

MCGOVERN, I am alarmed by the recent developments in what is becoming, in my mind, a full-fledged military campaign in Iraq. The situation in Iraq may be difficult, but that excuse does not merit the President's overreliance on war powers and the two outdated authorizations for use of force. When it comes to war and peace, the authority remains firmly with this body, the United States Congress.

Last month we heard that the White House planned to double the number of troops in Iraq, bringing the total to 3,000, despite the President's own promise not to put U.S. troops on the ground. On Monday another 250 paratroopers were called up from the 82nd Airborne for service in Iraq, and Congress is poised to give the President his \$5.6 billion request to combat ISIS with virtually no debate scheduled on this House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to implore the President to come to Congress and explain his strategy for this new campaign in Iraq. Even the last President, who was far less sensible, sought congressional authority. It is in President Obama's best interest to address not just those relevant committees apt to grant him the legal leeway the White House weakly asserts but all 435 Members who have congressional authority and constitutional authority to send our Nation's sons and daughters to war.

The President must tread carefully going forward, and not just because our recent military history in Iraq is poor but also because he now faces a Republican Congress. Those recklessly clamoring for greater military involvement against ISIS would like nothing more than to blame what could easily become a wider conflict, likely doomed to fail, squarely on the President's head. I trust this President, and I have faith that he will make the decisions in the best interest of the American people, as he understands them.

Let me be clear: it is in the American people's best interest for the President to ask the people's representatives—us in the House of Representatives—for a proper authorization for the use of military force. Then JOHN BOEHNER should lead the debate on such an authorization—a debate at great length and with complete transparency, not behind closed doors, not in committees, not somewhere in conference reports, but out here on the floor in front of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we have wandered down this road in Iraq before with a far less thoughtful President. What our goal was in Iraq is long since lost. Whatever President Bush said it was, it never turned out to be what we were there about. And here we are doing the same thing again, unfortunately. It is time we learned from our mistakes and that we, as Members of Congress, take responsibility for sending our people over there to die. There will be deaths, make no mistake about it. Generals have already said if we go over there a

little bit, we are going to be there for the next 2 years. It is time for us to vote on this issue after a lengthy debate.

#### NANNY STATE LUNCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Federal food police are whipping up their latest batch of distasteful government regulations. With a government fist around an iron spatula, the Federal Government has become the new Mr. Bumble from the book "Oliver Twist."

The food police have placed unhealthy and illogical regulations on menus for government school lunches across the fruited plain. This is just more unneeded, unnecessary, and unwarranted Federal Government invasion of what school kids eat. The Federal Government now is trying to raise America's children.

In an effort to control, dictate, and give children a nanny state society, school lunches have gotten watered down to a skimpy new low. After strict portion control and outlandish so-called nutrition standards, school lunches have become as exciting as detention. The food is unappealing and lacking in nutrition.

So what have students done? They have taken their frustrations to Twitter, taking photos of government-dictated school lunches. An Oklahoma school student tweeted a picture of a few chicken nuggets, a half an apple, and a piece of bread, complaining, "Thanks for the fulfilling lunch." More and more students are catching on, saying sarcastically, "I will be full for days," and "Thanks for the delicious lunch, sure was filling."

A parent eating lunch with their child at school was stunned after seeing the lunch portions. And here she took a photograph of the lunch. Here it is. And she said correctly, "This is sad." Here you have a little condiment package. Here you have a bun with a something in between, and then you have a half a fruit over on the other side. Isn't this a lovely lunch? If a parent had anything to do with this, the Federal Government would probably accuse them of child neglect.

There is a 350-calorie limit in place for entrees. So that means taking two packets of ketchup or mayonnaise would put the student over the allowed limit. Kids find themselves in an "Oliver Twist" situation with the workhouse headmaster, Mr. Bumble, and having to fearfully ask, "More please, sir?" And of course just like in the book, the answer is a loud "No."

Kids need the energy to learn, to pay attention, and to focus. That energy comes from food. The cafeteria takeover by the Federal Government is leaving students—believe it or not—hungry.

How can we expect children operating on a lunch of no more than 350

calories to make it through the day? What about athletes and afterschool programs? Whether the student plays football or plays an instrument in the marching band, a dinky lunch just won't cut it.

Meghan Hellrood, a student at D.C. Everest High School in Wisconsin, is protesting the required "healthy" lunches by promising other students unlimited condiments that she herself will bring to school. Now, I wonder if the Federal Government will charge her with smuggling the forbidden condiments. Who knows?

Students all over the United States have started to speak out. Pictures of a lunch with two pieces of cauliflower, some ham, and a piece of cheese have surfaced, or three cherry tomatoes, skim milk, and some cheesy bread. This sounds more like the tasteless gruel Oliver Twist was served in the book "Oliver Twist."

Kids who buy their lunch but opt out of the side of fruits or vegetables are still charged for the whole meal, resulting in wasted food. There has been an 84 percent increase in wasted school lunches that are just thrown in the trash.

These regulations just aren't working. So what is next? Is the government going to force-feed kids who don't eat the government food lunches? The level of Federal Government intrusion is foolish, and it seems to be arrogant.

The time is now to protect schools from Mr. Bumble bureaucrats. Interestingly enough, some of the bureaucrats in Washington making the rules for government schools send their kids to private schools, which are not under the same absurd food regulations.

Mere calorie counting is not a viable healthy option. More physical activities in schools may be needed. In any event, it is the duty and responsibility of parents and local schools to decide what their kids eat in school, not the nanny, Mr. Bumble, and the bureaucrats in Washington.

Parents should raise their kids, not the Federal Government. Federal food police don't belong in a local school cafeteria.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1100

#### THE GAS TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, I introduced the first gas tax increase in over 20 years. I was joined by a broad coalition in announcing the bill, supported by the AFL-CIO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, building and construction industries and their unions, local governments, AAA and the truckers, environmentalists, transit, and cyclists. It was gratifying to have that broad base of support. One year later, the only thing that has