

AMERICA'S TRADE DEFICIT

(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, America had a \$15.7 billion record deficit in May. Billion. The formula says for every \$1 billion in deficits, America loses 20,000 jobs. So in May, check the formula, America lost 314,000 jobs. These are not burger flippers or chicken skinners. These are manufacturing jobs, folks. It is getting so bad China today has a 34 percent tariff on most American products. After all this, the White House by whatever name you want to call it once again wants most-favored-nation trade status for China. Unbelievable.

Who are the trade advisers at the White House, a bunch of proctologists, ladies and gentlemen? This is out of hand. Think about it. While Congress is debating campaign finance reform that was promulgated because of illegal Chinese contributions, the Chinese keep kicking our assets all the way to the bank. Beam me up. We need a proctologist.

KYOTO TREATY

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Kyoto treaty on climate change would have a crippling effect on the American economy. This fatally flawed agreement would kill millions of American jobs and diminish the standard of living in this country. Confronted by strong bipartisan opposition in both the House and the Senate, the Clinton administration has repeatedly assured Congress that it would not attempt to implement the Kyoto treaty until it has been ratified by the Senate. Now, despite this promise, there is strong evidence that the EPA has initiated and taken regulatory and other actions that are inconsistent with the administration assurances. This week, when the House considers the fiscal year 1999 VA-HUD bill, we will have the opportunity to ensure that the President keeps his word. This bill prohibits the EPA from using taxpayer dollars to issue rules or regulations to implement the Kyoto treaty until it has been ratified by the Senate. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to protect our economic interests by supporting the effort to stop the EPA from ramming the Kyoto treaty through the back door.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when are we going to address campaign finance reform? When are we going to

talk about the way campaign finance works? Particularly when are we going to talk seriously about taking soft money out of campaigning?

Soft money disenfranchises the average person. The reason we do not have 80, 90 percent voter turnout is that the people of this country, particularly the young people, believe that they have not invested money in our campaigns, therefore, they do not think they should come to the polls. They do not have a voice.

That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. We have to address campaign finance reform, we have to do away with soft money, and we have to get everybody in this country that is eligible to vote.

ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today in the name of the Bipartisan Women's Caucus to thank the House for the vote last Thursday to cover contraceptive prescriptions for Federal employees, the pill, the diaphragm, intrauterine devices, Norplant and Depo-Provera. Some plans covered no contraceptive prescriptions. None of these prescriptions promote abortions. All preserve women's health.

Without contraception, of course, abortions are promoted, and some of these devices in fact lead to abortions because they are not as effective as others. That is why women need these choices, at least these choices when deciding something as central to their health as preventing abortions and deciding whether or not to bear a child. Every woman has had some contraceptive device that does not work for her. With this bill, we have passed one of the most significant women's health bills in many years.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 5 p.m. today.

CHILD NUTRITION AND WIC REAUTHORIZATION AMENDMENTS OF 1998

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3874) to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to make improvements to the special supplemental nutrition

program for women, infants, and children and to extend the authority of that program through fiscal year 2003, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3874

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Amendments of 1998".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Effective date.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE
NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Sec. 101. Provision of commodities.

Sec. 102. Nutritional and other program requirements.

Sec. 103. Special assistance.

Sec. 104. Miscellaneous provisions and definitions.

Sec. 105. Summer food service program for children.

Sec. 106. Commodity distribution program.

Sec. 107. Child and adult care food program.

Sec. 108. Meal supplements for children in afterschool care.

Sec. 109. Universal free breakfast pilot projects.

Sec. 110. Training and technical assistance.

Sec. 111. Compliance and accountability.

Sec. 112. Information clearinghouse.

Sec. 113. Accommodation of the special dietary needs of individuals with disabilities.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE CHILD
NUTRITION ACT OF 1966

Sec. 201. State administrative expenses.

Sec. 202. Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children.

Sec. 203. Nutrition education and training program.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on October 1, 1998, or the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO THE
NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

SEC. 101. PROVISION OF COMMODITIES.

Section 6 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1755) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking "authorized under subsection (c)" and inserting "required under subsections (c) and (e)";

(2) by striking subsections (c) and (d); and

(3) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), and (g) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively.

SEC. 102. NUTRITIONAL AND OTHER PROGRAM
REQUIREMENTS.

(a) STATE OR LOCAL HEALTH AND SAFETY INSPECTIONS.—Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) If the food service operations of a school participating in the school lunch program under this Act or the school breakfast program under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) are not required by State or local law to undergo health and safety inspections, then the school shall twice during each school year obtain State or local health and safety inspections to ensure that meals provided under such programs are prepared and served in a healthful and safe environment."

(b) SINGLE PERMANENT AGREEMENTS BETWEEN STATE AGENCIES AND SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITIES; COMMON CLAIMING PROCEDURES.—

Section 9 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1758), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i)(1) If a single State agency administers the school lunch program under this Act, the school breakfast program under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773), the summer food service program for children under section 13 of this Act, or the child and adult care food program under section 17 of this Act, then such agency—

“(A) shall require each school food authority to submit a single agreement with respect to the operation of such programs by such authority; and

“(B) shall require a common claiming procedure with respect to meals and supplements served under such programs.

“(2) The agreement described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be a permanent agreement that may be amended as necessary.”.

SEC. 103. SPECIAL ASSISTANCE.

(a) SCHOOL ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR PAYMENTS.—Section 11(a)(1) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) in clause (i)(I), by striking “3 successive school years” each place it appears and inserting “4 successive school years”; and

(B) in clauses (ii) and (iii), by striking “3-school-year period” each place it appears and inserting “4-school-year period”; and

(2) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking “3-school-year period” each place it appears and inserting “4-school-year period”; and

(ii) by striking “2 school years” and inserting “4 school years”; and

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by striking the first sentence; and

(ii) by striking “5-school-year period” each place it appears and inserting “4-school-year period”; and

(C) in clause (iii), by striking “5-school-year period” and inserting “4-school-year period”.

(b) ADJUSTMENTS TO PAYMENT RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 11(a)(3)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1759a(a)(3)(B)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “The annual” and inserting “(i) The annual”; and

(B) in the third sentence—

(i) by striking “The adjustments” and inserting the following:

“(ii) The adjustments”; and

(ii) by inserting “through April 30, 1999,” after “under this paragraph”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) For the period beginning on May 1, 1999, and ending on June 30, 1999, the national average payment rates for meals and supplements shall be adjusted to the nearest lower cent increment and shall be based on the unrounded amounts used to calculate the rates in effect on July 1, 1998.

“(iv) For July 1, 1999, and each subsequent July 1, the national average payment rates for meals and supplements shall be adjusted to the nearest lower cent increment and shall be based on the unrounded amount for the preceding 12-month period.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 4(b) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773(b)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence of paragraph (1)(B), by striking “adjusted to the nearest one-fourth cent.”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), by striking “to the nearest one-fourth cent”.

SEC. 104. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS AND DEFINITIONS.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO REIMBURSEMENT RATES FOR CERTAIN STATES AND TERRITORIES.—Section 12(f) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking “school breakfasts and lunches” and inserting “breakfasts, lunches, suppers, and supplements”; and

(2) by striking “sections 4 and 11” and inserting “sections 4, 11, 13, and 17”; and

(3) by striking “lunches and breakfasts” each place it appears and inserting “meals”.

(b) BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.—Section 12 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1760) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(n) BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of providing meals under the school lunch program under this Act or the school breakfast program under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773), the Secretary shall require schools located in the contiguous United States to purchase, to the extent practicable, only food products that are produced in the United States.

“(2) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The requirement of paragraph (1) shall also apply to recipient agencies in Hawaii only with respect to food products that are grown in Hawaii in sufficient quantities to meet the needs of meals provided under the school lunch program under this Act or the school breakfast program under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773).

“(3) DEFINITION.—As used in this subsection, the term ‘food products that are produced in the United States’ means—

“(A) unmanufactured food products that are grown or produced in the United States; and

“(B) manufactured food products that are manufactured in the United States substantially from agricultural products grown or produced in the United States.”.

SEC. 105. SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN.

(a) DEFINITION OF PRIVATE NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 13(a)(7)(B) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(7)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), to read as follows:

“(i) operate not more than 25 sites, with not more than 300 children being served at any one site (or, with a waiver granted by the State agency under standards developed by the Secretary, not more than 500 children being served at any one site);”;

(2) by striking clauses (ii) and (iii); and

(3) by redesignating clauses (iv), (v), (vi), and (vii) as clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), and (v), respectively.

(b) OFFER VERSUS SERVE.—Section 13(f)(7) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(f)(7)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “attending a site on school premises operated directly by the authority”.

(c) FOOD SERVICE MANAGEMENT COMPANIES.—

(1) CONTRACTING FOR PROVISION OF MEALS OR MANAGEMENT OF PROGRAM.—Section 13(l)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(l)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “(other than private nonprofit organizations eligible under subsection (a)(7))”; and

(ii) by striking “only with food service management companies registered with the State in which they operate” and inserting “with food service management companies”; and

(B) by striking the last sentence.

(2) REGISTRATION.—Section 13(l)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(l)(2)) is amended—

(A) in the first sentence of the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “shall” and inserting “may”; and

(B) by striking all after the first sentence.

(3) OTHER PROVISIONS.—Section 13(l) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(l)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (3); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively.

(d) REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—Section 13(q) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(q)) is amended by striking “1998” and inserting “2003”.

SEC. 106. COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM.

Section 14(a) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1762a(a)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “1998” and inserting “2003”.

SEC. 107. CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM.

(a) ELIGIBILITY OF INSTITUTIONS.—Section 17(a)(1) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) an institution (except a school or family or group day care home sponsoring organization) or family or group day care home—

“(A)(i) shall be licensed, or otherwise have approval, by the appropriate Federal, State, or local licensing authority; or

“(ii) shall be in compliance with appropriate procedures for renewing participation in the program, as prescribed by the Secretary, unless the State has information indicating that the institution or family or group day care home’s license will not be renewed;

“(B) if Federal, State, or local licensing or approval is not available—

“(i) shall meet any alternate approval standards established by the appropriate State or local governmental agency; or

“(ii) shall meet any alternate approval standards established by the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services; or

“(C) if the institution provides care to school children outside of school hours and Federal, State, or local licensing or approval is not required for such institution, shall meet State or local health and safety standards; and”.

(b) CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY FOR EVEN START PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS.—Section 17(c)(6)(B) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(c)(6)(B)) is amended by striking “1997” and inserting “2003”.

(c) TAX EXEMPT STATUS OF ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS; REMOVAL OF NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS.—Section 17(d)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after the third sentence the following: “An institution moving toward compliance with the requirement for tax exempt status shall be allowed to participate in the program for a period of not more than 6 months unless it can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the State agency that its inability to obtain tax exempt status within the 6-month period is beyond the control of the institution in which case the State agency may grant a single extension not to exceed 90 days.”; and

(2) by striking the last sentence.

(d) USE OF FUNDS FOR AUDITS OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.—Section 17(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(i)) is amended by striking “2 percent” and inserting “1 percent”.

(e) PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Section 17(p) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(p)) is amended by striking paragraphs (4) and (5).

(f) TRANSFER OF HOMELESS PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1766) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) PARTICIPATION BY EMERGENCY SHELTERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, an emergency shelter shall be eligible to participate in the program authorized under this section in accordance with the terms and conditions applicable to eligible institutions described in subsection (a).

"(2) LICENSING REQUIREMENTS.—The licensing requirements contained in subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to emergency shelters or sites operated by such shelters under the program.

"(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—

"(A) HEALTH AND SAFETY STANDARDS.—An emergency shelter and each site operated by such shelter shall comply with State or local health and safety standards.

"(B) MEAL REIMBURSEMENT.—

"(i) LIMITATION.—An emergency shelter may claim reimbursement—

"(I) only for meals and supplements served to children who have not attained the age of 13 and who are residing at an emergency shelter; and

"(II) for not more than 3 meals, or 2 meals and a supplement, per child per day.

"(ii) RATE.—A meal or supplement eligible for reimbursement shall be reimbursed at the rate at which free meals and supplements are reimbursed under subsection (c).

"(iii) NO CHARGE.—A meal or supplement claimed for reimbursement shall be served without charge.

"(4) DEFINITION OF EMERGENCY SHELTER.—As used in this subsection, the term 'emergency shelter' has the meaning given such term in section 321(2) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11351(2))."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(A) Section 13(a)(3)(C) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(a)(3)(C)) is amended—

(i) in clause (i), by adding "or" at the end;

(ii) by striking clause (ii); and

(iii) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii).

(B) Section 17B of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1766b) is hereby repealed.

(g) PARTICIPATION BY "AT RISK" CHILD CARE PROGRAMS.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1766), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(r) 'AT RISK' CHILD CARE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the conditions in this subsection, institutions that provide care to at risk school children during after-school hours, weekends, or holidays during the regular school year may participate in the program authorized under this section. Unless otherwise specified in this subsection, all other provisions of this section shall apply to these institutions.

"(2) AT RISK SCHOOL CHILDREN.—Children ages 12 through 18 who live in a geographical area served by a school enrolling elementary students in which at least 50 percent of the total number of children enrolled are certified eligible to receive free or reduced price school meals under this Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 shall be considered at risk.

"(3) SUPPLEMENT REIMBURSEMENT.—

"(A) LIMITATION.—Only supplements served to at risk school children during after-school hours, weekends, or holidays during the regular school year may be claimed for reimbursement. Institutions may claim reimbursement for only one supplement per child per day.

"(B) RATE.—Eligible supplements shall be reimbursed at the rate for free supplements under subsection (c)(3).

"(C) NO CHARGE.—All supplements claimed for reimbursement shall be served without charge."

SEC. 108. MEAL SUPPLEMENTS FOR CHILDREN IN AFTERSCHOOL CARE.

Section 17A of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)(C) to read as follows:

"(C) operate afterschool programs with an educational or enrichment purpose."; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "served to children" and all that follows and inserting "served to children who are not more than 18 years of age."

SEC. 109. UNIVERSAL FREE BREAKFAST PILOT PROJECTS.

Section 18(i) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769(i)) is amended to read as follows:

"(i) UNIVERSAL FREE BREAKFAST PILOT PROJECTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—

"(A) GRANTS TO STATES.—(i) Subject to the availability of advance appropriations under paragraph (8), the Secretary shall make grants to not more than 5 States to conduct pilot projects in elementary schools under school food authorities located in each such State—

"(I) to reduce paperwork;

"(II) to simplify meal counting requirements; and

"(III) to make changes that will increase participation in the school breakfast program.

"(ii) The Secretary shall select States to receive grants under clause (i), and make grants to such States, in the first fiscal year for which appropriations are made to carry out this subsection.

"(B) GRANTS TO SCHOOL FOOD AUTHORITIES; DURATION OF PILOT PROJECTS.—(i)(I) A State receiving a grant under subparagraph (A) shall make grants to school food authorities to carry out the pilot projects described in such subparagraph.

"(II) The State shall select school food authorities to receive grants under clause (i), and make grants to such authorities, in the first fiscal year for which the State receives amounts under a grant.

"(ii) A school food authority receiving amounts under a grant to conduct a pilot project described in subparagraph (A) shall conduct such project for the 3-year period beginning in the first fiscal year in which the authority receives amounts under a grant from the State.

"(C) PARTICIPATION LIMITATION.—A school food authority conducting a pilot project under this paragraph shall ensure that some elementary schools under such authority do not participate in the pilot project.

"(2) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary may waive the requirements of this Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.) relating to counting of meals, applications for eligibility, and related requirements that would preclude the Secretary from making a grant to conduct a pilot project under paragraph (1).

"(B) NON-WAIVABLE REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may not waive a requirement under subparagraph (A) if the waiver would prevent a program participant, a potential recipient, or a school from receiving all of the benefits and protections of this Act, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, or a Federal statute or regulation that protects an individual constitutional right or a statutory civil right.

"(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION IN PILOT.—To be eligible to participate in a pilot project under this subsection—

"(A) a State—

"(i) shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall establish; and

"(ii) shall provide such information relative to the operation and results of the pilot as the Secretary may reasonably require; and

"(B) a school food authority—

"(i) shall agree to serve all breakfasts at no charge to all children in participating elementary schools;

"(ii) shall not have a history of violations of this Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq.); and

"(iii) shall meet any other requirement that the Secretary may reasonably require.

"(4) SELECTION OF PILOT ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—To the extent practicable, a State shall select school food authorities to participate in the pilot program under this subsection in a manner that will provide for an equitable distribution among the following types of elementary schools:

"(A) Urban and rural elementary schools.

"(B) Elementary schools of varying family income levels.

"(5) REIMBURSEMENT RATES.—A school food authority conducting a pilot project under this subsection shall receive reimbursement for each breakfast served under the pilot in an amount equal to the rate for free breakfasts established under section 4(b)(1)(B) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773(b)(1)(B)).

"(6) COMMODITY ENTITLEMENT.—A school food authority conducting a pilot project under this subsection shall receive commodities in the amount of at least 5 cents per breakfast served under the pilot. The value of such commodities shall be deducted from the amount of cash reimbursement described in paragraph (5).

"(7) EVALUATION OF PILOT PROJECT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Food and Nutrition Service, shall conduct an evaluation of the pilot projects in each of the school food authorities selected for participation. Such evaluation shall include—

"(i) a determination of the effect of participation in the pilot project on the academic achievement, tardiness and attendance, and dietary intake of participating children that is not attributable to changes in educational policies and practices; and

"(ii) a determination of the effect that participation by elementary schools in the pilot projects has on the proportion of students who eat breakfast.

"(B) REPORT.—Upon completion of the pilot projects and the evaluation, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the evaluation of the pilot required under subparagraph (A).

"(8) REIMBURSEMENT REQUIREMENT UNDER BREAKFAST PROGRAM.—(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a school participating in a pilot project under this subsection shall receive a total Federal reimbursement under the school breakfast program in an amount equal to the total Federal reimbursement for the school in the prior year under such program (adjusted for inflation and fluctuations in enrollment).

"(B) Funds required for the pilot project in excess of the level of reimbursement received by the school in the prior year (adjusted for inflation and fluctuations in enrollment) may be taken from any non-Federal source or from amounts appropriated to carry out this subsection. If no appropriations are made for the pilot projects, schools may not conduct the pilot projects.

"(9) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

"(B) REQUIREMENT.—No amounts may be provided under this subsection unless specifically provided in appropriations Acts."

SEC. 110. TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 21(e)(1) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769b-1(e)(1)) is amended by striking "1998" and inserting "2003".

SEC. 111. COMPLIANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 22(d) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769c(d)) is amended by striking "1996" and inserting "2003".

SEC. 112. INFORMATION CLEARINGHOUSE.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH AND MAINTAIN CLEARINGHOUSE.**—Section 26(a) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769g(a)) is amended by striking "shall" and inserting "may".

(b) **NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION.**—Section 26(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1769g(b)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting after "shall be selected on a competitive basis" the following: "except that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may enter into a contract for the services of any organization with which the Secretary has previously entered into a contract under this section without such organization competing for such new contract, if such organization has performed satisfactorily under such prior contract and otherwise meets the criteria established in this subsection.".

(c) **LIMITATION ON AMOUNT PROVIDED UNDER THE CONTRACT.**—Section 26 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1769g) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) **LIMITATION ON AMOUNT PROVIDED UNDER THE CONTRACT.**—The Secretary may provide to the organization described in subsection (b) an amount not to exceed \$150,000 in each of fiscal years 1999 through 2003."

(d) **FUNDING.**—Section 26(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1769g(e)) (as so redesignated) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) **FUNDING.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated \$150,000 for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003 to carry out this section.

"(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—No amounts may be provided for the clearinghouse under this section unless specifically provided in appropriations Acts."

SEC. 113. ACCOMMODATION OF THE SPECIAL DIETARY NEEDS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

Section 27 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769h) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 27. ACCOMMODATION OF THE SPECIAL DIETARY NEEDS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

"(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may carry out activities to help accommodate the special dietary needs of individuals with disabilities who are participating in a covered program. Such activities may include—

"(1) developing and disseminating to State agencies guidance and technical assistance materials;

"(2) conducting training of State agencies and eligible entities; and

"(3) providing grants to State agencies and eligible entities.

"(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this section:

"(1) **INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.**—The term 'individuals with disabilities' has the meaning given the term 'individual with a disability' as defined in section 7(8) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 706(8)).

"(2) **COVERED PROGRAM.**—The term 'covered program' means—

"(A) the school lunch program authorized under this Act;

"(B) the school breakfast program authorized under section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773); and

"(C) any other program authorized under this Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (except for section 17) that the Secretary determines is appropriate.

"(3) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term 'eligible entity' means a school food authority, institution, or service institution that participates in a covered program.

"(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1999 through 2003 to carry out this section."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE CHILD NUTRITION ACT OF 1966**SEC. 201. STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) **REALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS.**—Section 7(a)(5)(B) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1776(a)(5)(B)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(i)";

(2) by striking the second sentence and all that follows; and

(3) by adding at the end the following: "The Secretary shall then allocate, for purposes of administration costs, any remaining amounts among States that demonstrate a need for such amounts."

(b) **ELIMINATION OF 10 PERCENT TRANSFER LIMITATION.**—Section 7(a)(6) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1776(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) Funds available to States under this subsection and under section 13(k)(1) of the National School Lunch Act may be used by State agencies for the costs of administration of the programs authorized under this Act (except for the programs authorized under sections 17 and 21) and the National School Lunch Act without regard to the basis on which such funds were earned and allocated."

(c) **REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.**—Section 7(g) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1776(g)) is amended by striking "1998" and inserting "2003".

SEC. 202. SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN.

(a) **ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR APPLICANTS.**—

(1) **PHYSICAL PRESENCE REQUIREMENT.**—Section 17(d)(3) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(d)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(C)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), each applicant to the program shall be physically present at each certification determination in order to determine eligibility under the program.

"(ii) A local agency may waive the requirement of clause (i)—

"(I) if required to do so by requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act;

"(II) with respect to a child who was present at the initial certification visit and who is receiving on-going health care from a provider other than such local agency, if the agency determines that the requirement of clause (i) would present a barrier to participation; or

"(III) with respect to a child (aa) who was present at the initial certification visit, (bb) who was present at a certification determination within the 1-year period ending on the date of the certification determination described in clause (i), and (cc) who has one or more parents who work, if the agency determines that the requirement of clause (i) would cause a barrier to participation."

(2) **INCOME DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENT.**—Section 17(d)(3) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(d)(3)), as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), in order to be eligible for the program, each applicant to the program shall provide—

"(I) documentation of household income; or

"(II) documentation of participation in a program described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of paragraph (2)(A).

"(ii)(I) A State agency may waive the requirement of clause (i)—

"(aa) with respect to an applicant for whom the necessary documentation is not available; or

"(bb) with respect to an applicant, such as homeless women or children, for whom the agency determines the requirement of clause (i) would present a barrier to participation.

"(II) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations to carry out division (aa)."

(b) **EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS RELATING TO EFFECTS OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL USE.**—Section 17(e)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "A local agency participating in the program shall provide education or educational materials relating to the effects of drug and alcohol use by a pregnant, postpartum, or breastfeeding woman on the developing child of the woman."

(c) **DISTRIBUTION OF NUTRITION EDUCATION MATERIALS TO STATE AGENCIES ADMINISTERING THE COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM.**—Section 17(e) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(e)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

"(4) The Secretary may provide nutrition education materials, including breastfeeding promotion materials, developed with funds appropriated to carry out the program under this section in bulk quantity to State agencies administering the commodity supplemental food program authorized under sections 4(a) and 5 of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 at no cost to that program."

(d) **IDENTIFICATION OF RECIPIENTS PARTICIPATING AT MORE THAN 1 SITE.**—Section 17(f) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(23) Each State agency shall implement a system designed to identify recipients who are participating at more than 1 site under the program."

(e) **IDENTIFICATION OF HIGH RISK VENDORS; COMPLIANCE INVESTIGATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 17(f) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(24) Each State agency—

"(A) shall identify vendors that have a high probability of program abuse; and

"(B) shall conduct compliance investigations of such vendors."

(2) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than March 1, 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate final regulations to carry out section 17(f)(24) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(f)(24)), as added by paragraph (1).

(f) **REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.**—Section 17(g)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(g)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "1995 through 1998" and inserting "1999 through 2003".

(g) **PURCHASE OF BREAST PUMPS.**—Section 17(h)(1)(C) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(C)" and inserting "(C)(i)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii)(I) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, with respect to fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years, a State agency may use amounts made available under clause (i) for the purchase of breast pumps.

"(II) A State agency that exercises the authority of subclause (I) shall expend from amounts allocated for nutrition services and administration an amount for the purchase of breast pumps that is not less than the amount expended for the purchase of breast pumps from amounts available for nutrition

services and administration for the prior fiscal year.”.

(h) NUTRITION SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) ALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS.—Section 17(h)(2)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(2)(A)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “1995 through 1998” and inserting “1999 through 2003”.

(2) LEVEL OF PER PARTICIPANT EXPENDITURE.—Section 17(h)(2)(B)(ii) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “15 percent” and inserting “10 percent (except that the Secretary may establish a higher percentage for small State agencies)”.

(i) CONVERSION OF AMOUNTS FOR FOOD BENEFITS TO AMOUNTS FOR NUTRITION SERVICES AND ADMINISTRATION.—Section 17(h)(5)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(5)(A)) is amended in the matter preceding clause (i) by striking “achieves” and all that follows through “such State agency may” and inserting “submits a plan to reduce average food costs per participant and to increase participation above the level estimated for such State agency, such State agency may, with the approval of the Secretary,”.

(j) INFANT FORMULA PROCUREMENT.—Section 17(h)(8)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(8)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) A State agency using a competitive bidding system for infant formula shall award contracts to the bidder offering the lowest net price unless the State agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the weighted average retail price for different brands of infant formula in the State does not vary by more than five percent.”.

(k) INFRASTRUCTURE AND BREASTFEEDING PROMOTION/SUPPORT ACTIVITIES.—Section 17(h)(10)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(10)(A)) is amended by striking “For each of fiscal years 1995 through 1998,” and inserting “For each fiscal year through 2003.”.

(l) CONSIDERATION OF PRICE LEVELS OF RETAIL STORES FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 17(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(11)(A) For the purpose of promoting efficiency and to contain costs under the program, a State agency shall, in selecting a retail store for participation in the program, take into consideration the prices that the store charges for foods under the program as compared to the prices that other stores charge for such foods.

“(B) The State agency shall establish procedures to insure that a retail store selected for participation in the program does not subsequently raise prices to levels that would otherwise make the store ineligible for selection in the program.”.

(2) REGULATIONS.—Not later than March 1, 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate final regulations to carry out section 17(h)(11)(A) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)(11)(A)), as added by paragraph (1).

(m) MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM PLAN.—Section 17(h) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(h)), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(12)(A) In consultation with State agencies, retailers, and other interested persons, the Secretary shall establish a long range plan for the development and implementation of management information systems (including electronic benefit transfers) to be used in carrying out the program.

“(B) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on

Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report on actions taken to carry out subparagraph (A).

“(C) Prior to the date of the submission of the report of the Secretary required under subparagraph (B), the cost of systems or equipment that may be required to test management information systems (including electronic benefit transfers) for the program may not be imposed on a retail food store.”.

(n) USE OF FUNDS IN PRECEDING AND SUBSEQUENT FISCAL YEARS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Clauses (i) and (ii) of section 17(i)(3)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(i)(3)(A)) (i) and (ii)) are amended to read as follows:

“(i) not more than 1 percent (except as provided in subparagraph (C)) of the amount of funds allocated to a State agency under this section for supplemental foods for a fiscal year, and not more than 1 percent of the amount of funds allocated to a State agency under this section for nutrition services and administration for a fiscal year, may be expended by the State agency for allowable expenses incurred under this section for supplemental foods and nutrition services and administration, respectively, during the preceding fiscal year; and

“(ii)(I) a State agency may expend, from amounts allocated to the agency for nutrition services and administration, an amount equal to not more than 1 percent of the total amount of funds allocated to the agency under this section for a fiscal year for allowable expenses incurred under this section for nutrition services and administration during the subsequent fiscal year; and

“(II) with the prior approval of the Secretary, a State agency may expend, from amounts allocated to the agency for nutrition services and administration, an amount equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent of the total amount of funds allocated to the agency under this section for a fiscal year for the development of a management information system, including an electronic benefit transfer system, during the subsequent fiscal year.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786) is amended—

(A) in subsection (h)(10)(A) (as amended by this Act), by inserting after “nutrition services and administration funds” the following: “and food benefit funds”; and

(B) in subsection (i)(3)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (C) through (G); and

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (H) as subparagraph (C).

(o) FARMERS MARKET NUTRITION PROGRAM.—

(1) MATCHING FUND REQUIREMENT.—Section 17(m)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(m)(3)) is amended in both the first and second sentences by striking “total” each place it appears and inserting “administrative”.

(2) RANKING CRITERIA FOR STATE PLANS.—Section 17(m)(6) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(m)(6)) is amended—

(A) by striking subparagraph (F); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (F).

(3) REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM.—Section 17(m)(9)(A) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(m)(9)(A)) is amended by striking “1996 through 1998” and inserting “1999 through 2003”.

(p) DISQUALIFICATION OF CERTAIN VENDORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(o) DISQUALIFICATION OF VENDORS CONVICTED OF TRAFFICKING OR ILLEGAL SALES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), the State agency shall permanently disqualify a vendor convicted of trafficking in food instruments (including any voucher, draft, check, or access device, including an electronic benefit transfer card or personal identification number, issued in lieu of a food instrument pursuant to the provisions of this section), or selling firearms, ammunition, explosives, or controlled substances (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act) in exchange for food instruments.

“(2) NOTICE OF DISQUALIFICATION.—The State agency shall provide the vendor with notification of the disqualification and shall make such disqualification effective on the date of receipt of the notice of disqualification.

“(3) PROHIBITION ON RECEIPT OF LOST REVENUES.—A vendor shall not be entitled to receive any compensation for revenues lost as a result of the disqualification under this subsection.

“(4) HARDSHIP EXCEPTION IN LIEU OF DISQUALIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A State agency may permit a vendor that would otherwise be disqualified under paragraph (1) to continue to redeem food instruments or otherwise provide supplemental foods to participants if the State agency determines, in its sole discretion according to criteria established by the Secretary, disqualification of the vendor would cause hardship to participants in the program authorized under this section.

“(B) CIVIL MONEY PENALTY.—Whenever a State agency authorizes a vendor that would otherwise be disqualified to redeem food instruments or provide supplemental foods in accordance with subparagraph (A), the State agency shall assess the vendor a civil money penalty in lieu of a disqualification.

“(C) AMOUNT.—The State agency shall determine the amount of the civil penalty according to criteria established by the Secretary.”.

(2) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 1999, the Secretary of Agriculture shall promulgate final regulations to carry out section 17(o) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786(o)), as added by paragraph (1).

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENT.—The final regulations described in subparagraph (A) shall include criteria for determining the amount of civil money penalties in lieu of disqualification and for making hardship determinations under such section.

(q) STUDY AND REPORT BY ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(p) STUDY AND REPORT BY ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE.—

“(1) STUDY.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Economic Research Service, shall conduct a study on the effect of cost containment practices established by States under the program for the selection of vendors and approved food items (other than infant formula) on the following:

“(A) Program participation.

“(B) Access and availability of prescribed foods.

“(C) Voucher redemption rates and actual food selections by participants.

“(D) Participants on special diets or with specific food allergies.

“(E) Participant use and satisfaction of prescribed foods.

“(F) Achievement of positive health outcomes.

“(G) Program costs.

"(2) REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Amendments of 1998, the Administrator shall submit to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1)."

(r) COLLECTION AND USE OF PENALTIES FROM VENDOR AND RECIPIENT FRAUD AND ABUSE.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(q) USE OF PENALTIES FROM VENDOR AND RECIPIENT FRAUD AND ABUSE.—Amounts collected from penalties from vendors and recipients relating to violations of any provision of this section (including any regulation established to carry out this section) for fraud and abuse under the program may be used for nutrition services and administration and food benefits only for the 1-year period beginning on the date on which amounts under the penalty are received."

(s) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF FINE FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS UNDER THE PROGRAM.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(r) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF FINE FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS UNDER THE PROGRAM.—The maximum amount of a fine with respect to the embezzlement, willful misapplication, stealing, obtaining by fraud, or trafficking in food instruments of funds, assets, or property that are of a value of \$100 or more under the program shall be \$25,000."

(t) CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.—Section 17 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1786), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(s) CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In imposing a sentence on a person convicted of an offense in violation of any provision of this section (or any regulation promulgated under this section), a court shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed under this section, that the person forfeit to the United States all property described in paragraph (2).

"(2) PROPERTY SUBJECT TO FORFEITURE.—All property, real and personal, used in a transaction or attempted transaction, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, a violation (other than a misdemeanor) of any provision of this section (or any regulation promulgated under this section), or proceeds traceable to a violation of any provision of this section (or any regulation promulgated under this section), shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States under paragraph (1).

"(3) INTEREST OF OWNER.—No interest in property shall be forfeited under this subsection as the result of any act or omission established by the owner of the interest to have been committed or omitted without the knowledge or consent of the owner.

"(4) PROCEEDS.—The proceeds from any sale of forfeited property and any monies forfeited under this subsection shall be used—

"(A) first, to reimburse the Department of Justice for the costs incurred by the Department to initiate and complete the forfeiture proceeding;

"(B) second, to reimburse the Department of Agriculture Office of Inspector General for any costs the Office incurred in the law enforcement effort resulting in the forfeiture;

"(C) third, to reimburse any Federal or State law enforcement agency for any costs incurred in the law enforcement effort resulting in the forfeiture; and

"(D) fourth, by the State agency to carry out the approval, reauthorization, and compliance investigations of vendors."

SEC. 203. NUTRITION EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM.

Section 19(i) of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1788(i)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (1) (as redesignated)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking "1997 THROUGH 2002" and inserting "1999 THROUGH 2003"; and

(B) by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as are necessary for fiscal years 1999 through 2003."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3874, the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Amendments of 1998. This bill makes important changes to our Nation's vital child nutrition programs. Members who have worked with me during my years in Congress know that I consider these to be some of the most important programs serving our Nation's children. My support of these programs comes primarily from my years as an educator where I learned firsthand that children who did not consume nutritious meals did not perform very well in school.

I am most pleased that this year we have been able to work in a bipartisan manner with USDA and the nutrition community to craft the legislation before us. We need to work together to ensure our Federal child nutrition programs are effective in providing nutritious meals to participants while increasing accountability and effectiveness.

There is no new spending in this bill. Every new cost provision has an offset. The bill before us today strives to maintain program integrity by fighting fraud and abuse in the WIC program. The Committee on Appropriations has identified problems within the WIC program that this bill addresses. The WIC program has helped improve the health of pregnant women and of infants and children. It has made tremendous strides in reducing the number of low birth weight babies and birth defects caused by poor nutrition. Addressing issues of fraud and abuse will only help ensure that program dollars provide important nutrition services to participants while not being wasted on individuals who illegally benefit from the program.

The bill also makes numerous changes to nutrition programs that provide greater flexibility to States and local providers. I understand the burden placed on schools operating multiple nutrition programs.

I believe some of the most important flexibility provisions contained in this

bill are those that support a seamless nutrition program for schools operating a variety of child nutrition programs. These provisions allow schools currently offering meals under the School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Child and Adult Care Food Program and the Summer Food Service Program to apply for a single monthly claim for all meals using a single, common claiming procedure; to have meal patterns be consistent throughout all meal programs, including current offer versus serve rules; and to have a single permanent agreement between school food authorities and the States' Departments of Education.

Another important provision seeks to address problems of juvenile crime by providing a snack to children participating in afterschool programs, with an educational or enrichment purpose, keeping them at the school rather than on the streets.

Over the past few years, I have sought to make our Nation's child nutrition programs more effective in providing important nutrition services to children. Our main goals must remain to provide nutritious meals to children and their families and to allow those closest to the children the flexibility to determine how to most effectively serve their needs. The bill embraces those principles and deserves our support.

I want to commend the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who carried the load to a great degree in the subcommittee; the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), the chairman of the subcommittee; the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ); and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who knows a good bit about nutrition. When it comes to campaign finance, well, but nutrition, yes.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3874 for the reauthorization of the child nutrition programs. I also rise to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the subcommittee chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), our ranking member, for a very positive effort.

This was a bipartisan effort that has resulted in a very good bill. This is a good bill that will benefit children in schools and children in child care facilities across America. I am pleased that it includes my pilot program for universal school breakfasts.

It also includes a provision from my bill to increase the number of schools that can participate in the Child and Adult Care Food Program and raise the age of students who are eligible for snacks in these programs.

The school breakfast pilot project will allow five elementary schools nationwide to make school breakfasts available to all of their students free of charge, not based on economic status, all students. We already have two studies which prove that children who eat breakfast improve both their grades and their classroom behavior.

But in today's world, where two working parents are the norm and long commutes are common, more and more families are out the door and on the road early in the morning with no time to sit down for breakfast. Whether we like it or not, many of these children arrive at school hungry. So, unless you want to pass a law requiring every family to feed their children breakfast before they go to school in the morning and then hire a bunch of breakfast police to enforce it, we need to look at schools and school breakfast programs in a different way.

Of course, I believe that this will be a better bill if, in the end, it includes the Senate's language on the school breakfast program. Both the Senate and the administration support a fully funded pilot program, so the House can, I hope, agree and defer in conference.

Mark my words, Mr. Speaker, the next time we reauthorize child nutrition programs, the legislation will include school breakfasts for all elementary school children, because I am confident that this pilot project will prove that school breakfast is not a welfare program. It is an education program.

I am also pleased that H.R. 3874 will make it easier for schools and community organizations to offer after-school programs to teenagers. This bill does this by raising the age of eligibility for after-school snacks from 13 to 18 years old, which makes it much more affordable to offer programs. We know that the vast majority of juvenile crime and teen pregnancies occur after the school bell rings and before the dinner bell rings. We desperately need more after-school programs for adolescents.

But feeding adolescents, even when it is just a snack, can be very expensive. H.R. 3874 will open the Child and Adult Care Food Program to low-income teens and to more after-school programs.

This is not "Twinkies for teens". The Police Athletic League and other law enforcement organizations have strongly endorsed the benefits of after-school programs for adolescents. H.R. 3874 will make more of these programs possible.

Before my enthusiasm causes any of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reconsider their support of this bill, thinking that it might be too generous, let me say that it certainly does not do everything that I would want it to do and everything that I think should be included. In particular, I hope that we can continue to work together to expand the Child and Adult Care Food Program to more low-income children, those who are in for-profit child care centers.

H.R. 3874 is a good bill. It is a bill that will benefit millions of children. Children are 25 percent of the population in America, but they are 100 percent of America's future. This bill is a sound investment in our children and our future. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of the time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time he may consume to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who played a major role in crafting this legislation.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) has been, as he indicated and as many have told me, a long-time supporter of child nutrition programs for the entire time he has been in this Congress which has been a number of years now. I think all the country and all the children of the country should appreciate that.

I, too, rise in strong support of H.R. 3747, which is known as the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Amendments of 1998. I am pleased to state, as we have seen on the floor today, that this a bipartisan bill worked out over many long hours of negotiations with members on the committee, the nutrition community, and the United States Department of Agriculture. In fact, Shirley Watkins who heads this for the Department of Agriculture, wrote a letter to me saying: I appreciate you and your staff including the Department of Agriculture in the effort to enact an excellent child nutrition program. You have our commitment to work with you to expeditiously complete the enactment process. Thanks for your continued support.

Obviously, we would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), and their staffs for working with us to reach this bipartisan agreement on this legislation.

When we say bipartisan agreement, it is not quite that simple. I remember the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) being across the table asking me rather hard questions, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and others, as a matter of fact, sort of coming at me with, can we not do more here or there? But it worked out in the long run, and that is what counts, and we appreciate all of their concern.

We know we have not addressed everyone's ultimate concerns, but I believe we do have a good bill that will go a long way towards improving our Nation's child nutrition programs by reducing red tape and bureaucracy, fighting and punishing fraud and abuse, giving program providers more flexibility, ensuring our Nation's children have access to healthy meals in school, in child care settings, in after-school programs and during the summer months,

and providing low-income pregnant and postpartum women, their infants and young children access to nutritious foods.

Of great significance is the fact that we have been able to make these important changes and save money at the same time. This bill would save a total of \$69 million over 5 years.

While this legislation contained numerous changes to Federal child nutrition programs, I would like to focus on what I consider to be the key provisions of the legislation.

The first provision deals with the provision of snacks to children in after-school care programs. I share the concerns of many Members of this body with respect to juvenile crime that occurs between the hours school ends and their parents return home from work. In fact, I just had a round table in Delaware about this just moments before I came down here. Beyond crime, unsupervised youth may be involved in other undesirable behaviors, such as using drugs and alcohol, smoking, or engaging in sexual activities.

Parents, schools, and communities throughout the United States are seeking solutions to this problem. Many families would like their children to be involved in structured activities after school, but they simply cannot find affordable options.

In response, many schools and communities are setting up after-school programs with an education or enrichment program. H.R. 3874 supports these programs through amendments to two nutrition programs, allowing the provisions of snacks to children in after-school programs.

First, it amends the Child and Adult Care Food Program to assist organizations operating in high poverty areas to provide a snack to at-risk children through age 18 who are enrolled in after-school programs.

Second, it amends an after-school care program under the School Lunch Act to permit the provision of snacks to children through the age of 18 who are participating in after-school programs with an educational or enrichment purpose. I believe that these changes will contribute to ongoing efforts to reduce juvenile crime and drug and alcohol abuse and prevent teen pregnancy.

Another important provision in this legislation recognizes how hard private, nonprofit organizations have worked to overcome their past history of program abuse and operate quality summer food programs to provide meals to low-income children during the summer months when school is not in session. As a result, we lift remaining restrictions on their participation in this program.

Finally, we have modified the WIC program to provide greater flexibility to States and local providers in meeting the needs of program participants and to address concerns raised about fraud and abuse.

Antifraud provisions contained in this legislation include: disqualifying

WIC vendors convicted of trafficking in WIC food instruments or the sale of firearms, ammunition, explosives, or drugs in exchange for WIC food instruments; requiring individuals to be physically present in order to be certified for the WIC program benefits; requiring WIC participants to have income documentation; requiring States to take into consideration the prices stores charge for WIC foods in relation to prices charged by other stores in making vendor selections.

It allows States to keep any collections and recoveries of improperly paid benefits for use no later than the Federal fiscal year following recovery. It raises the maximum fine for trafficking and other violations under WIC from \$10,000 to \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the highlights of the child nutrition bill we are considering today. This is a good bipartisan bill that will strengthen the child nutrition programs. I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very, very strong support of this legislation to reauthorize WIC and make important changes, as was outlined by the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), in school nutrition programs.

It is a demonstrated fact, and I do not think anybody can contradict it, that those children who do not receive adequate nutrition in their early years will struggle throughout their lives.

We also know that hungry children cannot learn. The school lunch program was created actually to address the malnutrition of our Nation's soldiers. Staggering numbers of young men drafted to serve in World War II lacked the health and strength required to defend this country.

Today, we acknowledge that the education of our children is even more important for the future security of the United States, and thus we reaffirm our commitment to the child nutrition programs.

Perhaps the most crucial years for children to receive proper nutrition are from the time they are conceived through their preschool years. Recent studies have confirmed that significant growth occurs in early childhood, and if children lack the nutrition to develop fully, they will likely experience lifelong difficulties.

The special supplemental nutritional program for women, infants, and children, or WIC as it is better known, provides mothers with access to healthy foods and nutrition education when they are pregnant, and continues this assistance throughout the infancy and the early years of their children.

Once children are in school, the national School Breakfast and Lunch Program helps to ensure that children have the nutrition necessary to learn. It is only fitting that the effort to continue the Federal Government's dedication to the health of our children is and was bipartisan.

Throughout the years, Congress has united to strengthen these child nutrition programs by assessing the issues of meal standards, food safety, program eligibility, cost containment efforts, and accountability. The bill before us continues these efforts to enhance the nutrition programs while incorporating provisions to address the needs of today's children.

Many of these ideas were first articulated in the reauthorization legislation that was introduced by myself on behalf of the administration, H.R. 3666. In addition, the inclusion of many of the innovative changes in the legislation before us today was made possible by the tireless efforts of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Last year, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) introduced H.R. 3086, the Meals For Achievement Act, which called for the creation of universal breakfast program and the provision of nutrition support for after-school programs. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of that legislation. Through the diligence of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), these proposals are reflected now in H.R. 3874.

The importance of after-school programs to the safety of our children cannot be denied. A recent Justice Department study confirms that most juvenile crime is committed between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. That is why helping communities increase the number of after-school programs is a priority of the Clinton Administration and many Members of this Congress.

H.R. 3874 expands the Child and Adult Care Food Program to enable schools and community organizations serving at-risk teenagers after school to provide healthy snacks. Thus, these after-school provisions furnish an added incentive to young people to get off the streets and into positive programs that help put them on the path to successful, healthy futures and enterprises.

I am equally pleased that we were able to work together to include in H.R. 3874 a universal breakfast pilot program. Children miss breakfast for a variety of reasons, but they all need to start the day with a nutritious meal in order to be ready to learn.

Of course, we can only be sure that the pilot will take place if it is a mandatory program. Unfortunately, the language in H.R. 3874 only authorizes discretionary funding.

The Senate committee, however, approved by unanimous vote legislation that will authorize a mandatory universal breakfast pilot. Recently, the administration strongly endorsed the Senate's language. It is my hope that in conference the House will recede to the Senate's position on this matter.

Thus, we can be certain that universal breakfast programs will proceed and ultimately affirm that providing breakfast for all children is a means to ensure education success in this country.

□ 1430

Before I close, I must also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who have worked so closely with this side of the aisle to fashion legislation that all Members can support and support proudly. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3874, the "Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Amendments of 1998." This is a strong bipartisan bill that makes important changes to our nation's child nutrition programs.

While many Members contributed to this legislation, including Representative MARTINEZ, I particularly thank Congressman MIKE CASTLE. He has performed a tremendous job in putting together this legislation.

Congressman CASTLE already has outlined many of the key provisions of this legislation. Let me focus on several key provisions.

As a former member of the House Committee on Appropriations I know the WIC program is being closely monitored. We took all possible steps necessary to insure the integrity of this program. In addition to the provisions outlined by Congressman CASTLE, I added three provisions to H.R. 3874 to help reduce fraud and abuse.

One provision would require State WIC agencies to design and implement systems to identify recipients who might be participating at more than one site. We need to guard against the potential for participation at multiple WIC sites.

State WIC agencies also would have to identify vendors that have a high probability of program abuse and follow up with compliance investigations. Right now WIC agency oversight of vendors varies considerably from State to State, but identification and investigation of high-risk vendors should be at least a minimum standard.

A criminal forfeiture amendment provides that those convicted of trafficking face forfeiture of property associated with the trafficking. This is now the rule for the Food Stamp program.

I also strongly support the afterschool care provisions included in this legislation. Last year, the House passed H.R. 1818, the Juvenile Crime Control and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1997. This legislation authorized a variety of activities aimed at preventing juvenile crime.

Several of the witnesses who appeared before our Committee on the issue of juvenile crime spoke about the need for high quality afterschool care programs to provide educational and enrichment activities for youth during the hours when they are most likely to engage in delinquent activities. This legislation would support afterschool programs through federal reimbursement for snacks in afterschool care programs operated by schools, which have an educational or enrichment purpose. It also would reimburse for free snacks for at-risk children ages 12–18 in afterschool programs in low-income areas through the Child and Adult Care Food Program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also includes a variety of other provisions that streamline federal child nutrition programs and provide state and local providers additional flexibility in providing services to program participants. It is a good bill that deserves the support of all Members.

I encourage my Colleagues to support H.R. 3874.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, Congress should reject H.R. 3874, a bill reauthorizing the Women's, Infant, and Children's (WIC) program and other childhood nutrition programs, and the flawed redistributionist, welfare state model that lies behind this bill. Although the goals of this legislation are noble, the means toward achieving the goals embodied therein are unconstitutional and ineffective.

Providing for the care of the poor is a moral responsibility of every citizen, however, it is not a proper function of the Federal Government to plunder one group of citizens and redistribute those funds to another group of citizens. Nowhere in the United States Constitution is the Federal Government authorized to provide welfare services. If any government must provide welfare services, it should be State and local governments. However, the most humane and efficient way to provide charitable services are through private efforts. Among their other virtues, private charities are much more likely to provide short-term assistance rather than fostering long-term dependency upon government programs.

Mr. Speaker, I know that you, and many of my colleagues, understand that private charities are also much better able to target assistance to the truly needy than government programs, which are burdened with bureaucratic rules of eligibility, as well as procedures designed to protect the "due process" rights of recipients, which cannot be adequately changed to meet unique individual circumstances. Thus, many people who are genuinely needy do not receive needed help. In fact, more than 40 percent of all families living below the poverty level receive no government assistance. Private charities can also be more effective because they do not have to fulfill administrative requirements, such as the WIC program's rebate system, which actually divert resources from the needy.

Private charities are also able to place an emphasis upon reformation of personal behavior while not imposing the controls on personal life that government programs, such as WIC, impose on the program recipients. When a pregnant woman signs up to receive WIC vouchers, she is trading away a large amount of her personal freedom. Her choices of where to shop will be restricted to WIC-approved vendors and her choice of what foods to buy will be restricted to those foods which match the WIC nutrition specifications. WIC recipients are also required to participate in WIC parenting and nutrition classes.

As an OB/GYN I certainly recognize the importance of proper nutrition for pregnant women and young children. However, as a constitutionalist, I strenuously object to the federal government coercing pregnant women into accepting such services and restricting their choices of food products. The founders of this country would be flabbergasted if they knew that the federal government had monopolized the provisions of charitable services to low-income women, but they would be horrified if they knew the federal government was forbidding poor women from purchasing Post Raisin Bran for their children because some federal bureaucrats had determined that it contains too much sugar!

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the manufacture of foods such as Raisin Bran battle to get their products included in this program reveals the

extent to which WIC is actually corporate welfare. Many corporations have made a tidy profit from helping to feed the poor and excluding their competitors in the process. For example, thanks to the WIC program, the federal government is the largest purchaser of infant formula in the nation.

According to the Congressional Research Service, food vendors participating in WIC received 9.86 billion in Fiscal Year 1997—75% of the total funds spent on the WIC program! This fiscal year, producers of food products approved by the federal government for purchase by WIC participants are expected to receive \$10 billion dollars in taxpayer dollars! Small wonder the lobbyists who came to my office to discuss WIC were not advocates for the poor, but rather well-healed spokespersons for corporate interests!

Any of my colleagues who doubt that these programs serve the interests of large corporations should consider that one of the most contentious issues debated at Committee mark-up was opposition to an attempt to allow USDA to purchase non-quote peanuts (currently the only peanuts available for sale are farmers who have a USDA quota all other farmers are forbidden to sell peanuts in the US) for school nutrition programs. Although this program would have saved the American taxpayers \$5 million this year, the amendment was rejected at the behest of supporters of the peanut lobby. A member of my staff, who appropriately asked why this amendment could not pass with overwhelming support, was informed by a staffer for another member, who enthusiastically supports the welfare state, that the true purpose of this program is to benefit producers of food products, not feed children.

The main reason supporters of a free and moral society must oppose this bill is because federal welfare programs crowd out the more efficient private charities for two reasons. First, the taxes imposed on the American people in order to finance these programs leave taxpayers with fewer resources to devote to private charity. Secondly, the welfare state erodes the ethic of charitable responsibility as citizens view aiding the poor as the government's role, rather than a moral obligation of the individual.

The best way to help the poor is to dramatically cut taxes thus allowing individuals to devote more of their own resources to those charitable causes which better address genuine need. I am a cosponsor of HR 1338, which raises the charitable deduction and I believe Congress should make awakening the charitable impulses of the American people by reducing their tax burden one of its top priorities. In fact, Congress should seriously consider enacting a dollar-per-dollar tax credit for donations to the needy. This would do more to truly help the disadvantaged than a tenfold increase in spending on the programs in HR 3874.

In conclusion, Congress should reject HR 3874 because the programs contained therein lack constitutional foundation, allow the federal government to control the lives of program recipients, and serve as a means of transferring monies from the taxpayers to big corporations. Instead of funding programs, Congress should return responsibility for helping those in need to those best able to effectively provide assistance; the American people acting voluntarily.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3874, the Child Nutri-

tion and WIC Reauthorization Amendments of 1998. This bill not only reauthorizes the expiring WIC, Summer Food Service, State Administrative Expenses, and Commodity Assistance programs, it also makes some important improvements to them. We've increased State's flexibility in administering these programs, expanded eligibility and services for after school programs, and taken steps to reduce fraud in the WIC program. My colleagues have even managed to orchestrate a savings of \$69 million over five years. This is a good bipartisan bill that will help millions of children, but I think it could have gone farther.

There is something missing from the bill that would increase participation in the Summer Food Service Program. This bill removes many barriers for sponsors of the program, thus encouraging more organizations to join. Because of expanded outreach efforts by state agencies and anti-hunger groups, many more small community-based organizations and private non-profit institutions are eager to provide summer food service programs.

However, many of these organizations lack the resources to purchase needed equipments such as milk coolers, ovens, microwaves, serving utensils, and food storage equipment. They also need funds to advertise and promote their programs. These one-time, non-recurring costs are often more than small organizations can handle.

Over 80% of children who are eligible for this program remain unserved by it. It's not because there isn't a need for more summer food sponsors, and it's not because these kids aren't hungry. The Second Harvest National Food Bank Network recently found, among those food banks reporting seasonal changes in requests for emergency food, nearly half report that requests for emergency food for children increase during the summer months when school is out.

In my district in Cleveland, for example, 63% of the local charities reported an increase in the number of children requesting emergency food assistance during the summer. Over half of the kids requesting emergency food received free or reduced price school meals and are eligible for participation in the summer food service program, but only 11.3% actually participate. During school, these low-income children receive up to 1/2 of their nutrients from school meals. During the summer, they do not have access to school breakfasts or lunches.

Offering sponsors a boost to help them get started would be a relatively inexpensive way, especially given the savings from the bill, to encourage more organizations to establish summer food service programs. A grant program to help defer the one-time costs associated with beginning a summer food program would allow more organizations to participate in low-income and rural areas that are typically underserved by this program.

I had hoped to work with my friends on the other side of the aisle to bring a grant program like this back to the Summer Food Service program before we brought this bill to the floor. And while it is not a particularly expensive concept and even though no one seems to be philosophically or ideologically opposed to the idea, we were unable to resolve the issue to include it in this bill. I think that is unfortunate for the millions of kids for whom summer vacation means hunger instead of fun.

I'd like to thank the Food Research and Action Center for their support and tireless efforts to increase the reach and scope of programs like Summer Food Service. And I encourage my colleagues to continue our work on this issue. I think there is a lot more we can do for these kids. The Summer Food Service Program is one of the least known and most underutilized of the federal nutrition programs. There is no reason for so many children to be hungry and under-nourished during the summer when we could increase participation in the program by offering one-time grants to help more sponsors get started.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 3874, the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Amendments of 1998.

I have always been a strong supporter of WIC because it gives women and young children access to the foods necessary for healthy development. WIC provides specific nutritious foods to at-risk, income-eligible, pregnant, postpartum and breast feeding women, infants and children up to five years of age. WIC gives women and young children the means to obtain highly nutritious foods like iron-fortified infant formula, calcium-rich milk, eggs, juice, and cereal.

During pregnancy, one of the most fragile periods in a woman's life, WIC enhances dietary intake, which improves weight gain and the likelihood of a successful pregnancy. After birth, WIC continues to promote the health of infants and is responsible for reducing low birth weight and infant mortality. Children who participate in WIC receive immunizations against childhood diseases at a higher rate than children who are not WIC participants. WIC also helps to reduce anemia among children.

As we know, children receiving nutritious meals are in a better position to focus on their daily studies. Proper nutrition is an integral part of our children's educational experience. In fact, WIC has been linked to improved cognitive development among children. WIC children are more prepared to learn compared to those children who lack proper nutritionally balanced diets.

In short, WIC is supported by many people and continues to be a popular program. It yields tremendous returns on our investments and improves the health and well being of pregnant women, infants and children. I urge my colleagues to show their support for the WIC Program by voting in favor of H.R. 3874.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak on this important issue. I support this bill which will guarantee that families are able to access the food they need. In addition, this program will extend funding for state school lunch programs and provide low income families' children with a national food program.

H.R. 3874 reauthorizes this program through 2003 to allow the Women, Infants and Children (WIC) nutrition program provides nutrition, education and supplemental food to low-income pregnant and post-partum women, infants and children up to age five. These necessary services are provided free of charge to eligible individuals and families. This bill also contains a number of other provisions including ones that extend funding for administration expenses for the State school lunch program and reauthorize a national summer food program for children of low income families.

In my own homestate of Texas, in the 18th Congressional District, a total of 109,596 women, infants and children receive WIC services each month. This means that in Harris County, TX 12,917 pregnant women, 5,259 breast feeding mothers, 9,448 postpartum mothers, how have recently given birth, and 29,934 infants, and 52,038 children can receive the help that they need. One-seventh of the State of Texas' 683,000 WIC recipients reside in Harris County, TX.

This program is not as glamorous as others—the WIC program is formula, milk, juice, and bread. The majority of those served are poor infants and children, those who are most often overlooked. To cut the WIC program does not materially reduce the numbers of women, infants and children who are in need. This program is one of the best run, most efficient and effective programs that the Federal Government has initiated.

According to the Government Accounting Office, for every dollar spent on the WIC program the tax payer saves \$3.50. This is the reason the WIC Program received very strong bi-partisan support throughout its history.

We must continue to support this program. What can be more important than making sure our country's children are healthy and safe? I strongly support this bill and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3874, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, on that, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3874.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND EXPANSION OF HOMEOWNERSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 208) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding access to affordable housing and expansion of homeownership opportunities.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the priorities of our Nation should include providing access to affordable housing that is safe, clean, and healthy and expanding homeownership opportunities; and

(2) these goals should be pursued through policies that—

(A) promote the ability of the private sector to produce affordable housing without excessive government regulation;

(B) encourage tax incentives, such as the mortgage interest deduction, at all levels of government; and

(C) facilitate the availability of capital for homeownership and housing production, including by continuing the essential roles carried out by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and the Federal Home Loan Banks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

(Mr. LEACH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, this, I believe, is a non-controversial bill. It underscores principles critical to the American family—the desirability of achieving the dream of home ownership for as many Americans as conceivably possible.

On this front, there is some good news, and also some challenging circumstances. The good news is that home ownership is going up in America, almost 1 percent in the last 4 years, until today it reaches approximately 66 percent of the American public. The principal reason for this relates to lower interest rates caused by restrained monetary policy and the movement from a deficit to a surplus fiscal policy.

It also relates to aspects of tax policy, the importance of quasi-governmental institutions like Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac that have served as extraordinarily helpful intermediaries in housing finance, and to certain housing programs of the Federal Government itself.

But what this bill, and it is a small bill, does is simply underscore what are the great principles of American housing, and underscore it in such a way as to make it clear that this Congress is not going to be backed down from those principles, particularly the principle that relates to the interest deduction for home ownership mortgage loans.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing that this is an exceptionally modest bill, but also one that relates to a subject very important to the heart of the American people, I would urge its adoption at this time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have faced repeated requests from communities that I represent for action at the Federal level to