

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

we are talking about here tonight and that the gentlewoman has just finished speaking about.

The two nutrition programs that the gentlewoman has spoken of show savings by your own party's count and by the Congressional Budget Office of \$6.6 billion over the next 5 years. That is the school-based nutrition program and the family nutrition program. How can you be claiming savings on those programs if in fact there has not been something cut?

Mrs. MYRICK. We are talking about, what you are talking about, the only thing that has been cut is the increases that were requested that are not being increases in the same point.

Mr. OLVER. How can you get savings if you have not cut something?

Mr. HOKE. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MYRICK. Yes.

Mr. HOKE. You get savings when you are using a baseline that is phony to begin with and you define savings as being a cut from an inflated number in the first place.

The fact is that we are going from some \$6.7 billion a year up to come \$7.8 billion a year in the year 2000. That is clearly an increase in spending. Only in Washington.

BASELINE BUDGETING

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, let us talk a little bit about phony baselines, which is where the gentleman on the other side of the aisle left off before the time expired. That is a funny place here inside the Beltway in Washington, DC.

The Pentagon gets its own special baseline. That is, at the Pentagon things are very expensive, you know, over there at the Pentagon. So they get not only the inflation that seniors get on Social Security or the inflation that anybody else might think about, they get their own special inflation index. And at the Pentagon a cut is a decrease in the increase.

So say next year the Pentagon determines its own little special inflation index is 6 percent. If they only get a 5 percent increase in their \$271 billion budget, that is if they only get an increase around \$11 billion, if they only get \$10 billion, that is a decrease, and we would hear screams from that side of the aisle. We heard screams earlier.

We have appropriated more money for the Pentagon this year. God forbid we should ask them to produce something. It costs extra.

We had to come up with a supplemental bill to pay for the Pentagon to do something. They couldn't squeeze it out of their \$271 billion budget.

Now with the nutrition programs, of course, they apply a different ruler. That is, are there going to be more kids going to school next year? Yes; is

food going to be more expensive next year? Yes.

There might even be a little bit of an increase in the wages for the people who cook those meals in the schools. A lot of them are getting minimum wage, and if we increase the minimum wage they will get a little bit more. Now in their world those increases don't count. Only increases in inflation for the Pentagon count.

So here is the world we are looking at. We know there will be more kids in school. We know there will be more need for those kids.

I visited a school lunch last week and talked about it last Monday night on the floor. So I won't repeat the stories about how hungry those kids are on Mondays and Fridays and what the needy really is. But the point is, in their world we will only give them enough money to increase it just a little bit. And if there are more kids, the portions get smaller. Or if there are more kids, ketchup becomes a vegetable again, whatever. We are just—can't afford those things.

But we can afford an infinite amount of money for the Pentagon. That is what is wrong with this debate. Let's put our priorities in order here. This debate is about priorities.

What will make America stronger tomorrow? Is it hungry kids who can't learn because we cut back on the school lunch program, the school breakfast program? Or is it imaginary programs like star wars and the fat defense contractors taking people out to dinner every night on the Federal budget, which we all know goes on with these Pentagon lobbyists.

So I would like to put it in that perspective. And let's just remember, when it comes to the Pentagon, a decrease and an increase is a cut, but when it comes to school lunches, a decrease in a real need is not a cut.

That is what the Republicans are trying to feed us here. It is about as real as feeding people ketchup and calling it a vegetable.

They talk a lot about the bureaucrats. I checked that out. I was disturbed about that. I thought, well, maybe they are right.

We could eliminate some of these administrative cuts if we eliminated every administrator. That is from the woman who runs the program downtown here in Washington, DC., down to the person who takes the little lunch tickets, to the person who cooks in the school. That is if Congress could miraculously appropriate the money and deliver the food straight to the kids with no one in between. That would be one-eighth of the cuts the Republicans are making in the real needs of these programs.

So it is a lie. It is a lie to say we just want to eliminate the bureaucrats. No, you can't just eliminate the bureaucrats. Where are you going to get the other seven-eighths of your cut?

The gentleman, Mr. OLVER, made a great point. How is it they can talk about \$7 billion, "b", billion dollars, in

savings in school nutrition programs, WIC programs and other children's nutrition programs and then tell us there aren't any cuts.

I would like to make \$7 billion in savings over at the Pentagon, and I would be happy to tell the Pentagon that those things don't constitute cuts. But we would hear screams from that side of the aisle because it is a different standard. It is a different ruler when it comes to kids. They come after the Pentagon.

STATE FUNDING AND CHILD NUTRITION

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

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, you know, every once in a while you have to come back to real numbers that will buy real groceries. And I am starting to even get confused listening to the other side. So what I want to know, and I would like to ask this of your, Representative HOKE.

I know where we are now, and I can't go home and tell anybody that we have increased the school lunch program unless it is in hard dollars. I know we are at \$6.296 billion right now a year on school lunches. I want to know how much it will take to feed those kids in later dollars, how much we put in the budget, and I want to make sure we feed those kids as many lunches as we are feeding now. You show me that.

Mr. HOKE. Okay. This has got to be so incredibly confusing to the American public watching this and trying to discern what is really going on. I can't imagine what could be more confusing until finally you are going to have to decide somebody is telling the truth and somebody is lying. Let me review.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. I just want real numbers. I don't want anything spun. How much are we going to spend in this budget compared to the last budget?

Mr. HOKE. March 20, 1995, from the Congressional Research Service. Let me just read the preamble.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. That is the nonpartisan group?

Mr. HOKE. Yes, that is the nonpartisan group. It is anybody, any Member of Congress can ask them to do research. Let me read this. Then I will go directly to the numbers.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Thank you.

Mr. HOKE. All right. This is from Jean Yavis Jones. She is a specialist in Food and Agriculture Policy in the Food and Agriculture Section. The subject is Child Nutrition: State funding under current law and block grants proposed in H.R. 1214. That is what we are talking about, the nutrition block grants.

This memorandum responds to numerous congressional requests for information on the effect that recent