

billion over 5 years. Family-based nutrition programs would be cut by \$680 million in 1996 and \$4.6 billion over 5 years.

The Republicans say their plan frees up more money for food by making the programs less bureaucratic. This is preposterous. The Republicans' proposal would actually make the programs more bureaucratic by creating 50 new bureaucracies to administer 50 new programs. This will only increase administrative costs for the States, and ultimately mean less food for children. The fact is the Republicans would not be cutting Federal bureaucracy, they would simply be cutting Federal funding.

I am especially concerned about the impact this block grant proposal would have on the School Lunch Program—a program that serves free and reduced priced lunches to over 104,000 children in my home State of Connecticut every day.

I met today with two special people who run a program in my district called Boys Village. This program provides community-based and day treatment services for at-risk children. Every day, Boys Village feeds breakfast and lunch to all the children enrolled in its program. To help do this, they receive \$30,000 a year from the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs.

The budget for this remarkably successful program is small. If funding for its nutrition programs was substantially reduced, or eliminated, which is possible under the Republicans' proposal, Boys Village would have to make some tough choices.

Those are not pleasant choices, Mr. Speaker. And they're choices that all School Meal Programs will be forced to make. They will have to either eliminate meals, increase prices, or reduce the quality and quantity of the well-balanced, nutritious meals that kids currently receive.

Newt Gingrich, who spoke so highly of the Boys Town of yesteryear, should wake up and see what the Boys Villages of tomorrow will be like if he has his way. They will not feature the smiling faces of the movie version. It will be more like the Dickens' version, with hungry children holding out their tin cups and begging for more.

Child Nutrition Programs in this country will be a pale imitation of what they are today. Enrollment will decrease, nutritional standards will diminish, and the health of our children will suffer.

It is a vision of hungry kids who are not healthy, alert, and ready to learn—all this so the Republicans can pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. This Republican scheme must be stopped. I urge my colleagues to keep up the fight.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Would you just comment on the fact that most of the time when we think about changing things, we want to correct them; do you see anything wrong with the school lunch and the WIC program? Is there fraud or something we know that is going on that it is not effective? Why are we changing the school lunch program? Is there some reason that would help us understand? Are we improving it? Why are we changing it?

Ms. DELAURO. My colleague has put her finger really on the crux of this issue. I say do not listen to all of us tonight, listen to us, but talk to the people in our districts who run these programs. These are successful programs. They work. They are living up to the objectives that they were created for, and it is foolish for us to unravel these very fine programs and create difficult problems for our youngsters and, quite frankly, for our economy in the future.

And once again, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

#### REPUBLICAN SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM INCREASES FUNDING

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the school lunch program under the Republican majority proposal will actually increase the current \$4.5 billion budgeted to \$4.7 billion for fiscal year 1996.

The other side of the aisle would have you believe the school lunch program will be eliminated. This is pure fiction.

Republicans propose to actually increase by 4.5 percent more on school lunches in 1996 and 4 percent for each year thereafter for the next 5 years.

They key to delivering more to our local schools is accomplished by eliminating the Federal bureaucrats and their involvement, and directly sending aid to the States for our local students. Through this block grant, the weight of the unnecessary Federal paperwork will be eliminated.

Now, the Federal Government—

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I will when I complete my statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will not yield at this time.

Mr. POMEROY. The full 5-minute statement or the sentence?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Now, the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, wastes 15 percent of the school nutrition money—

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, point of clarification, I am not sure when the gentleman is going to yield to me for my question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls the time, and he has declined to yield.

Mr. POMEROY. Does the gentleman yield? He said he would yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls the time.

Mr. POMEROY. The gentleman did not yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it wastes 15 percent—

Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania controls the time.

Mr. POMEROY. Does the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has repeatedly stated that.

Mr. POMEROY. He said he would yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I did not say that. I said I would yield at the end of my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman controls the time and has refused to yield.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the Federal Government wastes 15 percent of the school nutrition funds for administrative costs alone, and under the majority Republican proposal, more children will be fed, and only the bureaucrats of Washington, DC, will be the ones disappointed.

The successes of our school lunch program at Penn Dale Middle School in Lansdale, Montgomery County, was observed by me firsthand on Monday.

Motivated students are involved in planning menus, dedicated faculty are working closely with home economics classes, and most of all, Dorothy Irvin, as our food service coordinator, is doing an outstanding job working with principal Donald Venema to make the program work.

They have understood that what we have discussed here is more money for the school district, more money for the program.

In summation, Mr. Speaker, we believe the key to the school lunch program and the proposal we have before the Congress now will have more dollars spent on direct services for children and less on the administrative paperwork that helps no one, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is in the best interests of everyone.

#### CHILDHOOD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, Americans want streamlined and efficient government, but they also expect Congress to be fair and responsible.

They did not ask us to achieve these goals at all costs, especially if it means

jeopardizing the future of our defenseless children.

Republicans claim their proposals to cut crucial nutrition programs are aimed at bureaucrats, but the real victims of these deadly cuts are the children of America.

The pain and suffering of childhood hunger can be seen in each of our 50 States.

Children who pass out on the school playground because of hunger;

Children who have learned the heart-breaking skill of stretching one packet of cheese flavoring for three meals of macaroni and cheese; and

Children who literally sob from the pain of stomach cramps because they have not eaten since the previous day.

These scenarios are not grossly exaggerated fictional accounts concocted to illustrate my point.

They are actual examples of childhood hunger in this country recently documented in the Los Angeles Times of children without the benefit of nutrition programs.

These tragic scenarios will become more frequent and more severe if Republican proposals to block grant vital nutrition programs are approved. For they will limit the money that will be available to feed our children.

Scientific evidence reveals that children are far more susceptible to the harmful effects of nutrient deprivation than previously known and, according to physicians, results in lifelong damage.

Once physical growth and cognitive development have been impaired, the damage is often irreversible.

The highly effective WIC and the national school lunch programs protect children from the physical and mental ravages caused by hunger.

As a direct result of Federal nutrition programs, growth stunting has declined by 65 percent according to the USDA.

The General Accounting Office reports that the WIC program saves \$3.50 in special education and Medicaid costs for every prenatal \$1 it spends.

In my home State of California, almost 2½ million children participate in these nutrition programs.

The future of these and other children is now endangered by the irresponsible and heartless cuts proposed by the Republican majority.

Teachers in the Los Angeles Unified School District, as in school districts throughout this country, support the school breakfast and school lunch program.

They know first-hand that children who are well-nourished are more alert, more attentive and more eager to learn as contrasted with hungry children who are listless and can barely raise their heads from their desks.

While children will be the first victims of the Republicans' callous and ill-conceived program cuts, all Americans will ultimately pay the price when our young people cannot fulfill

their academic potential and cannot grow into productive workers.

As a result, our Nation will no longer be a global competitor.

To deny food to our children is a betrayal of our values and our future as the richest Nation on Earth.

It is imperative that we maintain this safety net of nutrition for America's Children.

How can we in good conscience afford to do less?

Mrs. CLAYTON. You had emphasized the value of nutrition for education. I just wanted you to expand on that in terms of the value of nutrition to reduce the cost of health care. Part of, obviously, why nutrition is valuable is to make sure young people are healthy, and when they are not healthy, the cost of health care goes up.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Absolutely. If you talk to teachers throughout this country, they will tell you when children go to school hungry, not only do they not learn, but they are much more susceptible to disease and, therefore, the cost of health care is also increased.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I was thinking in this atmosphere of reduction and deficit reduction, it seems to be pound-foolish and to be penny-wise in trying to cut back on nutrition programs when you put at risk not only kids' learning abilities but also raise the cost of health care. It seems like if we were trying just to reduce the budget, we have chosen the wrong program, the WIC program, to do that or the school lunch program to do that.

□ 2215

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Absolutely, because in the long run I guess it is going to cost society much, much more.

#### REPUBLICANS STARVING CHILDREN TO PAY FOR THEIR CONTRACT ON AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for organizing tonight's special orders. She is so appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I know personally the fear of not having enough money to buy food for my children. Twenty-seven years ago I was a single working mother with three small children forced to rely on Aid For Dependent Children and food stamps in order to give my children the health care, child care and food they needed. That experience never leaves me, Mr. Speaker. It is the basis for my commitment to make sure that every child enters the classroom safe, healthy and ready to learn, and without nutrition programs this will not be possible.

That is why I am shocked that at the same time Republicans are talking about taking school lunches away from almost 7,000 children in my congressional district, Mr. Speaker, they are refusing to cut pork barrel military projects like the F-22 fighter plane.

Health care providers, parents and teachers all know that the school lunch program is crucial to our children's education and to their health. In fact, the school lunch program is the source of more than one-third of the recommended daily allowance for the children it serves. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, eliminating Federal school meal programs, cutting funds and giving what is left over to the States is no way to take care of our children. Rather we should be talking about full funding our school lunch programs and full stomachs for our kids.

In fact, I have only one thing to say to this pea-brain plan. States do not get hungry, children do, and the public is not going to allow the Republicans to starve children just so they can pay for their Contract on America.

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

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

#### REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS ARE PLACING THE WELL-BEING OF OUR CHILDREN IN JEOPARDY

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my deep concern over Republican proposals that would excessively cut nutrition programs—proposals which could jeopardize the future of our children and our ability to compete in the global economy.

Our country has had a long-standing, bipartisan commitment to ensuring an adequate nutritious diet for our most vulnerable citizens. Members on both sides of the aisle have always before recognized that the country's strength depends on having a healthy, productive population, and nutrition programs contribute substantially to that goal.

The School Lunch Program was started in 1946 as a national security measure in response to the large number of men enlisting in the armed forces who were found to be malnourished. Other Federal nutrition programs, such as the Food Stamp Program and WIC, were developed in response to findings of widespread hunger in the late 1960's. In 1967, for example, the Field Foundation sponsored a study that was shocking to much of America. It found that hunger and poverty were shortening the lives of many