

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

different programs would be set up, one in each state. Federal funding would be cut by 12% in the first year alone. Poor children would be lopped off programs in every state. Kids—who cannot lobby or vote—would have to compete for shrinking public funding against powerful special interests. Kids would lose. And health care costs would rise even higher to address the needs of more hungry children, *costs which could be avoided if food programs are not cut.*

### 3. PROPOSED CHANGES WOULD INCREASE THE NUMBER OF HUNGRY CHILDREN

Children will pay the price of shortsighted deficit reduction. Converting successful federal nutrition programs into reduced state grants will result in deep funding cuts—nearly \$31 billion by the year 2000. If the proposed Balanced Budget Amendment also passes, cuts will be even greater. In hard times, when tax revenues fall, there will be more hunger but less help.

Drastic changes in the nation's nutrition programs would make them insensitive to economic needs in a particular year. They would no longer insure that those in need could be protected. In fact, by their very nature proposed changes would not guarantee where assistance goes. And Congress could cut critical food programs further at any time.

"IF IT'S NOT BROKEN, DON'T FIX IT"

The nation's nutrition programs are cost-effective and target the truly needy. According to the General Accounting Office, one program alone (Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants and Children) saves \$3.50 in special education and Medicaid costs for every prenatal \$1 invested. Other research shows that children who get a school meal perform better academically.

The existing programs work, and they work well. The only problem is that they are not reaching enough of those in need. Proposed changes would mean that they never will.

For the richest nation on earth to deny food to its own children is a shortsighted betrayal of our values and our future. It is also unnecessary. In the name of our nation and its children, we call upon reason to prevail in Congress.

□ 2300

### IN SUPPORT OF CHILDREN'S NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I spoke with 95 little 3-year-olds in my district. Tonight, I rise on their behalf.

The school lunch program has worked well since 1946—it's not broken. America's children are our most important resource for the future.

Studies show that if a child is hungry, taxpayer dollars for education are wasted because when kids are hungry they can't learn. According to the Children's Defense Fund, millions of children will go hungry by cutting funds for school lunches, food stamps, child care, Head Start meals, and WIC programs. Republican double-talk says "cuts to school lunches" aren't "cuts," but block grants to States. That deceives the American people. As a 10-

year veteran of the Florida legislature, I can tell you that sending Federal dollars to the States as block grants does not ensure that these funds will go to child nutrition programs.

This school lunch program began after the start of World War II when young men tried to enlist in the military and were rejected because they were malnourished and couldn't pass the physical. President Truman wisely determined that producing healthy youngsters was in the national interest. It still is today.

Congress should not be cutting child nutrition and child care. These cuts take food out of the mouths of hungry children. No big federally subsidized defense contractor has seen a dime threatened. No wealthy individual has seen his special tax breaks cut. In fact, the reason they're making all these cuts is so that the wealthy can get additional capital gains benefits on the backs of suffering children.

Republicans seem to think they can fool some of the people, some of the time. But you can't fool all of the people all of the time. The Contract on America is a contract on children, the elderly, veterans and the hardest working Americans.

The school lunch program works, it feeds hungry children. As the saying goes, "If it's not broke, don't fix it."

### IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to commend the gentlewoman from North Carolina for the special order.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise in support of America's children because the Contract With America is an all-out assault on America's children.

Last week, in this Chamber's Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the former Education and Labor Committee, I offered two key amendments which will would have protected the most vulnerable members of our society.

One of my amendments would continue to guarantee free meals to children who are under 130 percent of poverty which was repealed in H.R. 999, the Welfare Reform Consolidation Act. My amendment was unilaterally defeated by the Republican supporters of the so-called "contract".

Restoring free meals for children at or below 130 percent of poverty would have continued a policy set in 1974 to help protect the health and well-being of low-income children. The Republican plan as detailed in H.R. 999 will curtail access to the main source of nutrition for some youngsters. Overall funding for the school-based block grant will be capped at a 4.5 percent rate of increase per year.

Under the current law, the rate of increase for fiscal year 1996 would be 5.2 percent, which is still not enough to meet current needs. It is unbelievable that we would risk letting children go hungry in this country under the cloak of fiscal responsibility. And I do not think that most Americans want to shred a critical safety net for children and infants.

If this proposal becomes law, it will be left up to the States or school district to decide whether or not to provide any free meals at all; States will not be required to serve meals to children who cannot afford to pay for them we know that hungry children cannot learn, because hunger impairs their ability to learn.

At a time when much lip service is given to improving education through the use of high-technology learning along the information superhighway, it seems very contradictory to take away such basics as the school lunch program.

I think every American should have deep concerns about what the termination of funding for feeding programs for children says about the direction this Nation is heading.

These are children who did not choose or ask to be born into a situation of poverty. These are children who cannot approach the legislators and legislatures, to let the folks who are making the decisions know that these policies are harmful and damaging to them. And these policies punish them for circumstances over which they have no control. Americans have always been proud of our spirit of concern for one another and compassion for people who are less fortunate than we are.

Has that been wiped out by the Contract With America?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to remind the audience, these are faces of real people. Mr. Speaker, I believe tonight the case has been made against H.R. 4, particularly the case of the provision to eliminate nutritional programs. We are more than Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker. We are actually public servants and we must remember that our first responsibility is not to the parties that we are members of but to the people we represent.

At the end of each day, Mr. Speaker, we must be honest with the facts, who have we helped and who have we harmed. Have we helped the few or have we helped the many?

I think President Kennedy had it right 34 years ago when he stated, "A country that cannot help the many who are poor cannot protect the few who are rich." No party or no person has an exclusive on family values and personal responsibility. Those are standards that each of us hold absolutely dear.