

the last one President Johnson submitted.

Mr. LAHOOD. Reclaiming my time, I am happy to say that we have all supported a balanced budget amendment. We could not get some of you to help us.

ON REPUBLICAN AND DEAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the former speakers keep talking about how they are not cutting money and then they start talking about how they are cutting the deficit. So which is it?

Mr. Speaker, the current welfare system has created a culture of dependency.

The system offers several incentives for welfare clients to shun independence and stay on the dole.

A single mother who goes to work could lose here child care, forcing her to leave her children home alone.

She could lose Medicaid benefits and go without health insurance.

And she could lose the food stamps that help her feed her children.

And for what?

To get a low-paying job that will leave her worse off financially, uninsured, and unable to supervise her children during the day.

You might ask, what could possibly be worse?

The answer is, H.R. 4 the Republican's Personal Responsibility Act.

The Republican bill would worsen poverty and hunger for innocent children by making deep cuts in benefits, especially during economic downturns.

It would do far too little to empower welfare recipients to rejoin the work force with education and training.

It would scale back the very child care funding that would liberate welfare recipients to go to work.

The plan is punitive, irresponsible, and cruel to children.

The Republican plan could render millions of Americans with nothing to lose.

No cash assistance, no housing, no day care, no medical care, and no jobs.

In New York City alone, experts are projecting that by the year 2000: 76,000 poor children will lose AFDC benefits, an allowance they need for food, shelter and clothing; 300,000 more children will require child care slots so their mothers can work. However, the Republican plan cuts child care spending by \$1.6 billion; 60,000 children would be dropped from the school lunch programs; 640,000 children would see their food stamps decrease by 30 percent.

Simply saying, "No more welfare, go get job" is not welfare reform.

The Republicans want people off of welfare. The Democrats want people to get a job.

The Deal substitute is not perfect.

But it is far better than the Republican plan.

Although it was defeated tonight parts of it should be a model when the Senate takes up the bill.

At least, the Deal substitute operates in the real world.

It recognizes that for welfare recipients to go to work, child care is essential.

So it invests in comprehensive child care.

It recognizes that for welfare recipients to go to work, they need skills and training.

So the plan invests in comprehensive training, education, and workfare programs.

The Deal plan's Work First Program supplies a vehicle of real assistance for recipients to move into the work force.

And once they do find a job, the Deal plan would extend their medical coverage for 1 to 2 years.

These are the tools of economic empowerment which are tragically absent from the Republican plan.

But make no mistake: this is a tough plan.

People must develop and carry out comprehensive plans to get back to work or they lose their benefits.

The Deal substitute requires teenage recipients to stay in school and make the grade or they lose their benefits.

It calls for punitive measures for deadbeat parents, like direct income withholding, revoking their drivers' license, or revoking their professional licenses, thus paralyzing their careers until they do right by their children.

And the Deal substitute targets a major source of welfare dependency—teen pregnancy—with major prevention.

The Republican plan contains no prevention plan except to cut off benefits, and hope less children are born.

It could be described as tough love.

The Republican bill just tells children, "tough luck."

The Democratic bill requires work and demands responsibility.

I would like to put this into the map illustrating the children cut off of school lunches.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following information for the RECORD.

CRS REPORT ON CHILD NUTRITION—TALKING POINTS

CRS released a report Tuesday comparing 1996 estimated state funding levels for the child nutrition programs under current law and under the Republican block grant. The numbers in the report are calculated differently for the school based block grant that we have seen before, showing a \$73 million increase in school lunch and breakfast funding under the block grant when compared to USDA's 1996 baseline. The Republicans are using these numbers to show that they do not cut school meals even when compared to the USDA baseline projection in 1996.

The report supports Democratic statements about total cuts:

Over \$800 million CUT in the total amount available for child nutrition programs in 1996

CRS supports CBO's estimate of a total child nutrition cut of \$7 billion over 5 years (this is not stated in this report but is the CRS stated position)

The report assumes a cut in school meal service to children:

Because the block grant provides so little (\$1.5 million per state, on average) over what schools will need to serve their students just lunch and breakfast, the CRS chart assumes that schools will not use these funds to operate summer food or after school food programs.

The report compares projected spending for lunch and breakfast under current law in 1996 to the Republican's entire school meal block grant. The block grant is supposed to be used for lunch, breakfast, summer food, and after school food. It compares apples to oranges.

The summer and after school/child care food programs serve some of our nation's poorest children. Summer food programs, in particular, have proven essential to the health and safety of children in high poverty areas—these children get what may be their only nutritious meal of the day and become involved in planned community group activities. Summer food keeps kids off the streets and in the school yards.

Furthermore, the report states the, "FY 1995 and FY 1996 estimates of spending under current law are likely to be understated. The amounts shown in the tables do not reflect the actual amounts of funding that States will receive either under current law or under the proposed block grants. They should be used only for the purpose of comparing the likely shifts in spending among the States under the proposed block grants."

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. MALONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I really had not intended to get involved in this until I had heard one of the most flagrant misstatements that might have ever been made on the House floor when my friend from Georgia said, you know, we want to put this money towards the deficit.

Less than an hour and a half ago, the Republican Members of this body had an opportunity to vote for cuts that would have put the money towards the deficit. Unanimously, they voted against it because they want to give that money to millionaires who got all the tax breaks during the 1980s so they can get more tax breaks now.

□ 2100

MEMBERS' DISCUSSION RELATIVE TO RECOGNITION IN SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. EWING, is recognized.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be substituted for that of Mr. EWING.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would object.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Would that be the gentleman to whom I yielded half my time last night objecting?

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thought we were under a five-minute rule. I would be glad to yield time when I come, but, Mr. Speaker, if we

are going to have that as a procedure, then we will probably have about 20 Democrats over here.

Mr. GREENWOOD. It was a procedure that your side began earlier in the evening.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. We have someone who has already spoken, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GREENWOOD. No, I have not spoken.

Mr. LAHOOD. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. State your inquiry.

Mr. LAHOOD. Previously when a Member from the other side asked to have their name substituted earlier this evening, it was allowed. But if you do not want to play by those rules, that is fine, Mr. GREEN, but that is what we were doing earlier on.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that Mr. GREENWOOD had spoken earlier under the 5-minute rule. If he has not, and I will take your word for it because I know you spoke, but maybe it was yielded because we have been yielding time to many different people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not spoken on his own time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Actually, my intention is to yield some time to your side because I think the Nation deserves a little debate.

Mr. BROWN, if you would like to step up, I would like to yield some time to you so we could have a colloquy here because I was mystified by your comments.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] took the microphone earlier this evening and talked about the State of Ohio losing X number of dollars under the Republicans' proposal for the school lunch program. And we checked, and in fact under what we are proposing to do, compared to what would have happened had we done nothing, the State of Ohio gains \$11.5 million.

Then I think your colleague from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] queried you and said, gee, why are we not on the same page here?

The Congressional Research Service tells us that the plan the Republicans have proposed, a 4.5 percent increase gives Ohio \$11.5 million. Your response was, well, just ask PTA leaders or the teachers. We are supposed to be here providing the Nation with some information.

Now, let us get it straight. Here are the facts:

When the Democrats, and I went through this last night, when the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate and the White House just last year, you made available for the school lunch program an increase of 3.1 percent. The President of the United

States in his budget proposal for this year said, let us take it up to 3.6 percent increase this year. So we say how about 4.5 percent? And how about 4.5 percent for the next 5 years?

Now, I would like to know what the assumptions are that you use to put your little stickers up on the map. What is the assumption that you use as to why there is a cut in the program when we are increasing it 4.5 percent for the next five years, which is far more than the President has proposed in his budget? How does that become a cut?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The fact is you talked, the Republicans over and over and over again take credit for \$7 billion in savings.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Wait, I reclaim my time. I will yield you time if you will and if you can respond to the question. And the question is this:

The Congressional Research Service says, quite logically, if we increase funding for the school lunch program by 4.5 percent compared to what your President asked for, our President asked for, 3.6 percent, Ohio receives an \$11 million windfall. Now, you have said Ohio is going to get cut. If you can and if you will respond to that question, I will yield you time. Comments I have no time for.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There is an overall cut in nutrition funding. That money can be in at least one of these nutrition programs, children nutrition programs.

Mr. GREENWOOD. We are talking about the school lunch program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The fact is that with inflation, with more children in the program, with bad years that can happen when parents are laid off in a school district, that there will not be enough money for school lunches.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reclaiming my time. Reclaiming my time.

That is what I thought. That is what I thought. The fact of the matter is that the Office of Budget and Management in the White House looked at inflation in the food market, looked at the trends in the growth of the school population for the whole country, and said if you want this program to continue to meet all of the eligibility requirements, if you want to produce the benefit, if you want to anticipate growth in the program, if you want to anticipate inflation in the food market, in the food basket, you are going to need 3.6 percent in the coming fiscal year. We said we want to do better than that. We went to 4.5 percent.

Now your hypotheticals are, well, what if there is a recession? What if children appear from another planet unpredicted by the White House? Now, come on, let us get serious.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman would yield, the President has a 6.5 percent increase built into his budget. There is no—

Mr. GREENWOOD. In the school lunch program?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. Overall in the child nutrition program.

Children, it is not necessarily a national recession or children falling from another planet. It is a plant closing in a community when a lot of parents all of a sudden are out of work and there is no help for those families, they turn to the school lunch program.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reclaiming my time.

So, in other words, the cuts on your map, despite the fact that we are increasing funding for every State, the cuts that you are illustrating on your map are anticipating hypothetical plant closings?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Hypothetical recessions, hypothetical depressions?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman let me finish a sentence?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Sure.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The fact is you claim \$7 billion in savings so you can fund tax cuts for millionaires, not deficit reduction.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Reclaiming my time. That is a diversion. I am reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that every time we try to pin you down about what these funny numbers are about compared to the realities, compared to the truth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Where in the legislation does it say 4.5 percent? If the gentleman would yield? It does not. It is a number that you have manufactured to try to hide the cut in school lunches and cut in child nutrition.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, let me try to respond a bit to the colloquy that has occurred in the last few minutes and say that it does not make any difference what CRS says or what we say. Ultimately, it is what the principals in our schools say about their School Lunch Programs that matters. And what they will tell you is that each time they get more children.

The point I wish to make is, ultimately, what matters is what the principal says about how much money she will have to feed those kids through a School Lunch Program, given the growing number of children and the growing cost of feeding those children. That is what counts most.

What is worse about this bill, H.R. 4, that you have in the Contract on America is that when you say you are going to increase funding 4.5%, that is just talk. Because, quite honestly, what you have done in H.R. 4 in the Contract on America is you have changed the game. No longer do you guarantee a child that lunch.

Because, see, you may want to give 4.5 percent increases. I may want to