

up a large bulk of the school lunch program menu, but because there is no increase in the food assistance, they would have to take that from the breakfast program or one of these other. No matter how you move around the plates, of course, what you see is that the Republican proposal for child nutrition in our school lunch programs simply does not cover the needs of the children currently enrolled.

And we are now estimating that almost 2 million children that otherwise would be served will not be served because one of them, it is just sort of like musical chairs. One of them is going to show up for one of these programs. There is not going to be funding for that program. They are going to go unserved. That estimate is now 2 million children in the next 5 years.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman will yield, what do you make of the Republican claim? They keep saying, "Wait a minute, we are giving a 4½-percent increase every year for school lunch; how can you complain? Four-and-a-half percent ought to be plenty."

Mr. MILLER of California. That is really similar if I were to cut your wages by \$20,000 and then say I am going to give you a 4½-percent increase over the next 5 years. You start out in the hole, and you never get well, and because they do not provide a 4½-percent increase on inflation, on the price of commodities, the price of food, the increase in enrollment, the 4½ percent turns out to be fraudulent. Under the Republican program, you can do this. You have no lunches, no food assistance, no afterschool program, and no breakfast. What a shame, shameful thing for America's children who were expecting a block grant to take care of their needs.

The plates will be available after the show.

SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, tonight we are going to talk a little bit more about the school nutrition programs, because this seems to be the Democrats' favorite topic of the topics de jour.

Somewhat, somewhere along the line the Democrats have decided or believe that somehow they can make, by telling the same lie over and over and over, that they can somehow get a wedge with the American people. And the fact is that in some ways the opposition does understand politics perhaps better than the Republicans do. They understand that politics is about power, and when it is about power, you stop at nothing to try to regain it.

Republicans are still under the impression that politics is about ideas and ideals. But this is about the politics of deceit and the politics of the big lie.

I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH]. Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, I have been standing here for 2 days listening, in fact, nearly 2 weeks, to untruths.

My mom used to say, you know, it would be awful nice if people would just turn purple when they started stretching the truth, shifting words around and using wiggle words. There would be an awful lot of purple people here tonight if that were the case.

I think what we need to do is just make sure the American people understand that a 4½-percent-a-year increase is not a cut. Now, if you are used to being in Congress where you guys all have been spending more than we out there have been earning, you think a 4½-percent increase is a cut. The American people, I do not think, will agree with that.

So let us take a look at the actual members of how much the food programs are going to go up.

Mr. HOKE. Only a liberal could call a \$200 million increase a cut. Only people that think the way the people think inside of Washington could call that a cut.

I would like to draw attention just for a moment to the CRS study that was published just today. We got a copy of it just today [CRS] Congressional Research Service, completely independent, nonpartisan.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Not a Republican group.

Mr. HOKE. Not a Republican group, not a Democrat group. It is a completely nonpartisan group.

Here is what they say about what is going to happen in Ohio, a State close to my heart. What we are going to find in Ohio with respect to the school-based block grants, school-based nutrition programs, is that in 1995, fiscal 1995, under current law, \$190 million is being spent. Under the school-based block grant program, our Republican program, that will go up to \$202 million, an increase of \$11 million.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is in one State.

Mr. HOKE. That is in one State, just the State of Ohio, an \$11 million increase. Now, for those who like baseline budgeting, which is to say we will take into account demographics, that is, changing populations, plus an inflation number, not the way that America thinks. I mean, this is the way that you get the phony numbers. But the fact is even using those numbers, the 1996 fiscal year current baseline would be \$199 million, a \$2 million increase over that.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is a real increase in food.

Mr. HOKE. A real increase. This is food, and not only that, is there not a difference in the way that these programs get administered?

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You know, what is amazing about it is the closer you get it to home, from what I can see, the less waste there is. We do

not seem to hear much about that. The closer the States have control, the less we are going to take the money here. I think the thing that surprised me the most when I flew into D.C., and I am from the west coast, did not even have a very long campaign, all of a sudden I was here as a write-in candidate. I fly in, and I see all of these buildings. I get here and find out they are all filled with bureaucrats. Those bureaucrats are deciding one layer of how money is spent, then the States decide, and then the locals, to where by the time the money gets down to food, it has a lot of red tape and rules around it.

What I like about the school lunch program is we unwrap it from a lot of that red tape and make sure the food gets to kids.

Mr. HOKE. And kids who really need it, the kids who need it most. We give them the opportunity; we make it possible for that money to get to those that need it the most. How? By making sure it goes to parents, administrators, and teachers and people right there in the neighborhoods locally making those decisions as opposed to Washington bureaucrats making those decisions.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. You know, those other bureaucrats are going to whine, and that is the State superintendents of public instruction. They are going to whine, too, because we tell them you cannot spend any more than 2 percent on administration.

FACTS CONCERNING CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the people who are following these proceedings are really at a loss to figure out which side of this aisle is telling the truth. I am not sure my 5 minutes here will convince anyone one way or the other.

I would like to lay out a few of the facts which my friends on the Republican side just do not want to point to. The fact is if you took the time to go speak to a local school principal in your hometown or perhaps one of the people who runs the local school lunch program, they would tell you, as we have all heard on the Democratic side of the aisle, that the Republican idea is a very, very bad idea.

You would think, if the Republican position was so good and was going to give this authority to the local school districts and to the States, these people would be jumping up and down, and they are not. And do you know why? Because fundamentally what the Republicans are offering them is not enough money to do the job.

The Republican plan, yes, does provide additional funds in years to come. Let us concede that point. They just do not provide enough money, because we

know as sure as God made green apples that each year the cost of food is going to go up a little bit in each of our school lunch programs. We know there will be more kids enrolled in school, and we know, God forbid, if we have a recession, there will be more families that will be eligible for school lunch.

The Republicans do not build any of those possibilities into their block grant scheme. They assume none of that is ever going to occur. They think the cost of food, the increased number of kids, and the possibility of recession, the most that could ever increase the program in any given year is 4½ percent. That is it.

Then they say to the school districts, "Listen, If that is not enough, you find a way to economize. You find a way to cut costs."

Do you know what principals tell me at these schools they are going to have to do? They are either going to have to cut the money that they put into classrooms, teachers, computers and microscopes and the like or basically are going to have cut kids off the school lunch program.

That really gets to the bottom line here. Is it not curious when the Republicans finally got in the majority, the first place they turned to start cutting was not waste, fraud, and abuse? They were, in fact, on the floor of the House just a couple of weeks ago asking us for \$40 billion more for Star Wars, \$40 billion for that loony idea under President Reagan that might have made some sense when the Soviet Union was a powerful missile threat to the United States, but does not make sense anymore. They wanted \$40 billion more for Star Wars. They lost it, thank goodness. Then they turned around and said, "We will tell you how we will save some money. We will cut school lunches." School lunches? Do you remember reading, I sure do not, about scandals and waste and abuse in school lunches? You do not hear about it. The reason you do not is it is being run by your local school districts, your local principals, the folks who work for them in the cafeteria. It is a good program. It is a program that most of us saw when we were growing up as a way to have a good meal each day when we went to school, and unfortunately for a lot of kids today, it is the best meal of the day. We even offer a little breakfast to the school lunch program, and the Republicans are willing to cut that, too. They think it is unnecessary. Maybe it is a frill they can do away with.

You ought to see some of the kids I have seen. You ought to talk to some of the teachers about kids who get to school who do not get enough to eat and what their school day starts out like. It is not very pretty.

My friends on the Republican side turn first to school lunch programs, which I think frankly has been a big embarrassment to them to try to explain across America. They ask the bottom line, surely, there must be

something critically important they would cut America's school lunches for, it really must be the highest possible priority.

Well, what is it the Republicans want to cut school lunches for? Why do they want to cut the food available to kids in schools? So they can pay for a tax cut, a tax cut for these same families? Well, a little bit of it, sure. But the most of the money that goes in that tax cut goes to the wealthiest people in this country. The privileged few will get the break from the Republican tax cuts. It is the kids of working families, it is the kids of middle-class families that will find their school lunches being cut.

I went into Quincy, IL, and sat down with a group of mothers and their kids and talked about the Republican plan. Mothers came forward to me and said, "Congressman, let me tell you my story. I am not on welfare." This mother said, "I am working for a living." One of them said, "I am working two jobs." Another works 45 hours a week at fast food. They had their kids in day care. They are doing their darndest to stay off welfare. We gave them a little helping hand. You know what it is? We help pay for the meal at the day care home which the Republicans would cut.

Now, is that the way to end welfare in America, to heap more expenses on working families who are struggling every single day to make ends meet? I do not think so.

Let me offer a helping hand, whether it is the WIC program for the new mother, whether it is the day care center lunch or the school lunch, and make sure those struggling families, those working families trying to make ends meet get a helping hand to stay off of welfare and move in the right direction, the right family values, the right kind of personal responsibility.

We have to resist the Republican plan. It does nothing but cut the most vulnerable people in America. You cannot have a strong America without strong kids and strong families.

MORE FACTS ON CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, if you watched TV lately, read a magazine or a newspaper, surely you have seen photographs of Democrats surrounding themselves with children and claiming that Republicans are out to cut school lunches and be cruel and mean to little kids.

Mr. Speaker, the policy of this historic Chamber should be set based on the fact they are not on photo ops that make one party look like they love children more than the other. The American people are smarter than that, and I know they can see through it.

Between 1962 and 1992 welfare spending increased by over 900 percent, while the poverty rate only dropped less than 5 percent, and illegitimacy has increased over 400 percent.

I ask you, is that progress? My mom always told me you do not get something for nothing. But in this case, after spending \$5 trillion, we have got just that. Nothing.

I do not understand, why are the Democrats defending a system that has literally enslaved its recipients into a cycle of dependency? If Democrats feel so strongly about welfare reform, why did they not do something about it during the 40 years they controlled this House?

The Republicans are talking heat right now, but it is because we are picking up the mess left behind by the failed welfare state. But that is OK. It takes leadership to make hard choices.

The current welfare system should be arrested for entrapment, because it traps its recipients in a web of dependency.

Listen to the following facts: There are 5 million families with 9.6 million children on AFDC right now, and more than one-half of those families remain on AFDC for more than 10 years. Of the 5 million families receiving that help, only 20,000 people work, and children born out of wedlock have three times greater chance of being on welfare when they grow up.

You know, we are hearing a lot of talk right now about Head Start and WIC also. Well, not one penny is being withheld from Head Start, and as for WIC, this rescissions bill merely recouped \$25 million out of the \$125 million the programs was unable to spend in the previous fiscal year.

Our bill does not take a single person off the WIC rolls and leaves in place the \$260 million increase for the program in fiscal 1995.

□ 2100

And the School Nutrition Block Grant Program actually grows at a 4.5 percent rate. Over 5 years that is \$1 billion more than is currently being spent.

As a former mayor, I spent a lot of time with programs to help people get out of the dependency cycle and learn to help themselves. My experience has taught me that people want their self-respect and their dignity restored, and the current system does not do that. In fact, it works against that goal. I trust the American people can see through the smoke screens and deception that we have heard here tonight from the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I am finished.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the gentlewoman from North Carolina yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, thank, you very much.

I recognize that the gentlewoman and I both serve on the Budget Committee, and the Budget Committee has had to deal with scoring the items that