pernicious than affirmative action. It has changed America from a country grounded in individual rights and merit to one where justice is determined by what is done for, and to, one's racial or ethnic group.

Originally affirmative action was designed to protect men and women who had actually suffered direct discrimination. But now, these laws are used to set aside jobs, contracts, and seats in our best colleges.

Bill Bennett notes that with the helping hand of Federal bureaucrats and an activist judiciary we have actually regressed in race relations because, ''you have a combination of resegregation, reseparation, and pseudopsychological nonsense about how skin color means a different identity psychologically.''

Mr. Speaker, discrimination is wrong period. It is always wrong and affirmative-action is nothing more than discrimination with the Federal stamp of approval. For the sake of every American it is finally time to end the cult of victimization. It really is past time to end affirmative action as we know it.

REPUBLICAN WELFARE PLAN HURTS CHILDREN

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, out of this debate has come a paradox—a puzzle. The Republicans say that they can save $70 billion through welfare reform. They say they can save that amount and increase spending, at the same time. We say that $70 billion in reduced spending is a cut. They want to use the money saved to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans. We want to use the money cut to give a break to the children of America.

Who is right? Their bill ends entitlements; sharply cuts back aid to disabled children; allows below inflation growth for food stamps; puts a 5-year spending freeze on the largest cash program; reduces foster care; punishes fatherless children; and cuts off benefits after 5 years. They have the power to force this plan on the American people. Whatever piece of this puzzle you pick, the result is the same. They say they are saving money, but they are sacrificing children.

□ 1015

THE DEFINITION OF BIODIVERSITY

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, what is biodiversity?

Biodiversity is the overwhelming diversity of life. Each species has a definite and specific role to play in sustaining the dynamics of ecosystem processes as producers, consumers, decomposers, parasites, and predators, and each species occupies a specific niche.

Biodiversity refers to the harmony and tension that exist between all species and ecological systems on the plant. Remove or sufficiently damage one of the components and the entire structure is weakened.

The value of biodiversity to humanity goes far beyond economic utility. Humans are a part of the diversity of life. We rely on it to sustain our existence on this plant. We cannot continue to exist without interaction with other species. We rely on diversity for the air we breathe and the water we drink. The value of biodiversity lies not only in the utilization value of resources, it lies in the intrinsic value of its ability to support life.

CHARGES AGAINST SPEAKER GINGRICH ARE NOT FRIVOLOUS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON is right this morning when she says that the charges against Speaker GINGRICH are not frivolous. The fact is from across the country the evidence and the calls for an investigation are mounting up. In this last week the Baltimore Sun, the Boston Globe, the Los Angeles Times, and the Chicago Tribune all raised questions about Speaker GINGRICH'S actions as Speaker and his service in the House of Representatives, raised questions about whether or not he has violated the gift rules in receiving gifts from corporate interests, whether or not he has violated the use of his staff in the production of his book and production of his TV show and his classroom, whether or not he violated the rules of this House by peddling his tapes on the floor of the House.

These are serious questions. Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON, the chairman of the Ethics Committee, is quite right. These are not frivolous, but they also are so serious that they should call for a special counsel to provide for an independent investigation of whether or not the Speaker is peddling his office, his position, and his power.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S CAN-NOTS

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, as the misinformation swirls around the welfare debate, it is important to remember a few principles that have passed the test of time. Our great President Abraham Lincoln had a list of ''Lincoln's Can-Nots.'' Mr. Speaker, here are just a few:

You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

But, Mr. Speaker, the failure that we call a welfare system snubs these principles. It saps initiative; it does for its victims what they should do for themselves; its defenders stir up class hatred to protect it. It replaces principle with pork, and confuses reason with regulation. As a result, children are born into a world without hope or independence.

Mr. Speaker, answers start with principles. Our welfare reform bill works because it is based on solid, enduring principles. Lincoln would have approved.

THE PHYSICS OF SCHOOL LUNCHES

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a simple law of physics: ''For every action there is an equal, but opposite reaction.'' Although it is not a difficult concept to grasp, I would like to offer an example to help my colleagues who may not understand.

Last Friday, I had the opportunity to visit two schools in my district to observe the large number of children participating in the School Lunch Program. My district has been hard hit by a base closure, defense downsizing, and high unemployment.

At both Alessandro and Monterey Elementary Schools, over 80 percent of the children participate in the School Lunch Program. These schools are typical of the numbers of students whose nutritional needs are supplemented by the School Lunch Program in San Bernardino.

If we skimp on meals for hungry school children, we may save money in one area. But those savings will be lost due to increased medical expenses for undernourished children and higher education costs as children are held back in grades because they are not learning at the expected rate, unable to concentrate on an empty stomach. Our local schools may also lose much needed aid due to increased absenteeism due to sick, malnourished children having to stay home.

Throughout the balanced budget amendment debate in this House, my Republican colleagues took to the floor stating that unless we passed that one piece of legislation, our children and grandchildren would face a grim future. What could be more grim than 2 million children going hungry because congressional Republicans cut the School Lunch Program?

These may be simple cuts to make today, but the chain reaction set in motion could be disastrous for our country. Cutting school lunches is not the answer to this country's economic problems.

Let us be sure that we fully understand the opposite reaction to the action of cutting school lunches.