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 heartbreaking 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

thousands of young people in parts of the rural south. And if it was happening in the rural south, it was certainly also happening in many urban areas of the country where poverty was prevalent.

Federal nutrition programs have made a big difference in improving the lives of needy children and their families. These programs have given children access to better diets, which, in turn, has led to better health and a greater ability to learn in school and become productive citizens.

I have seen the results of the nutrition programs in my own State. In Georgia, more than 400,000 low-income children per month receive benefit of food stamps which help their families purchase nutritious food. More than 200,000 Georgia children receive help for school breakfasts and more than 450,000 receive help for school lunches.

These programs provide a vital safety net. Last year, for example, the Food Stamp Program provided emergency help for many families who lost their homes and their livelihoods in the flooding which struck parts of the area of Georgia I represent. Countless stories can be told of how nutrition programs have literally saved families during times of emergency.

Some of the untested reform proposals being discussed in Congress would threaten to slash nutrition funding for school children, for mothers and infants, for the elderly. If these programs can be better managed, fine. But simply slashing the level of funding or capping it arbitrarily would inevitably lead to increased hunger and all of the suffering and costs that are associated with poor nutrition. We can ill afford, Mr. Speaker, to place the health and well-being of our children, our economy and the country as a whole in jeopardy by turning back the clock on the gains that have been made over the past half century.

Let us cut short the Republican plans to cut short the nutrition programs so vital to America's women, infants, children and seniors.

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I was just looking at this report from the U.S. Department of Agriculture and looked at the State of Georgia and noted that over 108,000 persons will have less nutrition than they have now. These include school aged children, pre-school children, as well as school children in special programs. That is 108,000 less in Georgia, and I know the gentleman would be concerned about that so I wanted to bring that to his attention.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I am happy the gentlewoman pointed that out because I come from a district that has some of the poorest counties anywhere in the United States, and we have numerous individuals and families that suffer from malnutrition, and we have low birth weight babies that are born which ultimately has to be paid for by Medicaid, and it is a lot easier and a lot cheaper on society and on our taxpayers if we pay for a $6,000 delivery as opposed to a $150,000 delivery with incubation for that low birth weight baby.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I agree.

THE WIC PROGRAM IS WORKING

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I have spent all of my life in the food processing end of the business. I have spent the last 16 years of my life learning more about the consuming side our food industry. In the last few days I have spent a lot of time talking to the school lunch room administrators, school superintendents back home in my district, and they confirmed a belief that I already had, that our school lunch and breakfast programs are not broken, and I am puzzled why some seek to fix them.

But tonight I want to spend a few minutes talking about a program that I have become very supportive of, and that is the WIC Program. When I first heard of it, Mr. Speaker, I was supportive because it did one thing that was sort of important. It fed children. But 4 years ago in the House Committee on the Budget I had an experience of sitting and listening to four CEOs of four of the larger corporations of America who had come before the Committee on the Budget for one purpose that day, and that was to convince us in the Congress to fully fund the WIC Program, not just 40 percent or, at that time, 30 percent, but to fully fund it, and I listened with quite a bit of attention and some considerable interest. I listened to those CEOs first say that they hire tens of thousands of young men and women every year to work for them in their respective businesses, and they had to retain 70 percent of all of those who came to them, and they said, and I paraphrase what they basically told us that morning, but it was that at first we looked at our school system, we looked at our kindergartens, our grade schools, our middle schools, our high schools, our colleges, where we were fumbling the ball, but the more we looked, the more we came to the conclusion that we were really fumbling the ball by not giving every child born in America a healthy start. They came to us that morning and suggested that, if we had to cut anywhere, even in feeding programs, to cut anywhere other than the WIC program because unless a child has a healthy start from the womb through the first 3 or 4 years of its life, that child will be a health problem the rest of its life. With all odds it will be an educational problem. Eventually it will become a crime problem, and we only have to remember the discussions we have had in this body not too long ago about how much we are spending on crime.

Mr. Speaker, those were the words of four CEOs, and those words should be listened to with a great deal of interest as we debate the priority settings that are going to be necessary.

As my colleagues know, I, too, lament the fact that we failed to pass the balanced budget constitutional amendment today. But even if we were spending only that amount of money that we have today provided for us, not borrowing $200 billion, I would still be here tonight saying of the 1,300,000,000 we will spend that we have that the WIC program is one that we should, in fact, be prioritizing, certainly not cutting. We perhaps ought to be looking for ways in which we could increase that program because it is one of the better investments we could make.

We have already heard that every dollar we spend on WIC provides from $1.92 to $4.21 in Medicaid savings. Those are demonstrated factual savings that have been confirmed and reconfirmed by so many who also believe in this program.

So I commend the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for getting us together tonight and talking about the need of taking another look, and I would encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to take another look at the feeding program reductions, particularly though to take a look at the idea or the suggestion that WIC should be cut. I believe that, if my colleagues will look at the facts and not listen to only the whims of the current desires, that they will find, as I have done, and those four CEOs came to the conclusion 4 years ago, the WIC program is a good program, it is working, it needs to be increased in funding if we possibly can find it, but it certainly does not need to be cut.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. As the gentleman has spent a considerable amount of time trying to balance the budget, he knows that the WIC program in the rescission bill is cut 2 percent, and the money that was cut is money that the WIC program is not using.

Mr. STENHOLM. Well, I do not know that to be a fact. In fact, regardless of the numbers that we might talk about, et cetera, we are still only going to be providing for what percent of the children?

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, 2 percent of the money that is being cut from WIC represents money that the WIC program was not using.

Mr. STENHOLM. But we are only feeding 40 percent of the possible children, so it would seem to me rather than making that cut we ought to be looking for ways to make the program work better and reach out to the other 60 percent of the children that we are not feeding.