here, 10 million there. How many millions before an independent counsel is named to investigate the Speaker's shady deals.

INCREASES, NOT CUTS, CLAIMED FOR THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we have been falsely accused by our opponents and by the media of cutting nutrition programs through the Contract With America. The GOP has developed a plan, and it is a good plan. I have a graphic representation of that here. It talks about proposed spending.

In fiscal year 1995 for the school lunch program we are increasing spending from $4.5 to $4.7 billion. That is a $200 million increase in spending on nutrition programs. Yet we have been accused of trying to starve children.

Under the Women and Children's Nutrition Program we are increasing from $3.47 to $3.68 billion. This is a $200 million increase.

I just want to tell the people in America that the Contract With America is not a contract on America. We have a plan to feed those who are truly in need. We have a plan to cover those who have problems in our society. I think it is a good plan. I intend to support it, and I encourage others to support it.

CHINA POLICY RAISES QUESTIONS ABOUT INTELLIGENT LIFE IN WASHINGTON

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that China is ripping America off. They now enjoy a $38 billion trade surplus, laughing all the way to a Chinese bank.

To me that is unbelievable, but what is more unbelievable is that China is then rewarded with most-favored-nation trade status.

But what can even be more troubling in all this is that with that $35 billion, China builds Silkworm missiles. Then China takes those Silkworm missiles and sells them to Iran. Then Iran takes those Silkworm missiles and threatens the gulf, and then the Pentagon says to Congress, ''We need more money to protect the gulf from those Silkworm missiles that Iran has that were made in China.''

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Now NASA is on an unmanned space mission to the moon. I think NASA should redirect and have an unmanned space mission to Washington, DC, and try to find out if there is any intelligent life left in the Nation's Capital.

A LOVE AFFAIR WITH THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, why the Democratic love affair with the bureaucracy? What motivates the Democrats to fight so hard to save it?

As part of our welfare reform package, we Republicans have proposed increasing money for school nutrition programs and giving it directly to the States, thereby cutting out the bureaucracy. Yet, the Democrats have lied about the Republican plan to save the bureaucracy. Why?

Well, a good investigator always follows the money. When we do, we find that the eight largest Federal Government employee PAC's in the last five election cycles contributed $17.1 million to Democratic candidates, but only $1.9 million to Republican candidates. That is about a 9-to-1 ratio favoring the Democrats.

Could this be why the Democrats fight so hard and misinform so much? Are they really committed to the children, or to the bureaucracy that fills their electoral coffers?

The Republican plan, Mr. Speaker, will put more money where it is needed most.

WELFARE—A COLOSSAL FAILURE IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, with all the distortion, deceit, and deception coming from the other side of the aisle on the issue of welfare reform, I think it is time to remind my Democrat colleagues that welfare has been a colossal failure.

Since 1965, we have spent $5 trillion on welfare, an amount greater than our total national debt. An amount greater than the cost of winning World War II—even in constant, inflation-adjusted dollars.

But far from winning the War on Poverty, we have spent $5 trillion and poverty has won, or at least is winning.

Consider the sad facts. Since the end of World War II, poverty in America had been declining at a rapid and steady rate. But as welfare spending increased in the late 1960's and early 1970's, the poverty rate leveled off and began climbing, reversing a decades long trend in the other direction.

So why do the Democrats fight so hard to preserve a system that has been such a failure? Why do they want to perpetuate a system that has trapped so many in a cycle of dependency? Why are they so wedded to the old order?

SCHOOL LUNCHES

(Ms. ESHOO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, it is said in every war the first casualty is the truth and this is certainly the case in the Republican revolution.

While the GOP claims that its budget cuts will not hurt American children, the truth is that children are the ones in the direct line of fire.

Mr. Speaker, 43 percent of the children in my district—18,625 children—will be impacted by the Republicans' cuts in the School Lunch Program.

A lunch may be something my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take for granted, but for some of these children it is their only meal of the day.

This meal provides the nourishment they need to learn and perform better so they can become productive citizens.

The mantra of the day is block grants. Well this one needs to be closely examined. The truth is there will be less money in the block grants and the Governors don't have to use this money for school lunches.

To make matters worse, the Republicans have eliminated national nutritional standards which prevented ketchup from being counted as a vegetable.

Mr. Speaker, the mean-spirited attacks on our children must stop. I urge my colleagues to oppose these devastating cuts—for our children and for the future of our country.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS FEED CHILDREN, NOT BUREAUCRATS

(Ms. PRYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE. Mr. Speaker, to listen to the Democrats speak, one would think the Republicans are ogres, taking food out of the mouths of babes. They have called us cruel; they have called us despicable.

Mr. Speaker, what is despicable is their tactics. They are deceiving the American people, and they know it. There are absolutely no cuts in the School Lunch Program under the Republican welfare plan. Let me say that again. Thee will be no cuts in the School Lunch Program.

As a matter of fact, the funding for the program will actually increase by $203 million, an increase of 4.5 percent. Furthermore, the Republican plan guarantees that 80 percent of the funds will actually go to feed hungry children, while 2 percent can be spent on administrative costs.

Our proposal will make sure that the money will go where it is needed, into