

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, we will be voting on Wednesday on a major rescission. We will be voting to cut the spending for many programs that many of our people have learned to depend upon. Whether or not they should be depending on these programs, whether or not the Federal Government should be in those areas or not is a matter of debate, but if we cut these programs and then we spend the money, not on their benefit by bringing down the Federal deficit, which is the purpose behind cutting spending supposedly, but instead allow that money to be taken from the United States Treasury and sent to Wall Street speculators who went to Mexico to receive high returns on their investment or the Mexican elite, which is a corrupt elite that have betrayed their country time and again, we ourselves will be betraying our people in the same way that Mexican elite has been betraying their own people.

This bailout is a crime against our own people, and on top of that, it will not work. One can see the nature of this crime by the fact that here we are talking about the transferring of billions of dollars, American taxpayers' dollars, without so much as a vote of Congress.

The last time I heard, money was not supposed to be spent in this country unless the elected Representatives of the people voted for it. This is a travesty. It should and it will be stopped.

MORE ON THE MEXICAN BAILOUT

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the bailout, the Mexican bailout, there was no vote in this body on the transfer of those funds. In fact, when the President of the United States turned to Congress and saw that there was no support in Congress for this \$40 billion, potentially \$40 billion expenditure, he proceeded in what I consider an antidemocratic fashion to scheme and to plot in what could be a legal way of taking billions of our dollars and sending it to Mexico and spending it on the purposes he intended, meaning the bailing out of Wall Street speculators and basically lining the pockets of a corrupt Mexican elite so that the system will not break down in Mexico.

Well, perhaps it would be good if the current Mexican elite, which is corrupt, which has been antidemocratic, perhaps it would be good if that power structure did break down and that the people of Mexico at long last would be given a chance for true democracy and honest government, because the grip of their oppressor would have been broken.

We have a chance to try to put an end to this. Already \$3 billion has been spent. It is up to Congress now to do

everything that we possibly can to stop the spending of that money, mainly because—OK, it is wrong but also it will not work. It is not going to save Mexico.

Sending—you know, pouring money—it is the old adage, sending good money after bad is not a way to make things right. It will just make things worse. In Mexico, it will not work.

What is needed down there is a change. It needs change, basic change, and by us subsidizing the status quo by spending billions of dollars, we will not see that change come.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. The gentleman, perhaps like myself, has heard the arguments if we do not give this money to Mexico, there will be a financial catastrophe in Mexico and we hear that oftentimes here in the halls of Congress and we have heard the administration—in fact, recently Mr. Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank and the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Rubin, used this. And frankly I think it is sort of a scare tactic because a recent Wall Street Journal properly debunks that whole idea that there would be a financial catastrophe.

From early December through mid-February, stock markets in emerging countries that undertook significant pro-markets reforms, the ones you are talking about, and sound money reforms survived quite nicely during the so-called global crisis that the currency has just been through. Stock markets in Singapore, Chile, and the Czech Republic were essentially flat during that period. Emerging nations with partial or faltering reforms, including Brazil and Hungary, however, did indeed suffer mightily during the Mexican breakdown.

So, in other words, private global investment capital is discerning and mobile. It knows where it is investing its money. It knows a good deal from a bad deal and it will not be intimidated by disaster scenarios conjured up by financial officials like Chairman Greenspan and Secretary Rubin.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Reclaiming my time, every time we try to cut the budget around here, every time we say, Let us not spend Federal money in this area, let us cut the deficit, we are always told, My goodness, there is going to be a catastrophe, people are going to starve, there are going to be babies in the street, it is going to be horrible.

But you know what, most of these scare tactics that are being thrown out are just absolutely wrong and the people who are talking that way know they are wrong but they are using a tactic to get us to spend the taxpayer's dollar to line their own pockets. This is not contrary to what we have experienced here at home. But let us take a look at that.

If we are going to spend money to stabilize the currencies, what about Russia? Isn't that also an important country? We could be spending hun-

dreds of billions of dollars to stabilize their currency. After all, they have got nuclear weapons. What if chaos erupts in Russia?

This is a formula for the United States to be spending hundreds of billions of dollars to protect other people's currencies, and do you know what that means? That means our currency will come under attack. That means our currency will come under attack. That means people will sense that our currency no longer is strong because we are spending money from a stabilization fund meant to protect our currency that now is protecting these foreign interests who basically are big money guys and rich elitists in other countries, and what happens?

We have found that since the Mexican bailout and the defeat of the balanced budget amendment, that our own dollar is now under attack. This is unconscionable. It has already cost American people too much. It is a disgrace. We have got to act to stop this.

ON THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I probably will not take the whole 60 minutes, much to your relief and others, but I would like to take some time here to discuss some matters that concern me, some of which will be addressed in the rescission this week and later those that will come before us in the welfare reform bill proposed by the Republican Members of this Congress.

First of all, let me just say that it is pretty well documented now and I think people have come to understand that the welfare reform bill holds major, major cuts to populations that are very vulnerable in this American society and especially with those cuts with respect to nutrition programs for school children and for newborn infants and for children in child care settings. Specifically, some \$7 billion are cut out of nutrition programs that serve the women's, infants' and children's program and the school lunch programs.

Now, many of my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have come to the floor and suggested from time to time that they are not cutting anything, that they are simply slowing the growth, but the fact of the matter is that they are removing a little over \$7 billion from these programs over the next 5 years, and that means that the people who are administering these programs at the local level, because that is where these programs are run, will have to decide whether fewer children receive a school lunch or whether they will receive a smaller school lunch or whether they will receive it fewer days a week than they would

otherwise, because this money is simply not sufficient to keep up with the current—the current—demand on these programs. And of course, if the economy should go into any kind of downturn, as more and more people become eligible for these programs because they have lost their jobs in the economic downturn, there will be no money to provide for those children and those programs.

The program also, and you will start to see the linkage here, that the Republicans also cut the moneys for the women's, infants' and children's program. Again, they will argue it is block granted. Again, they will argue it can be used more efficiently, but the fact of the matter is that the funding is incapable of keeping up with the current demand with a case load that unfortunately, unfortunately in this country, continues to grow, and that is, women who are pregnant, that are certified to be at medical risk of either not being able to carry the pregnancy to term and thereby giving it very extensive risks to a low-birth-weight baby being born.

We know from all of the academic studies and scientific studies that have been done over the last 20 years that should a low-birth-weight baby be born, a baby generally under 5.5 pounds, that that baby suffers a dramatic increase in the likelihood of mental or physical disabilities or other complications, medical complications at the time of birth. That baby can very easily cause the increase, because of the intensive and increased medical attention at the time of birth, that baby can cause an expenditure in the hundreds of thousands of dollars over a very short period of time to try to get the birth weight of the child up and to get the child functioning properly, to deal with the problems of the lungs, the respiratory problems that come from low-birth-weight babies as they are born. If the baby is very low birth weight, of course the complications become much more dramatic and the costs much more dramatic.

Interestingly enough, though, what we have found following these children over an extended period of time is that when you return them home from the hospital to the parents who now have a healthy child, a child that is up to par here in terms of its birth weight and it is looking healthy here, that many other problems continue to linger with these children, that these children now, as we track them, are 30 to 40 percent more likely to come in and need special education, remedial costs all throughout the early years of education.

So these problems do not end. Their problems do not cease, and yet we know that if we get them back up and if we were not cutting the WIC programs, that we have a dramatically, a dramatically increased opportunity of raising the birth weight of this child, of having this pregnancy go to term and having this child be a healthy,

bouncy baby at the time of birth and not suffer all of these tragedies for the family, for the child, and eventually the expenses for the taxpayer.

But what are we doing now after 20 years of treating this population, we have now decided that we are going to turn our backs on this population and cut the funding to this most vulnerable, vulnerable group of people in our society, and something that is clearly preventable with a matter of a few dollars a week, because what has a few dollars a week done? What it does is it provides for medical screening for the pregnant mother.

At that time we try to tell them, do not engage in the use of alcohol, do not smoke during pregnancy because it can have a dramatic impact and unfortunately a bad impact on the fetus and the baby when it is born, and we also try to get them to understand nutrition.

□ 1445

And in that light, we provide for them high-protein foods, foods high in iron and other supplements that we know can have a very dramatic impact on the likelihood that this nutritional risk that the woman suffers from can be reversed and we can have a healthy pregnancy at the outset.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am delighted that the gentleman from California has taken this time, because I think there are a lot of myths going on. My understanding is that many offices are being flooded with phone calls because somebody on the radio told them that they were wrong.

But you do not have to be a rocket scientist to figure out Members of Congress cannot say we are delivering all these savings, but of course we are not cutting anything. It does not figure.

And I know the gentleman worked on the same reports that have seen when he chaired the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families that showed constantly over and over and over again every dollar spent by the Federal Government for immunizations, for WIC, for child feeding programs, we got back over and over and over again. It was one of the best investments we can make.

So I think the gentleman's point about cutting this, or even cutting the increase in this, without having it driven by the need I just think is outrageous, because it is very shortsighted and we are going to see very, very long-term spending.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman. And we both had the honor to chair the Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families in previous Congresses. It is interesting that they try to portray to the public that there essentially will be no cuts in these programs affecting the children, what have you, and yet they are also telling everybody that they cut all this money out so they can afford a tax cut

to the wealthiest 1 percent of the people in the country.

If there are no savings and no cuts, how do you pay for the tax cut? They say that they pay for the tax cut by the savings that they have made. You serve on the Committee on Armed Services. If you were to say to Congressman CUNNINGHAM, who serves, I believe, on the Committee on Armed Services with you. And he says this is not a cut, we are simply reducing the growth in spending. If you were to tell him that you were going to take the armed services down to current services to maintain this current fighting force next year and the year after, taking into account inflation and mission growth and all the other things that are taking place, and you told him that you were going to take away the money that would allow that, would he say, "That is a cut" or would he say, "That is not so bad; it is slowing the growth"?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You are setting me up. We would have to get a very large ladder and a scrapper and we would have to scrape him off the ceiling. He would be so angry that we would even think about cutting defense. In fact, they are yelling that defense is not high enough, even though defense is more than almost every other Nation on the planet is spending on defense added together, but that is still not enough. And, therefore, they are willing to go after these vulnerable populations.

I must say in my district I have not found anybody who agrees with these cuts. I have not found anyone who thinks these cuts are a great idea in order to give some fat cats who can pay \$50,000 a plate for dinner, to give them a break. They do not feel that you take it from the most vulnerable and give it to the guys who have done the best. That is not America.

What I am hoping is that people who do agree with these cuts would not only write me but send me their picture. And I would hope that you would ask the same thing. I would like to have a board back here. I want to see what these people look like. They do not look like any Americans that I know.

And, really, there is a lot of flimflammy and a lot of smoke being blown around here. But the bottom line is, as the gentleman from California is saying, when you blow away the smoke, the children are going to be hurt.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentlewoman is exactly right, because the fact of the matter is that if you take the cuts in school lunch programs, you are talking roughly about 2 million children that would have been served over that period of time, those 5 years, that simply will not be served because the programs will not have the money.

The notion is to suggest, again, that somehow local school districts will make up that money. The fact is that

the local school districts do not have that kind of money. And in our State they have been taking money from the School Lunch Program to do other things with. That is why we have a National School Lunch Program, because we knew that the politics was the most difficult at the local level and moneys were diverted to other purposes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Could I ask the gentleman another question? I think it is good to clear the airways that are cluttered with a lot of noise. The other issue being the women, infants and children's programs. And I know that we have worked very hard to get the best deal on formula we have ever seen. And no one that I am aware of has been complaining that that program has been mismanaged or anything else. To now see it broken up and sent out to 150 different States, when I believe and the gentleman from California knows about this, we have saved about a billion dollars just in the contracting with infant formula people.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentlewoman is quite correct. What we found out, unfortunately, is that, this never ceases to amaze me, but we do have very upstanding members of our communities and corporate members of our community who are fully prepared to rip off the taxpayers.

And what we found at one point was that a number of formula companies were charging very excessive rates for the formula for the newborn infants in this program, so we went to a program of bidding and making them compete on a national basis for these contracts and it dramatically lowered the cost of the formula about a billion dollars. And that was able to be plowed back into extending the number of infants that can be served.

Interestingly enough, in the bill that we will be considering, although this was a proposal by, I believe, the now chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], that we tried to make sure that this bidding would continue and that amendment was rejected in the committee.

So now we have the ability to see people negotiate contracts and, as I said, unfortunately, one of the sad things in our job from time to time is that we find out that there are professional people, well-educated people, and a lot of other people, who are fully prepared to rip the Federal Government off for their own narrow gains. And now the likelihood of that happening again is substantially increased and the loss of these savings and the loss of nutrition to the newborn infants and the babies.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Might I ask the gentleman another question, because I figure in a way maybe our dialog here can straighten out some of these things. There is so much disinformation around.

While I chaired the Committee on Children, Youth and Families, I do not believe we ever had one person come in

and complain, one person, about the management of the feeding programs for children and for WIC and for others. And I was wondering about the gentleman's experience when he was there. In other words, I am going through that old adage, "If it isn't broken, don't fix it."

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentlewoman is quite correct. There has been very few, if any, complaints about the management of this program. The WIC program is essentially run at the local level. We simply reimburse the States for the formula and for the food that they provide for the pregnant women and for the newborn infants.

It is run by State WIC directors and local WIC people in the counties that come together for this purpose. And there is unanimity. People like the way the program is being run now. And that is why the Congress, even during the Reagan years and the Bush years, there has been a steady trend toward full participation, 100 percent participation in WIC, because both Republicans and Democrats and Governors and Senators and Congresspeople and local county health directors and medical directors, they all like the way this program is running.

Now, we are using the issue of a block grant so we can slice the funding. It is a ruse, it is camouflage to cover up what is actually going on. It is interesting in the Committee on Education and Labor, the Republicans selected five witnesses. They selected the witnesses. I do not think we were allowed to have a witness from the Democratic side; maybe one. And all five witnesses said, "Leave the program alone. Leave it alone."

The only problems we have had in this program is from time to time when people from the private sector have come in and ripped the program off with stale meals and old meals, bad food, mislabeled commodities, phony formula. Those kinds of problems; not from the public sector but, from people from the private sector who are trying to rip the program off and make ill-gotten gains at the expense of the children.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. And we have aggressively gone after that.

Mr. MILLER of California. And that is minimal at this stage; 10 or 15 years ago it was a major problem, but because of the changes that have been made historically on a bipartisan basis with Senator DOLE and Congressman GOODLING leading the Republican efforts, this bipartisan effort on agriculture and on the education committees had worked out so that we have a program now which is the model throughout the world.

The WIC Program is the model throughout the world on how to deal with high-risk pregnancies and all of the tragedies that can come from that. And going up front and providing a very strong prevention mode that has worked beyond people's wildest expectations.

You point out that we saved \$3 for every dollar that we expend in WIC and \$10 for every dollar that we spend immunizing a young child. That is just the immediate medical cost. That does not go to what you save in special education and remedial education and all of these other problems that, unfortunately, these children manifest many years later that have been separated from the time of birth when people are no longer concentrating on what happened, so that now Sally or Johnny has a problem in class or with attention span or all of these other problems that occur today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman would yield further, I guess I stand here absolutely stunned by all of this because my other committee, unlike yours, is Armed Services. And we certainly could not come to the floor and say, "This has been a model. This has been marvelous. No one has come in front of us and shown us any fraud." My word, it comes in by the ton over the transom every year in every Member's office. And no one is proposing to block grant the Pentagon. It is interesting, the systems that are having trouble, they are winking at and saying, "No, we have to give them more money."

Mr. MILLER of California. It is not to block grant it. They make a big point about they give in the nutrition program 200 million more a year. But if the money is insufficient to meet the demand of the children that are eligible, the children who need this nutrition, then they are in fact cutting the program.

If I said to the people in our Committee on the Armed Services: We will give you \$500 million more a year every year for the next 5 years, they would say that is absolutely unacceptable. We have contingencies we cannot foresee. We do not know what is going to happen.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. They are saying that it is threat-based. We must have it be threat-based.

Mr. MILLER of California. We would like this to be family based and nutrition based and health based for the children of this country.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is correct. And I think it is so important to remember why we got into this. We got into this for national security reasons and that is because during World War II they found so many of the people that they drafted, when they came in for their physical, they were suffering from so many things from malnutrition and decided that it was a whole lot better to have some nutrition programs and some feeding programs and, obviously, national standards.

The idea to me that we are going to have 50 States having 50 different nutritional standards makes me crazy. But I think all of these things started as a national security program. Maybe what we ought to do is put it in the defense budget. I do not know.

And then the other thing, and this I realize I should not ask anyone from California. I realize you are in a difficult position, but I think of our Nation's children as a national problem. And it seems to me that in the past this is how we reflected it and they is why these have been in the budget.

And it seems that with these block grants we are saying, "Do not bring your problems anymore." We will throw money to the State and quickly we will get bored with that problem and it will be easy to cut entirely.

But another piece is we are saying that disasters have become a national problem, but not children. Part of the reason that we are hearing that we have to cut these is because of disasters.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think it is very unfortunate that we see the situation where before the election, when we had the Northridge earthquake in California, again on a bipartisan basis, people believed that that was a national emergency and you should not cut other program to pay for that.

I happen to have a little different view. I believe we should privatize the disaster system. We cannot have the "Disaster of the Month" here draining the Treasury. And I would have hoped that we would have done that with this California aid bill. The gentleman from Illinois, Congressman DURBIN, had a proposal in to do that and then we would have a rainy day fund and an earthquake fund or hurricane fund so that we would build that money up so that we could pay it out.

But that was not done, so now as we are halfway through taking care of people who were devastated in the earthquake, people who still cannot enter their houses or businesses or the universities because of the earthquake damage, all of a sudden we have decided it is no longer a national emergency and it is going to have to be paid for and the way to pay for it is to cut summer jobs for children, to cut drug-free schools and to cut the weatherization program to pay for the California aid.

And at the same time, the California Governor wants to give the same amount of money back to the taxpayers of California for a tax cut. So you are telling people in our State of Colorado, or New Mexico, or Maine, or Texas, you have to cut all of your programs to pay for the California aid, but the people in California are going to get a tax cut. I think that is a little hard to sell.

And I think that the Governor is doing a little bit of putting the pea under the walnut shell and seeing whether or not Congress can follow it. Apparently, the Republicans have lost the pea and they have decided they are going to go ahead and give them the money and he can give the tax cut and people all over the country will have those programs cut. It doesn't make any sense.

I honestly believe, and said this during the Midwest flood crisis, that we have got to develop another means of this so that we do not reach out on an ad hoc basis when we have these horrible, horrible disasters that this country, given its geographic size, is never going to be immune from, no matter what we do.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I truly thank you for being a statesman, because that is what it is. If you are from California, it is difficult to say what you just said.

Mr. MILLER of California. I just talked to my wife this morning and the sandbags are out. We are about this far from—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It is right at your front door. But I think you are absolutely correct, with the water at your front door, for which there would be a great temptation to say yes, the feds should pay for this and cut any program that there is, you are pointing out if we put cut these feeding programs, we are going to have a much bigger national disaster coming down the road.

And it is not fair for the Governor to have it both ways. He can give back State taxes and then we are forced here to send our Federal taxes to him.

Mr. MILLER of California. The word ingrate comes to mind.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It kind of comes to mind. I again thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for joining me in these remarks and raising these points.

The point is that when we look at the rescission bill that we will vote on on Wednesday, the cuts come from low-income housing, from elderly housing, low-income energy assistance. We are taking from the poorest people in this country to provide the disaster assistance so we can provide a tax cut. It just does not make sense and it does not add up. It sounds like Mexico. It sounds like those folks would not go for it over there.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It is going to go for tax cuts for the richest and disaster relief and it is going to create a huge disaster downstream.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman for joining me and, again, for all of her involvement in these issues.

I would just like to say now that it has been pretty well established that the Republican budget cuts and the welfare reform are prepared to turn their back on the issues of prevention with respect to disabled children and preventing these pregnancies that are high risk that we have identified.

We know before the fact, we know that we can go out and change the course of these pregnancies. But yet somehow we are not going to dedicate those funds. And Wednesday we will be voting to cut 100,000 women, pregnant women, pregnancies that are started. They do not know budget rescissions or balanced budgets or fiscal years. The pregnancies are launched, and yet we know if we can get there early, we can

change the outcome of this pregnancy. One hundred thousand women will not be served this fiscal year because of these cutbacks. And that is what I mean by cutting the most vulnerable.

But now let us move on to the next stage of the Republican plan. They have already decided they are not going to make the maximum effort to prevent a birth defect from taking place or prevent a low-birth-weight baby from being born or to prevent mental retardation or physical disabilities that occur for a whole host of reasons. They are not going to make that effort.

But now what we find out is that they come back years later. And when we see low-income families, one of the facts about disabilities, mental disabilities and physical disabilities and birth defects, is they know no socioeconomic bounds.

You can be living behind a gated community in a country club and you can have the sadness of the visitation of a birth defect come to your family. And you can struggle with this child and to work out and to create a life for the child and a community within your family, and a family setting for that child, or you can be the poorest person in town. It can happen.

But what we see now is that they are going to take 225,000 children who are severely disabled, either mentally or physically, and they are going to take them off of the Supplemental Security Income Fund that was created to try and help these most disabled children. And they are going to take these children off because they believe that somehow some parents may be coaching their children to act like they are retarded, to act like they have learning disabilities, to act like they have mental disabilities so they can get \$400 a month.

I am sure somewhere out there some place there are parents who do this. But let us assume it is 10 percent. It is 10 percent of the parents, so it is 25,000 children. That still leaves you with 200,000 children who are medically certified as severely disabled children. They are off the rolls. This low-income family now gets no fiscal help for the taking care of this child.

Assume it is 20 percent. You have 175,000 children out there who come from low-income families, because you only get the 400 a month if you are very poor. You must be among the poorest to get the maximum payment. You are off of the rolls.

So if your child has cerebral palsy, you are off of the rolls. If your child has other complications, such as the 6-year-old Jennifer Cox, who suffered from a congenital bowel malformation requiring a colostomy, and eye problems and lacks peripheral vision causing her to run into the walls.

At 6, she is not yet toilet trained. But if you are the family trying to take care of your child with all of these problems, we are going to say we are not going to help you anymore, even if

you are low income. Somehow, that is not going to happen, because we are going to provide for a tax cut.

Or Kendra Whalen who is 2 who suffers from a very rare growth condition in which one arm is twice as long as the other arm which means it causes her to lose her balance, motor impairment, spinal curvature and has lost lung volume because of this. Kendra is off the rolls if this goes through.

And it goes on and on. To Mosha Smith who is 10 months old, requires a shunt in the back of her head to drain the cerebral spinal fluid from her brain into her abdominal cavity. She suffers partial paralysis of the legs, bowel and bladder and a condition that requires frequent catheterization.

The family is struggling to take care of these children in their family settings. They love these children. And yet somehow what we are saying to these families is the Government cannot help you a little bit.

And what is the help for? What is the help for after the child has been medically certified to suffer these disabilities of retardation, of physical impairments? A documentation that requires the person from Social Security to talk to child care providers; to talk to physicians; if they are school age, to talk to the school personnel; to talk to neighbors and playmates to make sure that this, in fact, this person is disabled to the extent to which it has been represented.

If you are so fortunate to get this help so you can keep your child home, so you can keep your child out of an institution, so you can provide your child some semblance of a normal family life and a normal childhood experience, be they infant or school age, what are you doing with this money that you are getting?

In some cases you are probably having the child's clothing altered, so instead of buttons it can be velcro because the child may not be able to button their clothes.

You may be paying utility bills because a child at home may be on a respirator for 24 hours a day. You may have it to buy or rent a backup generator, because you worry that the loss of electricity for the child who is on the respirator.

You worry about your ability for communication devices, so if something goes wrong you will be able to communicate to people.

What about all the telephone calls you have to make? You are a low-income person with a severely disabled child in your home. You are making phone calls to medical providers, pharmacists, to social services, to schools. We are not going to help you out with that.

How about specially trained child care? You are trying to work. You are low income and you are trying to work, but most child care centers will not take these children. They are not equipped or trained. And if you do find a place for your child, it is much more

expensive. But the Government is not going to help you anymore.

Respite care. The taking care of these children is a 24-hour-a-day job. Husband and wife work it out together. They juggle their jobs. Most often what happens is one of them gives up income so that they can take care of the child. So you pay for respite care.

What is respite care? It is a chance to have the child taken care of for 5 hours, 6 hours, 12 hours. Maybe a big thrill, overnight so you and your spouse can spend the evening together. That would be the big thrill. Twenty-four hours of respite care. The Government helps you pay for that now. No longer, when you have a severely disabled child.

What about transportation? Additional transportation if the child is an older child? I mentioned adaptive clothing, the special laundry. The diapers for a teenage child that is uncontinent. You have to go through that for all those years.

Adaptive toys. All of the repairs for the equipment that you have for your child. That is what the \$400 a month goes for and that is what is going to be cut off in the welfare reform bill for these most severely disabled children.

We cannot really be doing this in the name of humanity. We cannot be doing this because it is good for the children. We are simply doing this because the Republicans are on the march to round up money so that they can provide a tax cut, as we said, to some of the wealthiest people and corporations in this country.

I am sure that each of those people who earn over \$100,000, \$150,000, \$200,000, if they knew where this money was coming from would probably say, "Why do you not take care of the children? Why do you not help out this family? Why do you not help these families who are financially poor and now have to deal with the problems of a disabled child in their family?"

I am sure that is what those people would say. But, apparently, the politicians whose represent them cannot get that message that that kind of cut is not necessary. This is not a cut about fraud and abuse. This is a cut about gathering up money that some people think that maybe families should not have.

Now, you could get the money if you can show that but for that money, your child would not have to be institutionalized. So if you have the threat of losing your child into an institution, away from your home, even though you want to take care of it, even though it may be less expensive, that is what you would have to show.

What about all the time and the effort and the money that these families put into these children already before they ever get to the Government for help? We have had hearings after hearings on these children and these families and what you see is a very loving child, a Down's syndrome child, a child

with cerebral palsy, and a very loving family.

But in this day and age, to hold that family together economically is very difficult with both people working. And if you are low-income, it is almost impossible. So what do you do? You risk losing your child. You risk having to give up your child, because you cannot get the money so that you can give up some hours of work to stay home with that child. And so, therefore, you must show that the child must be institutionalized. Somehow that does not seem to be fair. That does not seem to be fair in terms of putting families into that situation and I do not think it should be done.

If there is some allegation of fraud, if there is some belief that out there somewhere, some parent is coaching their child, then why do we not make it a crime? It is a fraud. Well, it is crime. Do what you want to do.

And the one random sampling of over 600 of these cases, I believe, in 13 cases, no case did they find coaching. And in 10 or 13 cases they thought maybe that potentially there could be some coaching. And I think 10 kids were taken off, but that comes nowhere near the whole population or 5 percent or 2 percent of this population.

And that is why we have to ask whether or not this is really where we want to cut the budget to these most vulnerable families and these most vulnerable children. We have had a history of commitment to these children. We have had a history of commitment to these children because we realized their situation.

We have recognized the stress, the pain, the financial burden that this places on a family. And we have said we will try to help you where that help is necessary. And now we are saying we are going to withdraw that kind of support.

I do not think that that is going to go over well in this country. I do not think that the people believe that that has a higher priority than a tax cut. I think that they believe that that is one of the missions of Government, to see that these families can stay together. To see that children are not taken away from their parents who love them, but are not able to care for them for the want of a couple of hundred dollars a month.

And finally, let me say this. That should a family have to give up their child, and should a family be unable to care for that child, and if because of those special circumstances that child becomes eligible for adoption, cutting SSI makes the adoption of that child much more difficult. Because today, the adoptive families could get some financial help for taking a child with special needs, reaching out to a child with disabilities and saying, "We will make this child a part of our family, but we don't have the financial wherewithal." So it is a better deal for the Government. A child gets a loving family.

But today, that assistance would be cut off under this provision. So now a family that wants to adopt this child with special needs is denied the opportunity. The child is denied the opportunity, so now the child is in foster care. High-cost foster care, because foster care for children with special needs is very expensive, very difficult to come by.

So I want somebody to explain to me, when you get all done cutting the WIC program, the school lunch program, and the SSI benefits for disabled children, and the adoption benefits for disabled children, I want people to explain to me how the children are better off when the Contract With America is done.

The children of this Nation are the first victims of the Contract With American. I guess these Republicans grew up hearing, "Women and children first." They thought that meant to throw them out of the life boat. It meant to put them in the life boat first. It means to save the women and children.

And yet, what do we see? We see that the contract now takes away prenatal care. It takes away health care for pregnancies because of nutritional risks. It takes away the care for a newborn infant because of nutritional risk and brain development; those first hours that are so important for the development of that child.

And now we see later in life, when this family and child is in need of more help because of the birth defects that they suffered, because of the disabilities that they suffered, once again the Federal Government is walking away.

So, clearly, I guess the policy is women and children first during the contract; that they will be sacrificed first in the contract's period on America's children and on America's women.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. FURSE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEARNS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. TALENT, for 5 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, for 5 minutes, on March 14.

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. SCHROEDER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. STEARNS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MILLER of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PALLONE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 14, 1995, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113(c)(3); to the Committee on National Security.

525. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Turkey (Transmittal No. 13-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

526. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for Presidential Determination on drawdown of Department of Defense commodities and services to support the Palestinian police force to carry out its responsibilities, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2348a; to the Committee on International Relations.

527. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112B(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

528. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, and other statutes, to extend VA's authority to operate various programs, collect copayments associated with provision of medical benefits, and obtain reimbursement from insurance companies for care furnished; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

529. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the annual report of consumer complaints filed against national banks and the disposition of those complaints; jointly, to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Commerce.

530. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting

the annual report regarding the accessibility standards issued, revised, amended, or repealed under the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, as amended, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4151; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Economic and Educational Opportunities.

531. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and National Security.

532. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the guarantee fee provisions of the Federal Ship Mortgage Insurance Program in the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and National Security.

533. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to revitalize the United States-flag merchant marine, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and National Security.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CLINGER: Committee of Conference. Conference report on S. 1. An act to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations; and for other purposes (Rept. 104-76). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. ROBERTS):

H.R. 1214. A bill to help children by reforming the Nation's welfare system to promote work, marriage, and personal responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Agriculture, Commerce, the Judiciary, National Security, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 1215. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to strengthen the American family and create jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.