than they would otherwise be able to serve in the coming year. The point is this, that when you look at the cuts in school

lunch programs, you see that the Republican proposal is off by some \$2.3 billion. They can say this is not a cut, but the fact is it is a cut, because those children who would otherwise be served in this program over the next 5 years, many of them simply are not going to be able to be served.

If they choose to serve every child, they have to decide to cut back on the meal and nutrition component of that meal, and as we know from many of these children, this is where they get a good portion of their nutrition in the entire day. They can decide to raise the price to those who are now paying a reduced price meal. The fact is when we have seen that, a good portion of the reduced price young people are forced to drop out of the program because they simply do not have in their family income sufficient money to increase that price. They can choose to throw all of the paying children out of the program who pay full price for the meal, but as we know, when you do that, you start to lose the economics of the program and programs close down as a result of that.

So what we have here is a mismatch of about \$7 billion in nutrition programs over what we should be spending to serve this population as opposed to what the Republicans are offering in the welfare reform bill under the child nutrition components. They say that they are offering \$4.5 billion every year, and that is supposed to make everybody here believe that that in fact takes care of the problem. But the problem is that the 4.5 percent they are offering every year is not based upon the total cost of what it costs to deliver school lunches and pay for them under the current program, because it does not include the cost of the commodities, so that is excluded from the 4.5 percent. The cost of education is excluded from the 4.5 percent, and in fact they omit almost 20 percent of the funds currently used to provide nutrition programs for our young people, and that is why the 4.5 percent then, even though they add it every year, falls further and further behind, until by the 5th year, we see there is a gap in the nutrition component of my Republican colleagues of a little over \$7 billion. That is roughly in the school lunch component because of 2 million children over the next 5 years that otherwise would be served under the current services budget as opposed to those who will not be served.

Now, the Republicans also want to convince everybody in America that they are not cutting meals, they are only cutting the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy at the Federal level for all nutrition programs is \$140 million a year. \$140 million a year. If you do it over the 5 years, it is roughly \$700 million. They are cutting \$7 billion out of the program. So obviously it is not just the bureaucracy.

The cuts go far beyond the bureaucracy at the Federal level. Where do the cuts go? They go right to the school lunches, to the participation in the

WIC program, to the school breakfast programs, to the nutrition education programs that are sponsored by this program.

What does that mean? That means a good many of our poor and our near-poor, the working poor in this country who rely on this program for nutrition, simply will no longer be able to do so to the same extent that they are today.

They are not talking about waste, fraud, and abuse. We had those problems many years ago when the private sector thought it was open season on the school lunch program and they could deliver substandard meals and poorly packaged meals and stale meals and charge us. We are not talking about that in the WIC program, when we had the problems of being ripped off by some of the largest food companies in this country that thought they could sell us substandard formula or sell it to us at rates that far exceed the going rate.

Unfortunately, in the Republicans' proposal, they no longer include the competitive bid process, which would save us a billion dollars, and we were using that money to plow back into providing the services for pregnant women and newborn infants. So the bottom line is that a cut is a cut. There is a \$7 billion gap between this and whatever.

I ask my colleagues, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM is on the Armed Services Committee, if someone said they were only reducing the growth of the defense budget, I suspect they would call it a cut. That is what they have been calling it over the last several years whenever it is suggested is that a cut take place or a reduction in the growth. But if you are a hungry child, the \$7 billion gap that you create means that lunches will not be delivered, and that is the simple fact. The numbers cannot be denied. I assume that is why they are so frantically trying to convince people all is well in the school lunch program. It is not, and it is not well for the children.

#### FAMILY AND SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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, my Republican colleagues and I are here tonight to set the record straight about family and school nutrition programs. We care about women, infants and children, and are committed to compassionate solutions to assist our children.

I believe that the whole debate on this issue was best summarized in an editorial which appeared recently in the Cincinnati Enquirer. The author poses the following question to us: If you had a dollar to spend on lunch, would you rather, A, give it to Uncle

Sam, who will order your lunch for a cut of the money, or, B, choose your own lunch, or, C, skip lunch and stay hungry?

We have a program that chooses A, give your money to Uncle Sam, who will order your lunch for a cut of the money. President Clinton and his Congressional allies would have you believe that any change in the current system would mean choice C, that kids would go hungry.

Nothing could be further from the truth. My colleagues and I believe we should choose B, to give block grants to the States and allow decisions to be made closer to our children, which empowers families and our local communities.

We are growing kids, not the Government. Our plan will increase funding for Women, Infants and Children programs and school nutrition programs by 4.5% each year. As you see from this chart in each year from 1995 to the year 2000, the red chart shows a yearly increase of the food programs for school nutrition of 4.5 percent and an even larger increase for WIC programs.

The GOP growth in school meals is very clear, the huge increase. You see the increases, 3.6 percent, 4.5 percent, and 4.5 percent. The same is true with WIC programs. I wish to point that out. The GOP also grows the WIC programs. In this case we see that a line goes up, the CBO baseline WIC funding and the GOP WIC funding, which is even higher.

By eliminating the Federal middleman and the 15-percent administrative costs that were used to run the current program, our plan will make more resources available to feed more children.

Our proposal creates two separate block grants—one to address family nutrition needs and one to address school nutrition needs, which preserves the family and rewards work.

The family nutrition block grant will allow States to promote the good nutrition, health and development of women, infants and children and to provide healthy meals in child care, head start, summer camp, and homeless shelters.

Under the block grant, funding for family programs, including vital programs to help women, infants, and children, will be \$588 million greater over the next 5 years than in the current programs. With increased funding and less bureaucracy and paperwork, States can assist more of our children.

The school nutrition block grant allows our schools to provide breakfast, lunch, before and after school meals and low-cost milk to our children. We know that hungry children cannot learn—that is why we propose to increase funding for school meals 4.5 percent each year for 5 years. We are sensitive to the needs of our children. We are committed to providing healthy meals and thus creating a proper learning environment.

Furthermore, the school nutrition block grant will enable more meals to be served to more children.

We are proud to be part of a caring solution that helps our children grown, not our Government bureaucracy.

#### SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton visited Patrick Henry Elementary School in Alexandria, VA, to have a bite to eat. He dined on federally subsidized beef tacos and coleslaw and corn and fruit. The point of his visit was to try to convince the American people that the Personal Responsibility Act would slash the money that funds the current school lunch programs. Frankly, that is a lot of suckatash.

The President and those who oppose welfare reform are not telling the truth to the American people. The Personal Responsibility Act would direct that money to go where it is most needed, away from the Washington bureaucrats and toward low income children. The idea is to help those who have the greatest need.

I apologize for injecting real facts into this otherwise lively debate, but let us look at the numbers. In 1994, the Federal appropriation for the school lunch program was \$4.3 billion. The Personal Responsibility Act would allocate block grants to the States of \$6.7 billion next year, rising to \$7.8 billion in the year 2000.

So funding for school lunch programs will increase by 4.5 percent each year over the next 5 years. Let me repeat that again. School lunch programs will increase by 4.5 percent each year. Now, people can argue about whether that is good or bad public policy, but, please, do not mislead the public by calling it a cut.

There has never been a time during this debate when those of us who favor welfare reform have voted for decreasing spending for school lunch programs. Our intent is to better serve children, not the Washington bureaucrats.

How does this bill work? We will transfer power away from the Federal food bureaucrats in Washington and give more authority to the States where it belongs. At the same time, we will focus the program more efficiently to ensure that at least 80 percent of the money goes to children from low income families.

States will have the flexibility to use the grant funds to support what they find to be the best programs for their individual school districts. They can decide how to meet the needs of children and families in their areas. This plan makes school nutrition programs easier to operate and more cost-effective by reducing paperwork. It caps administrative costs at 2 percent, and it helps ensure that meals are appealing

to children by allowing greater choice at the regional and local level. We are not cutting funds for our children; we are eliminating the Federal bureaucrat as the middleman.

Federally funded beef tacos may be what we have become accustomed to, but the diet we have become accustomed to here in Washington is not necessarily healthy for the American people. The States should have the opportunity to see if they can feed more children more efficiently with more money. That is what we propose to do.

Frankly, as a parent myself, it makes a lot more sense to me for someone to be able to talk directly with his or her local school board about school lunches than it does to have to speak to the Agriculture Department or Committee on Agriculture here in Washington. It is not as though Federal overmanagement makes beef tacos, coleslaw, corn and fruit taste better.

I hope that those who are so wedded to the present system finally will begin to tell the truth to the American people. The debate becomes clearer when it is understood all the distortions and false accusations are coming from people who understand that we are not proposing state school lunch cuts, but they want to avoid the real cuts other unrelated programs later on.

But opponents want to preserve the country's huge welfare state, so they launch this fear attack now as a preemptive strike. Well, my view is while we need nutritious lunches in our schools, we need a whole lot less baloney here in Washington.

□ 1915

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

[Mr. KILDEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### REFORMING THE WELFARE SYSTEM AND FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite Presidents was Ronald Reagan, and two of my favorite expressions that he used, and some Members will remember in some of the debates, he would use the phrase, "Well, there you go again."

He used that expression when people would attempt to distort the facts. We have heard it again tonight. "Well, there you go again."

One of my other favorite expressions from President Reagan was one that I use often around my office, and, that is, "Facts are stubborn things." I almost wish we could bring those charts