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