

the heaviest burdens for their pet projects.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican recently proposed budget cuts inflicts even more damage to programs for children. Their plan has proposed:

A \$10 million cut for Healthy Start—a program which gives needed pre-natal care to expectant mothers.

A \$25 million cut for the Women, Infant, and Children [WIC] program that would knock 100,000 expectant women and newborn children out of a program which provides badly needed nutrition assistance.

A \$100 million cut for foster care.

Mr. Speaker, why was there not a single Defense Department or pork barrel project considered?

The petrified pork civilian marksmanship program still wastes \$2 million a year for free ammunition and recreational shooting.

What ever happened to America's family values? This plan is headed in the wrong direction.

FOOD FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN MUST HAVE PRIORITY OVER SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

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

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the children of Alabama, like those of the rest of the Nation, depend on the food programs of the Federal Government. Some come from very needy families who cannot afford to feed their children.

In my district, one of the poorest in the Nation, these food programs for kids make the difference between health and sickness, or between the ability to concentrate or become distracted from their class studies. These programs make the difference between a successful student and one who fails.

In the 7th district of Alabama, nearly two-thirds of students served cannot afford to pay. Even field kids who cannot afford to pay for their breakfast meal under Federal guidelines receive food. Mr. Speaker, this is a catastrophe. We must take care of our kids. We must protect our kids. Cutting food programs will literally take food out of the mouths of young kids. This we cannot afford to do.

Mr. Speaker, we must prepare for the future. Those of us who wish to balance the budget do not wish to balance the budget on the backs of kids. There are so many other ways and methods we could make cuts in order to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, last year we spent \$4 billion defending Japan. Japan paid the United States \$2 billion of that \$4 billion we spent. We will spend \$2.4 billion over the next five years that will be taken from the food program for the support of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, last year we spent \$18 billion defending Europe. We will take

\$2.4 billion from the food program over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, one year of defending Germany or defending China or defending the world will support the food program in this country for 5 years. I submit that we should take priorities, and that the number one priority should be our children.

Mr. Speaker, most of us would love to balance the budget. Each one of us, regardless of our party, believe in balancing the budget, but we cannot balance it at the expense of our children. I am opposed to including children's nutrition programs in block grant form. I am opposed, because I realize that, like my State, which is a deficit State, that money will be used for other purposes, directly or indirectly.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, exactly how that would happen. If the money is sent directly to the State, and it is not earmarked just solely for food programs, but for other indirect costs associated with administering that program, then that money will be spent for highways, it will be spent for roads and bridges, it will be spent for other programs, and it will happen in this manner.

The money will go to the States, earmarked for the administration of the food program. Instead of buying food supplies, that money will be used to pay salaries of workers. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the Federal program pays for the food supplies, and the State program matches it by paying salaries of the workers.

I am certain that the State will not pay the salaries of the workers. Therefore, the money that ordinarily will go for food supplies will go towards partially paying the salaries of the workers, and the workers' salaries that have been paid by the State, what will happen to that money? Mr. Speaker, you know and I know that it will be used to build highways, to build bridges, to repair roads, or for any other emergency that may occur.

I have been in the State government for 18 years. We have many trust funds in the State of Alabama. I have seen us raid those trust funds for other purposes than those intended by the fund itself, so I know what will happen. I suggest it will happen every day, all across America. There will not be just 50 programs, but every State will have a program. That program, Mr. Speaker, would not be sufficient to feed the children, to feed the kids, to feed the students in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the children, the kids, the students in this country deserve our very best. They deserve to be treated better than we treat them, and they deserve to be treated in terms of priority above the defense of Japan and above the defense of Europe.

IN THE WORLD OF NEWT GINGRICH, WE TURN OUR BACKS ON CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for organizing this time. We are all indebted to the people of North Carolina for your leadership on issues of equity, such as this.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot protest enough what is really going on right now in this people's House of Representatives. I hope there are some parents out there who have put their children to bed and are listening to tonight's discussion. If your child eats breakfast at school, eats a hot school lunch, eats at day care while you work, or has cereal or milk or orange juice purchased with WIC coupons, or eats any food from a food bank, perhaps at the end of the month when money is tight, or has a meal that is purchased with food stamps, and I know that food stamps do not just help people who receive welfare payments, but also help millions of full-time workers to make ends meet, if your child uses any of these, your child is at risk.

The new Republican majority in this House is waging a full-scale war on America's children. The first goal of this war is to cripple the effort to end hunger among America's children, and that is a cruel move. Thus far, Republicans have staged this battle on two fronts: first, in their welfare reform bill, the Personal Responsibility Act.

That bill turns all Federal child nutrition services into State block grants. I have already said that many of the children who benefit today are not even on welfare, but that does not seem to matter. Now, the idea of block grants is not all bad. We have other block grants for community services and community development that go to the States and work well. But look again. This is not just a shift in who runs the current nutrition services, it is really a dangerous shell game.

The Republicans washed their hands of any responsibility for the welfare of America's children, shifted that responsibility to the States, and at the same time cut billions of dollars needed by those States to adequately feed those children.

The second front of this war is the rescissions bill which was approved by the Committee on Appropriations just today. The Republicans today cut \$25 million from the WIC program. WIC provides nutrition to pregnant women that reduces the risk of having low-birthweight babies, thereby saving heartbreak and billions of dollars. WIC helps mothers buy infant formula for their babies, milk and juice for their preschool children.

These are a child's formative years, when good nutrition is crucial. Today's cut is just the beginning. Republicans

expect to cut at least \$10 billion from Federal aid for childhood nutrition. It is a total myth that these cuts are being made to reduce the deficit.

The Republicans are willing to hurt children so they can buy fantasy projects like the Star Wars antiballistic missile system and so they can shovel out massive tax breaks to the very wealthiest of Americans. They want to give \$55 billion in tax cuts to families with more than \$200,000 of income per year.

Mr. Speaker, children cannot vote or make political contributions, so they are being trashed. It is shameful. The health of children should be one of the first priorities of every Member of Congress. We are supposed to be building a better Nation, but in the world of NEWT GINGRICH, we will shamefully throw that responsibility to the States, then cut the dollars that the States need to meet it.

In the world of NEWT GINGRICH, we will turn our backs on children. That is a terrible way to invest in our future.

WE CANNOT BALANCE THE BUDGET ON THE BACK OF THE NATION'S SMALLEST AND WEAKEST CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to again raise my voice on behalf of my constituents and in behalf of America's children.

My conscience and the conscience of the Nation tell me that the unprincipled and unreasonable cuts to long-standing child nutrition programs proposed by my Republican colleagues are simply insensitive and yes they are immoral.

Those advocating these cuts are prepared to disregard the very health and nutritional well-being of some of America's poorest children.

While resisting lobby reform that would restrict the ability of high-rolling lobbyists to wine and dine without regulation Members of Congress and their staffs at posh, Washington restaurants, nutrition-cut advocates are prepared to literally snatch food from the mouths of the most vulnerable among us.

Mr. Speaker, included with various assaults on child nutrition contained in title 5 of H.R. 4 is a proposal to eliminate competitive bidding on infant formula purchases under existing programs.

According to the Department of Agriculture, competitive bidding saved the states one-billion-dollars in 1994, helping them feed an additional one-point-five-million infants * * * better fed babies are healthier babies * * * and healthier babies consume far fewer health care resources.

So the cost-benefit analysis is clear * * * Federal infant feeding programs—

as currently administered—are a huge success, period.

Now you can bet the GOP proposal has the big formula producers very happy, but what horrible consequences await our Nation's babies born to poor mothers?

And what about cuts to school lunch and breakfast programs?

In my hand, I have a letter I received last month from both the dean of Tufts University Medical School and the President of the American Academy of Pediatrics.

Together, they represent a non-partisan group of medical educators and pediatricians known as the Physicians Committee on Childhood Hunger.

Mr. Speaker, these physicians—who have dedicated their lives to caring for all our Nation's children—share my grave concerns about proposed block-granting of child nutrition programs.

They write, and I quote, "Proposals to block grant these programs, remove Federal nutrition standards, and reduce available funding, all pose a direct threat to the well-being of American children."

Cutting the budget deficit they add, "at the expense of the Nation's children . . . is unacceptable."

Unacceptable in deed, Mr. Speaker. We can surely do better than that.

In my home State of Texas alone, again according to the Department of Agriculture, these mean-spirited cuts to school and pre-school programs will reduce available funds by more than \$65 million in fiscal year 1996.

And Texas' children would suffer more than \$671 million worth of cuts through fiscal year 2000.

Nationwide, poor and hungry babies and kids would be forced to go without a whopping \$7.3 billion of healthy, nutritious food through fiscal year 2000.

Yes, Government must become more efficient and Members of Congress from both parties must come to terms with a growing national debt that also threatens the futures of our children and grandchildren.

But I for one, Mr. Speaker, refuse to go quietly while some in this body seek to balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's smallest and weakest citizens while tax cuts for the strongest and best fed among us are being considered. Don't Hurt the Kids!

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter for the RECORD.

(The letter referred to follows:)

TUFTS UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
February 17, 1995.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN JACKSON-LEE: We wish to share with you an important message concerning child nutrition from physicians representing every state in the nation.

Deans of medical schools, public health schools, and members and officers of the American Academy of Pediatrics are working together as the "Physicians Committee on Childhood Hunger," the Committee's purpose is to insure that American children do not experience increased hunger and mal-

nutrition as the result of proposed policy changes now before Congress.

The Committee is a nonpartisan medical group, united in the belief that it would be medically unwise for Congress to weaken existing federal food and nutrition programs that have been carefully developed over three decades. Proposals to block grant these programs, remove federal nutrition standards, and reduce available funding, all pose a direct threat to the well-being of American children.

Whatever steps Congress takes to address federal budget deficits, doing so at the expense of the nation's children—many of whom already suffer from preventable insults to their health—is unacceptable. We look forward to working with Congressional leaders from both parties to maintain and strengthen these critical federal food programs.

Sincerely,

MORTON A. MADOFF, M.D.,
Dean, Tufts University
School of Medicine

GEORGE COMERCI, M.D.,
President, American
Academy of Pediatrics

PHYSICIANS COMMITTEE ON CHILDHOOD
HUNGER

WILL CONGRESS PRODUCE MORE HUNGRY
CHILDREN?

For nearly fifty years Congress has shown a bipartisan commitment to alleviate the worst of human suffering in our nation, especially hunger. Now radical new proposals could end this commitment. If adopted they would weaken every U.S. nutrition program—jeopardizing school lunches for young children, hot meals for the elderly, and nutritional supplements for infants.

One proposal in the "Contract with America" would cut or cripple the very anti-hunger programs that Republicans and Democrats in Congress developed. It would end all federal nutrition programs, replacing them with reduced grants to the states. The problem? Deep cuts in anti-hunger programs at a time when hunger already threatens millions of Americans, especially children. The consequences would be unacceptable.

1. DENYING ADEQUATE FOOD TO CHILDREN CAN
PRODUCE LIFELONG DAMAGE

In today's dollars-and-cents climate, everything has a cost. But the costs of a hungry childhood are excessive. Even a period of mild malnutrition can have lifelong effects.

A growing body of scientific evidence reveals that children are far more susceptible to the harmful effects of nutrient deprivation than previously understood. What was once considered relatively mild undernutrition can produce deficits that last a lifetime. And once physical growth and cognitive development are impaired, the damage can be irreversible. Children may carry this damage throughout their schooling and into the workforce. The price of this tragedy is paid by everyone: children who cannot reach their potentials, workers who are not as productive, a nation that is not as competitive.

It makes no sense to let this occur. Hunger is morally offensive and economically unwise.

2. CHILDREN CANNOT FIND FOOD IN SHRINKING
PUBLIC BUDGETS

Right now, federal nutrition programs precisely pinpoint people who need help. Kids have to qualify for food, but once they do, they get it. Proposals now before Congress would change this.

Funding cuts and block grants would remove access to federal food programs for millions of poor children. In their place, fifty