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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman form California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. PELOSI addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 2230

SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I am not much of a statistician, but when we are talking about children and nutrition, this is what I think it is all about. The opening statement of the National School Lunch Act of 1946 includes the words, ''It is hereby declared as a matter of national security to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children to provide for the establishment of nonprofit school lunch programs.''

Even in 1946, our Nation realized there was a significant need to invest in the health and diets of its citizens, most particularly its kids.

Since the implementation of the National School Lunch Act and the Food Stamp Act, these and other food assistance programs have received broad support from the people of this country and the results are in. We have gotten our money's worth. Successful health outcomes have resulted. Growth stunting has decreased 65-percent. Low birth weight has plummeted. Iron deficiency anemia among preschoolers has been dramatically reduced. These successes can be seen in the WIC program, the school lunch and breakfast programs, and the child and adult food care programs.

Now, some lawmakers in Washington want to significantly reduce the funds and fundamentally change the way we extend quality nutrition to kids and other deserving Americans. The proposal being debated that we have been discussing this evening would scrap several well-working nutrition programs, cut funding, and send the reduced amount back to the States. They call it block granting. I call it blockheaded.

The designers of this program intend for these block grants to reduce the Federal spending on domestic food aid, give the States more power. States would be allowed to consolidate and target the programs.

I am all for State power and flexibility. I think that is a good idea. But if this block granted proposal becomes law, many nutrition programs that we now have will have to compete against one another for the reduced funds that would be available. Imagine being the State administrator, forced to pick between programs for seniors versus programs for infants, school age children versus day-care kids. These are all worthy nutrition recipients, competing for support that under the proposal would be dramatically below what we have extended presently and for the past several years.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture released numbers just Monday that indicated my State, North Dakota, would alone see a total reduction of $53 million over the next 5 years. Now, this is a cut that goes far below any so-called bureaucratic or paperwork savings that they claim would result. This is taking meals from seniors, lunches from school children, milk from toddlers at day-care centers.

Certainly North Dakota under its block grant authority, like any other State, wants to do well by the nutrition for our citizens. I trust the State officials to look after that. But under this reduced funding level, cuts will be certain, meals will be withdrawn.

You know, at the age of 41 last year I became a father for the first time? I am now the parent of a 16-month-old beautiful little girl, and it has given me in particular an interest in what is available for day-care, because I know all over the country we got parents really worried about quality day-care and affordable day-care.

Last weekend I met about over a dozen parents and day-care providers in North Dakota, and they told me that the access they have to the child and adult food program, one of several, by the way, being eliminated under the block grant program, has been vitally important to them. They have written in fact across the State of North Dakota over 300 letters from day-care providers, and what they tell me says an awful lot about how ill-advised these program changes are.

Let me quote to you from these letters. One woman who provides day-care writes,

> The meals eaten at day-care are the healthiest meals some of our children have each day. I do not feel that the discretionary funding for children's nutrition programs will have a positive effect on our children. In fact, it may harm many. We would be in direct competition with other programs within our State that receive the funding.

A parent writes,

> Without the food program to assist her, my day-care provider, as well as many others, will not be able to keep taking care of the children and still make enough money to make ends meet. She has considered raising her prices to help make up the cost of assistance if the program is no longer available. If she does raise her hourly wage, some families will not be able to afford to pay her the price she requests.

These and other testimonials from those most directly affected show that consolidation of the day-care feeding programs are a terrible idea, they will raise costs for parents, they will reduce the quality of nutrition for our kids, and they must be stopped.

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

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

DON'T HURT THE CHILDREN

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I had a very, very important visit from my district. I had a visit from a very, very young kid, whose name is Jonathan Edwards. He is a kindergarten student. He is 6-years of age. He walked into my office and he had some little red buttons, and he pinned a little red sticker on each member of my staff. He walked into my office and he indeed stuck one on me. And it indicated ''Don't hurt the children.'' Don't hurt the kids.

I gave him a big hug and we talked about some of the things that were taking place in Baton Rouge, and we also talked about what is taking place here in Washington. He walked out of the office, Mr. Speaker, and I could not help but think about what is taking place right here in Washington, DC as this little kid tried to make some sense of what is taking place here in the midst of this debate.

I thought about Healthy Start, and I thought about the cut of $10 million in a program that is so important to our young people. I thought about the WIC Program, $25 million will be cut; 50 to 100 thousand expected mothers will be taken away from this program. I

thought about the fact there are so many babies that die, Mr. Speaker, after they are born, because their parents do not have proper prenatal care. And I was looking at little Jonathan, and it made me think what shameful condition in this country when we take money away from mothers who want to have productive children, who want to bring birth to kids who can live and who can survive.

Then I thought about educational cuts, $1.7 billion in educational programs, and I could not help but think about the $500 million that we cut in the program called Drug Free Schools and Communities. And how can we, Mr. Speaker, cut $500 million, totally eliminate drug free schools in communities, when drugs in our schools and communities are going up and not coming down?

What are we saying to our children? Just say no to drugs? Or just say no to drugs is the moron's answer to the drug problems? And it was that simple, we would not even need schools. We would simply tell kids, just say yes to math, just say yes to science. But that is not the answer to the drug problem. We must teach kids drug education.

Then I could not help but think about the fact we are cutting $100 million from elementary and secondary infrastructure, school infrastructure. We have jails and prisons in this country, Mr. Speaker, that are in better condition than our schools. You take a school in my own Parish, Red River Parish, where the ceilings are leaking everyday. Every time it rains, students cannot stay in the classroom because the ceilings are leaking, not to mention the fact that the air conditioner does not work during the summertime and the heat does not work during the wintertime.

This same Congress, just when we took away $100 million of money for infrastructure for schools, we just appropriated $10.5 billion for jails. So if you are a prisoner in this country you have great air condition, the ceilings do not leak, and you have an opportunity to be in a building that is built well and well maintained.

Then I thought about the $28 million from the Dropout Program that was cut. Realizing that 86 percent of the people in this country who are in jail are high school dropouts, there is a serious correlation between education and incarceration. But yet we find the need in this Congress to cut $28 million from the Dropout Program.

Then I thought about the summer jobs program. I guess that irked me almost the most, because I thought the Contract With America was to take people off of the welfare roles, but not to take kids off of the payrolls; to take innocent kids in the summertime who finished school, and all they have to do and look forward to is a summer job, to totally eliminate that program. Now we are going to have kids on the streets, more crime indeed. Kids who go and work during the summer will not be able to do it this summer if this rescission package stays as it is today. These kids take that money and buy their school clothes. Many of them help their parents.

Then I thought about, lastly, but certainly not least, the school lunch program. And I take a moment of personal privilege on the school lunch program because I am indeed a person who went through school and who benefitted from the school lunch program. And to think that this Congress would have the audacity and unmitigated gall to take school lunches away from innocent children, when in jails, when prisoners in jail today get three square meals a day. It is popular to feed a prisoner in this country, but it is not popular and is not correct to feed a child.

Then what really irks me, Mr. Speaker, at the time we take food out of the innocent kids' mouths, we give $1.2 billion in food aid to foreign countries. At the time we take away summer jobs, we give $2.3 billion to economically support other countries.

So I hope that my colleagues defend these children and defend what is right and take this opportunity to defeat this rescission package when it comes to the floor.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, since the other side has obviously a coordinated effort here to really have not just a series of 5-minute special orders, but a number of them, could we please be tight on the time? Because there are folks on this side of the aisle who want to keep in the spirit of the 1 hour here and 1 hour there. I would ask perhaps without a ruling form the Chair that, and I suppose Mrs. CLAYTON is in charge, that you could be a little tighter on your time so we could have the chance to talk, unless you want to yield some time to us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In response to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, the Chair would state for Members who have spoken this evening on both sides of the aisle, the Chair has attempted to remind them of that 5-minute limit, and will continue to do so.

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

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

EFFECT OF CONTRACT WITH AMERICA ON CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, if passed, the Republican contract's war on children will have a devastating impact on New York City.

The Republican contract would cut assistance for children across the board including large reductions in: school lunches and breakfasts, nutrition programs, food stamps, medical care, education, and housing programs.

In the contract's plan to cap the food Stamp Program, New Yorkers would lose $300 million in the first year alone. A food stamp reduction of that magnitude could prevent as many as 190,000 children from receiving assistance.

In the contract's plan to lower child nutrition costs, New York State stands to lose $70 million in assistance by 1996, and $600 million by the year 2000.

This contradicts the overwhelming evidence that child nutrition programs lower the possibility of low birthweight and anemia in children.

In the contract's plan to eliminate the school lunch and school breakfast programs, over 800,000 children in New York City will be forced to pay more for breakfast and lunch.

I would really like to know where are they going to get that money to eat.

Schools will have to choose either to cut back on the quality of food or simply not provide lunches for children who need to eat.

There is even talk that the Summer Meals Program might be eliminated altogether.

Mr. Speaker, even President Richard Nixon supported school nutrition programs when he stated, ''A child ill fed is dulled in curiosity, lower in stamina, distracted from learning.''

These cuts are callous and mean-spirited. They not only affect child nutrition programs, but they also affect many other well deserving programs.

The contract would cut Medicaid and Medicare by $33 billion over the next 7 years.

In an effort to dismantle Federal nutrition programs, the Republicans voted to expand the profits of four U.S. drug corporations of up to $1 billion by elminating a competitive bidding process for infant formula. As a result, these four companies can raise their prices and pad their profits.

What does that say about our family values?

The Republicans voted to cut $1.3 billion in heating assistance to needy families while at the same time voting for a $6.5 million pork-barrel visitor center with a complete heating system for a Republican's district in Oregon.

What does that say about our family values?

The Republicans voted to eliminate 185,000 meals a day for children in family day care homes while at the same time voted to continue spending tens of billions of dollars on the F–22 fighter.

What does that say about our family values?

It has become very clear that the Republicans are forcing children to pay