

growth is about 5.2 percent. There was a large concern and they wanted to put the nutrition programs in with the welfare block grant.

As the subcommittee chairman, I determined that if we did that, we would hurt those nutrition programs. So I separated the school breakfast and the school lunch program and guaranteed that 80 percent of it would be spent on the most needy children, those children, 185 percent and below poverty level. That protected those.

The States and the Governors also wanted a 20 percent remaining to be flexible, that they could either add, if that particular State needed it, to the school breakfast or school lunch program or other nutritional programs. For example, what may work for Tommy Thompson in Wisconsin may be a little bit different than Governor Wilson of California, but it gives them the flexibility. We increased the spending level by 4.9 percent.

I would like to submit this chart also for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. It shows incrementally, for example, in 1995, for the school breakfast program, it was \$4.59 billion. In 1996, it is \$4.7. In 1997, it is 4.9. In 1998, it is 5.1. And in 1999, it is 5.4. And in the year 2000, it is 5.6. As you can see, each year we have increased spending for the school breakfast and lunch program. Also for the Women, Infants and Children Program that we have increased funding and, again, if we would have block granted it with the welfare block grants, it would have been in competition and I protected it.

[Chart not reproducible in the RECORD.]

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I also mandated that 80 percent of the funds in that block grant must go to the WIC Program. And the 80 percent funding is more money than current law gives to the WIC Program. Why? Because the WIC Program in California and most States across the country is very effective and it is the Women, Infants and Children Program.

For example, currently it is 3.5. In 1996, under our block grant, it goes to 3.7, this is from 3.5. That is not a cut, my colleagues. In 1997, it is 3.8; in 1998, it is 4.0; 4.1 in 1999, and in the year 2000, 4.2, nearly 4.3. That is not a cut.

I would like to submit this for the RECORD also, Mr. Speaker.

What the other side would have you believe is that we are actually trying to kill and cut children's nutrition programs. It is not true. The Governors came to us and said there was 366 welfare programs, very noneffective, if you look. And the American people understand that those programs have failed. The monumental paperwork, the Government bureaucracy, the reporting documents. I listened to State Senator Hoffer from the State of Colorado and he said they literally in the State have two full computer system programs and computers dedicated to just the reporting data of the children's nutrition program. We have eliminated that. We

have made it easier for the States to work. And so that we do not build State bureaucracies, we have limited the administration of States to 2 percent. In the case of WIC because it is more demanding, 5 percent. And what we are doing is getting the dollars to the kids.

We are growing kids, not Federal bureaucracies. I think that is important also. I included the language to make sure that the nutrition standards were maintained. But yet, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], came and said, can we add language to ensure, even stronger language, that we maintain those nutritional levels? Both those amendments were accepted in the committee. They passed with bipartisan support.

But yet they still say we are killing the programs. Let me tell you what we are doing. We limit Federal bureaucracy, paperwork, increase local flexibility. We allow for the expansion of the children's nutrition programs. And that is a fact, Mr. Speaker. It is backed up with facts and figures.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the documents to which I referred.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 28, 1995]
DEMOCRATS "LIE" ABOUT LUNCH

(By Nancy E. Roman)

Democrats continued to spin the GOP's proposed "cuts" to the school-lunch program yesterday as "mean-spirited" and "cruel," herding a troop of preschoolers from Cheverly Early Childhood Center into the Capitol to make the point.

Rep. Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland Democrat, said if the Republican plan succeeds, it will "roll back years of progress."

Vermont Gov. Howard Dean, M.D., said it is "despicable" and accused Republicans of targeting nutrition programs for children because they cannot vote.

In fact, under the Republican proposal, the federal school lunch program will grow by 4.5 percent or \$203 million. In the current budget year, the federal government spends \$4.5 billion. Republicans would spend \$4.7 billion.

The "cuts" that have received so much press attention, refer to a reduction in the 5.2 percent average increase in the school-lunch program, as projected by the Congressional Budget Office. The GOP increase is 4.5 percent.

Rep. John Boehner, Ohio Republican and chairman of the Republican Conference, called talk of cuts in the school-lunch program "the biggest lie in Washington, D.C., this last week."

"What we're doing is guaranteeing that states will get more money," he said.

Republicans propose to spend 4.5 percent more on school lunches in 1996—an average of 4 percent more every year for the next five years. They hope that by eliminating federal paperwork, the states will be able to serve even more free and subsidized lunches.

"If they [the governors] can't take more money and do a better job, they should step down," said Rep. Bill Goodling, Pennsylvania Republican and chairman of the committee that crafted the bill.

The failure to get that message out fore-shadows the trouble Republicans face when they get to real cutting necessary to balance the budget.

"It points out the job we are going to have to do in going over the heads of special-interest groups who want to portray whatever we do as a cut," said Brian Cuthbertson, press secretary for Rep. John Kasich, chairman of the House Budget Committee.

He said he routinely explains to reporters that even after budget cuts, some programs will grow.

"I had to explain that to a local reporter from Columbus, Ohio, on Friday," he said. "I said, 'Would it surprise you to learn that it is not being cut? That we are going to spend more on school lunches?'"

The reporter said "Oh," Mr. Cuthbertson recalled.

"Let's focus on facts," Rep. Steven Gunderson, Wisconsin Republican and welfare-reform point man, said when House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee was marking up its welfare reform last week. The "toughest accusation" that can be made about the block-grant approach "is that it reduces growth."

Mr. Hoyer said because of an expected increase in children using the school lunch program, a 4 percent increase in overall spending amounts to a cut.

The Democrat barrage continued yesterday with Donna E. Shalala, secretary of health and human services, telling members of the American Public Welfare Association conference: "Cruel is the only way to describe provisions that would abolish nutrition programs for children, deny benefits to children of teen mothers, and reduce assistance to thousands of abused, neglected and abandoned children."

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, South Dakota Democrat, said he, too, is appalled.

"How ironic that in the name of reducing the debt on our children, we take their meals instead," he said.

Ed Gillespie, spokesman for House Majority Leader Dick Arney, said it has been difficult to counter the Democratic assault on the Republican bill as stealing food from the mouths of children.

"I don't know what else you can do when the Democrat Party has a concerted strategy to lie to the American people other than to tell the truth," he said.

□ 2015

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

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

IN MEMORY OF SHAWN LEINEN

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to advise the House of news that another police officer has fallen in the line of duty. The officer, Shawn Leinen, was 27 years old and married to Susan Leinen, who is 6 months pregnant with their first child. Shawn was an officer with the Denver Police Department, and on seven separate occasions, he was cited for professionalism as an officer. He loved his duties and understood the risks, but always kept