

weight baby and the critical care that must be delivered in the intensive care and the neonatal intensive care units of our hospitals around this country.

Yet we see that those are the ones that the Gingrich Republicans have focused in on like a laser. They went immediately to those programs to cut that out. Out of the child nutrition programs and the WIC programs, we see over \$7 billion over the next 5 years being taken out of those programs. This year we see \$25 million directly taken out of the Women, Infants, and Children Program. Surely—surely the voters of America, the Republicans of America, do not believe that the first efforts in trying to balance the budget should be on the backs of these poor children, of these women at risk in their pregnancies, and of these newborn infants that are struggling, struggling to hold on to life, because we were not able to give them the attention during the pregnancy that we should have.

□ 0950

Surely that is not what this is all about. Nor should it be allowed to stand. People should call their Members of Congress and tell them that they want this 20-year program of success maintained. We are talking about \$1.50 a day during the term of that pregnancy. That should not be on the chopping block out of humanity and out of caring for these children and for these pregnant women.

#### “THE PROJECT”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITFIELD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great concern about an article which appeared in Sunday's Washington Post. Since I read articles in most newspapers with great skepticism, I hope that facts set out in this article are not true.

According to the article in the Washington Post, a prominent Democratic Congressman at a recent Washington dinner party enthusiastically discussed what he referred to as “The Project”—a coordinated, calculated effort designed to politically destroy Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

A week later, another Member of the Democratic Party, in a keynote address to a party convention in Boca Raton, disclosed that the House Democratic leadership had embarked on a day-by-day plan to investigate the House Speaker, harass the Speaker, and drive him from office.

According to the article, members of the Democratic leadership in the House meet on a weekly basis for this purpose. Mr. GEPHARDT is represented at the meetings and the White House is also kept informed.

The Democratic National Committee also publishes a weekly “Newt Gram” trashing the Speaker.

Two senior liberal Democratic Members of Congress—not a part of “The Project”; that is, Newt bashing—said “Our party attacks GINGRICH because we don't have anything else to say.”

If it is true, what a tragedy—the National Democratic Party and its leaders deliberately working on “The Project” to destroy another political leader.

Our great Nation faces many serious issues crying out for a solution. It is almost incomprehensible that a handful of Democratic leaders would be consumed with such a destructive compulsion for revenge.

It is not surprising that in so many issues we have debated on this floor during the last month that a handful of Democrats have used similar tactics to polarize America. Pitting the poor versus the middle class—and the middle class versus wealthy members of our society—in effect using scare tactics.

We are all Americans and we must develop solutions that will benefit our entire society not just one part of our society. The American people not only deserve but demand that Members of Congress devote their time and energy trying to solve very serious national issues instead of trying to destroy another political leader because they do not agree with his political philosophy.

The election box is the proper place to decide philosophical differences, not some sinister plan referred to as “The Project.”

#### EFFECTS OF THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA ON WOMEN AND CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, but let us talk issues instead of speak personality.

When the Republicans talked about the contract for America, they did not tell anyone it would be women and children first. The first round of cuts were in the school breakfast and lunch programs. The second round of cuts include funding for safe and drug-free schools and the summer jobs program.

The Speaker may not believe liberals and even call some of us liars. This report that I will insert in the RECORD from the Houston Post talked about the “foes are lying about children.” He says they are lying this last weekend.

Well, I am a Member from Texas. I am not lying about what my Texas State agency and my school district told me about the school lunch and breakfast program.

We would sustain a cut of almost 4 percent for our lunch and breakfast programs. I would hope we could tone down the rhetoric and talk about issues. I share the concern of my colleague who just spoke.

Again, we could see a definite cut of 4 percent in our Texas program and a half-million dollars in the Houston independent school district, the largest school district in the State of Texas.

The school breakfast and lunch programs, as estimated by the Texas Education Agency, will lose for the children of Texas \$261 million in 1996. On the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, we tried to strike the nutrition programs from the Republican reform bill, but we were outvoted on a party line vote by the Republican majority. I will go to that in a few minutes. Let us look at what this new amended contract for America talks about, not only cutting children nutrition programs and the WIC Program. Let us see now; we are having \$11 million for two new executive airplanes for the Army that they did not request, \$20 million more for a new runway for a base that is on the base closure commission list, a million dollars for a bike trail in North Miami Beach.

One thing that is apparent in this new amended Contract With America, there is no clause that our children will have a hot nutritious meal or a clause that our children will have a safe and drug-free school or that our children may have a summer youth job program.

Let me continue with the children's nutrition. A TV consumer reporter in Houston just last night said that it took the Republican majority 40 years to gain control of the House but only took them 40 days to cut food to children. The school-based nutrition grant program overall funding would be \$104 million less in fiscal year 1996; \$101.3 billion would be transferred out of the block grant in 1996 for nonfood programs, which would compromise the health of children.

The school-based nutrition block grant would eliminate the standards that guarantee America's children access to healthy meals.

There was an amendment adopted in the committee last week that said for the first year the States can all come up with 50 nutritional grant programs, but at the end of that year there would be some national standards. Well, we already have some national standards that apply whether you are in Texas or New York or California. We are building in additional costs into this program by having 50 States to develop their nutrition plans and then have to comply with some national standards.

The new school-based nutrition block grant would not respond to recessions or recoveries. If this bill had been enacted in 1989, it would have resulted in the 70-percent reduction in funding for school meals in 1994 alone. Between 1990 and 1994, the number of free lunches served to low-income children

increased by 23 percent. During that period, the number of free meals served in child care centers increased by 45 percent. The block grants would not respond to the change in the school population, which is expected to increase by 4 to 6 percent. In the State of Texas alone we would lose 4 percent of our funding. Every September and all during the year we have new children who show up at our doors and qualify for these programs. We are not only cutting 4 percent, but if those new children show up, they would not have it.

Yesterday morning, before I left Houston, I went to a nutrition program in the Heights part of my district at the Field Elementary School. That is a school that has 90 percent of their children have free or reduced lunch. What 4 percent would we cut from those 90 percent of those children and next year when we have at least 20 more kids who show up or are qualified, are we going to tell that principal or that teacher or that food service worker, who does a hard job there, that they cannot serve those children?

There are reforms we can do in the program, but not cutting off the meals that those children have. I saw that meal. They had cereal. They had the option of orange juice and milk. A number of kids actually drank both the orange juice and the milk. They had some little sausages.

I noticed this last Friday the Committee on Agriculture cut the effort for the Food Stamp Program.

I am glad they are concerned about that, but I know we have some concern about the food stamp abuses. But I know I saw those children eating that food. I would hope that the Republican majority would see the err of their ways on school nutrition and also change that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the article to which I referred.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 26, 1995]

SCHOOL LUNCH DEBATE SERVES UP HOT RHETORIC BUT FEW COLD FACTS—HOW KIDS WOULD FARE UNDER CHANGE UNCLEAR

(by Wendy Koch)

WASHINGTON.—Uncle Sam would no longer guarantee poor kids a free school lunch if a Republican measure now gaining momentum in Congress becomes law.

Instead, states would be free to decide who gets what.

Democratic critics say kids would suffer because funding would fall, and states won't have enough money in case a recession strikes. Republicans argue kids would benefit because the system would be more efficient.

But no one really knows—yet.

The GOP bill, which scraps the 49-year-old school lunch program, passed a House committee last week but needs the approval of the full House—considered likely—and the Senate—expected to be more difficult.

Even if it passes, its impact will depend on how each governor handles the new responsibility of feeding kids.

Still, there's no shortage of red-hot rhetoric.

Democrats have accused Republicans of trying to starve kids. "There are an awful lot of poor kids, and some not-so-poor kids, who will go home hungry," says Wisconsin

Rep. Dave Obey, senior Democrat on the House Appropriations Committee.

"Absurd," responds Michigan's GOP Gov. John Engler, a leading proponent of giving states greater flexibility to administer programs. He says it's "offensive" to say Republicans would harm kids.

The school lunch program serves 24 million children every day. Lunch is free for those whose parents earn less than 130 percent of the poverty line and is heavily discounted for those whose parents earn less than 185 percent. It sets a small subsidy, 20 cents a lunch, for all other kids.

The school breakfast program serves about 5 million children daily and operates similarly.

Every child who meets the eligibility criteria is guaranteed a free meal if his or her school participates in the program. If a recession hits, federal funding increases to meet greater demand.

The meals must meet federal dietary standards, nationally recommended for all Americans.

The Republican measure, part of the effort to reform welfare, would end the federal guarantee that poor kids get meals. With that goes the nutritional guidelines.

It would instead lump school meal programs together and give states a set payment, or block grant, to administer as they choose. It also would allow states to set their own dietary standards.

The measure would allow legal immigrants—but not illegal ones—to get subsidized meals.

Proponents argue that by cutting the middleman—federal bureaucrats—less money would be wasted on paperwork and more would be spent on meals for poor kids.

They say their block grants would increase funding by 4.5 percent annually—more than the rate of inflation.

Yet Democrats say the increase is less than they would receive under the current system, which adjusts for the rising number of eligible school-age kids. And thus, they call it a cut.

"Every state will get less funding," says Walt Haake, a spokesman for the U.S. Agriculture Department. Overall, USDA estimates funding will be \$309 million less next year and \$2 billion less over five years.

He criticizes the GOP bill for allowing states to use up to 20 percent of their school lunch money for other programs.

Critics also say governors of poorer states—even if they wanted to help kids—would have a tough time meeting the greater demand in a recession because their funding would not automatically adjust.

"That is the unknown, and the scary part," says Tami Cline, director of nutrition for the American School Food Service Association, which represents the administrators of school meals.

Yet Republicans bristle at the notion that governors, who face re-election, won't be responsive.

"Why would state and local officials do that?" asks Kelly Presta, majority spokesman for the House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee, which passed the bill.

[From the Houston Post, Feb. 26, 1995]

GINGRICH: FOES LYING ABOUT KIDS

ROSWELL, GA.—House Speaker Newt Gingrich lashed out at political opponents Saturday, saying anyone who claims Republicans want to hurt children is lying.

"They're going to argue meanness. They're going to argue Republicans are for the rich. And they're going to argue Republicans want to hurt children," he told a gymnasium full of loyal constituents here during a 2½-hour town hall meeting.

"It will be a deliberate, malicious lie. And they will repeat it, and repeat it and repeat it."

The Georgia Republican was addressing recent criticism from Democrats who charge that GOP proposals to end federal nutrition programs for children as well as Medicaid benefits for the poor would victimize the weakest members of society.

"Any liberal who tells you that we are cutting spending and hurting children is lying—L-Y-I-N-G," said the House speaker.

#### H.R. 1022, RISK ASSESSMENT/COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1022, the risk assessment cost-benefit analysis bill. This legislation very simply puts common sense into the way the Government regulates.

All of us have heard the horror stories from businesses and municipalities about the Federal regulations and the way that they have strangled their budgets only to have miniscule benefits result.

Earlier today I hope my colleagues had the opportunity to review a dear colleague I circulated to all of them concerning the city of Columbus, OH. In it I noted that Federal regulations currently require the municipal water systems keep atrazine levels in drinking water below 3 parts per billion. A human being would have to drink 3,000 gallons of water a day with three parts per billion atrazine to equal the dose found to be cancerous in rats.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, under its constitutionally mandated authority, sets this level by using the most exposed individual risk assessment model, which assumes a person is to be exposed to atrazine every day for 70 percent years. To show how absurd this regulation is, to consume enough water to come even close to causing any health risk, an individual would have to drink 38 bathtubs full of water every day. City officials in Columbus found that compliance with this regulation would require a new \$80 million water purification plant. For the same amount of money 3,700 teachers could have been hired at the average State teacher's salary.

To further show how wasteful this three parts per billion Federal requirement is, consider the following: The U.S. EPA developed a health advisory for atrazine which states that a child could drink water containing 100 parts per billion for 10 days or 50 parts per billion for 7 years with no adverse effects.

Mr. Speaker, it is for reasons like this that I am supporting H.R. 1022. I believe it is reasonable to ask our Federal regulating bodies to prepare a cost-benefit analysis of proposed regulations. I support the idea of providing alternatives without making expense