

thought about the fact there are so many babies that die, Mr. Speaker, after they are born, because their parents do not have proper prenatal care. And I was looking at little Jonathan, and it made me think what shameful condition in this country when we take money away from mothers who want to have productive children, who want to bring birth to kids who can live and who can survive.

Then I thought about educational cuts, \$1.7 billion in educational programs, and I could not help but think about the \$500 million that we cut in the program called Drug Free Schools and Communities. And how can we, Mr. Speaker, cut \$500 million, totally eliminate drug free schools in communities, when drugs in our schools and communities are going up and not coming down?

What are we saying to our children? Just say no to drugs? Or just say no to drugs is the moron's answer to the drug problems? And it was that simple, we would not even need schools. We would simply tell kids, just say yes to math, just say yes to science. But that is not the answer to the drug problem. We must teach kids drug education.

Then I could not help but think about the fact we are cutting \$100 million from elementary and secondary infrastructure, school infrastructure. We have jails and prisons in this country, Mr. Speaker, that are in better condition than our schools. You take a school in my own Parish, Red River Parish, where the ceilings are leaking everyday. Every time it rains, students cannot stay in the classroom because the ceilings are leaking, not to mention the fact that the air conditioner does not work during the summertime and the heat does not work during the wintertime.

This same Congress, just when we took away \$100 million of money for infrastructure for schools, we just appropriated \$10.5 billion for jails. So if you are a prisoner in this country you have great air condition, the ceilings do not leak, and you have an opportunity to be in a building that is built well and well maintained.

Then I thought about the \$28 million from the Dropout Program that was cut. Realizing that 86 percent of the people in this country who are in jail are high school dropouts, there is a serious correlation between education and incarceration. But yet we find the need in this Congress to cut \$28 million from the Dropout Program.

Then I thought about the summer jobs program. I guess that irked me almost the most, because I thought the Contract With America was to take people off of the welfare roles, but not to take kids off of the payrolls; to take innocent kids in the summertime who finished school, and all they have to do and look forward to is a summer job, to totally eliminate that program. Now we are going to have kids on the streets, more crime indeed. Kids who go and work during the summer will

not be able to do it this summer if this rescission package stays as it is today. These kids take that money and buy their school clothes. Many of them help their parents.

Then I thought about, lastly, but certainly not least, the school lunch program. And I take a moment of personal privilege on the school lunch program because I am indeed a person who went through school and who benefitted from the school lunch program. And to think that this Congress would have the audacity and unmitigated gall to take school lunches away from innocent children, when in jails, when prisoners in jail today get three square meals a day. It is popular to feed a prisoner in this country, but it is not popular and is not correct to feed a child.

Then what really irks me, Mr. Speaker, at the time we take food out of the innocent kids' mouths, we give \$1.2 billion in food aid to foreign countries. At the time we take away summer jobs, we give \$2.3 billion to economically support other countries.

So I hope that my colleagues defend these children and defend what is right and take this opportunity to defeat this rescission package when it comes to the floor.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, since the other side has obviously a coordinated effort here to really have not just a series of 5-minute special orders, but a number of them, could we please be tight on the time? Because there are folks on this side of the aisle who want to keep in the spirit of the 1 hour here and 1 hour there. I would ask perhaps without a ruling from the Chair that, and I suppose Mrs. CLAYTON is in charge, that you could be a little tighter on your time so we could have the chance to talk, unless you want to yield some time to us?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In response to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, the Chair would state for Members who have spoken this evening on both sides of the aisle, the Chair has attempted to remind them of that 5-minute limit, and will continue to do so.

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

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

EFFECT OF CONTRACT WITH AMERICA ON CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, if passed, the Republican contract's war on children will have a devastating impact on New York City.

The Republican contract would cut assistance for children across the board including large reductions in: school lunches and breakfasts, nutrition programs, food stamps, medical care, education, and housing programs.

In the contract's plan to cap the food Stamp Program, New Yorkers would lose \$300 million in the first year alone. A food stamp reduction of that magnitude could prevent as many as 190,000 children from receiving assistance.

In the contract's plan to lower child nutrition costs, New York State stands to lose \$70 million in assistance by 1996, and \$600 million by the year 2000.

This contradicts the overwhelming evidence that child nutrition programs lower the possibility of low birthweight and anemia in children.

In the contract's plan to eliminate the school lunch and school breakfast programs, over 800,000 children in New York City will be forced to pay more for breakfast and lunch.

I would really like to know where are they going to get that money to eat.

Schools will have to choose either to cut back on the quality of food or simply not provide lunches for children who need to eat.

There is even talk that the Summer Meals Program might be eliminated altogether.

Mr. Speaker, even President Richard Nixon supported school nutrition programs when he stated, "A child ill fed is dulled in curiosity, lower in stamina, distracted from learning."

These cuts are callous and mean-spirited. They not only affect child nutrition programs, but they also affect many other well deserving programs.

The contract would cut Medicaid and Medicare by \$33 billion over the next 7 years.

In an effort to dismantle Federal nutrition programs, the Republicans voted to expand the profits of four U.S. drug corporations of up to \$1 billion by eliminating a competitive bidding process for infant formula. As a result, these four companies can raise their prices and pad their profits.

What does that say about our family values?

The Republicans voted to cut \$1.3 billion in heating assistance to needy families while at the same time voting for a \$6.5 million pork-barrel visitor center with a complete heating system for a Republican's district in Oregon.

What does that say about our family values?

The Republicans voted to eliminate 185,000 meals a day for children in family day care homes while at the same time voted to continue spending tens of billions of dollars on the F-22 fighter.

What does that say about our family values?

It has become very clear that the Republicans are forcing children to pay

the heaviest burdens for their pet projects.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican recently proposed budget cuts inflicts even more damage to programs for children. Their plan has proposed:

A \$10 million cut for Healthy Start—a program which gives needed pre-natal care to expectant mothers.

A \$25 million cut for the Women, Infant, and Children [WIC] program that would knock 100,000 expectant women and newborn children out of a program which provides badly needed nutrition assistance.

A \$100 million cut for foster care.

Mr. Speaker, why was there not a single Defense Department or pork barrel project considered?

The petrified pork civilian marksmanship program still wastes \$2 million a year for free ammunition and recreational shooting.

What ever happened to America's family values? This plan is headed in the wrong direction.

FOOD FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN MUST HAVE PRIORITY OVER SUPPORT FOR FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHUGH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the children of Alabama, like those of the rest of the Nation, depend on the food programs of the Federal Government. Some come from very needy families who cannot afford to feed their children.

In my district, one of the poorest in the Nation, these food programs for kids make the difference between health and sickness, or between the ability to concentrate or become distracted from their class studies. These programs make the difference between a successful student and one who fails.

In the 7th district of Alabama, nearly two-thirds of students served cannot afford to pay. Even field kids who cannot afford to pay for their breakfast meal under Federal guidelines receive food. Mr. Speaker, this is a catastrophe. We must take care of our kids. We must protect our kids. Cutting food programs will literally take food out of the mouths of young kids. This we cannot afford to do.

Mr. Speaker, we must prepare for the future. Those of us who wish to balance the budget do not wish to balance the budget on the backs of kids. There are so many other ways and methods we could make cuts in order to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, last year we spent \$4 billion defending Japan. Japan paid the United States \$2 billion of that \$4 billion we spent. We will spend \$2.4 billion over the next five years that will be taken from the food program for the support of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, last year we spent \$18 billion defending Europe. We will take

\$2.4 billion from the food program over the next five years.

Mr. Speaker, one year of defending Germany or defending China or defending the world will support the food program in this country for 5 years. I submit that we should take priorities, and that the number one priority should be our children.

Mr. Speaker, most of us would love to balance the budget. Each one of us, regardless of our party, believe in balancing the budget, but we cannot balance it at the expense of our children. I am opposed to including children's nutrition programs in block grant form. I am opposed, because I realize that, like my State, which is a deficit State, that money will be used for other purposes, directly or indirectly.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, exactly how that would happen. If the money is sent directly to the State, and it is not earmarked just solely for food programs, but for other indirect costs associated with administering that program, then that money will be spent for highways, it will be spent for roads and bridges, it will be spent for other programs, and it will happen in this manner.

The money will go to the States, earmarked for the administration of the food program. Instead of buying food supplies, that money will be used to pay salaries of workers. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the Federal program pays for the food supplies, and the State program matches it by paying salaries of the workers.

I am certain that the State will not pay the salaries of the workers. Therefore, the money that ordinarily will go for food supplies will go towards partially paying the salaries of the workers, and the workers' salaries that have been paid by the State, what will happen to that money? Mr. Speaker, you know and I know that it will be used to build highways, to build bridges, to repair roads, or for any other emergency that may occur.

I have been in the State government for 18 years. We have many trust funds in the State of Alabama. I have seen us raid those trust funds for other purposes than those intended by the fund itself, so I know what will happen. I suggest it will happen every day, all across America. There will not be just 50 programs, but every State will have a program. That program, Mr. Speaker, would not be sufficient to feed the children, to feed the kids, to feed the students in our country.

Mr. Speaker, the children, the kids, the students in this country deserve our very best. They deserve to be treated better than we treat them, and they deserve to be treated in terms of priority above the defense of Japan and above the defense of Europe.

IN THE WORLD OF NEWT GINGRICH, WE TURN OUR BACKS ON CHILDREN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] for organizing this time. We are all indebted to the people of North Carolina for your leadership on issues of equity, such as this.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot protest enough what is really going on right now in this people's House of Representatives. I hope there are some parents out there who have put their children to bed and are listening to tonight's discussion. If your child eats breakfast at school, eats a hot school lunch, eats at day care while you work, or has cereal or milk or orange juice purchased with WIC coupons, or eats any food from a food bank, perhaps at the end of the month when money is tight, or has a meal that is purchased with food stamps, and I know that food stamps do not just help people who receive welfare payments, but also help millions of full-time workers to make ends meet, if your child uses any of these, your child is at risk.

The new Republican majority in this House is waging a full-scale war on America's children. The first goal of this war is to cripple the effort to end hunger among America's children, and that is a cruel move. Thus far, Republicans have staged this battle on two fronts: first, in their welfare reform bill, the Personal Responsibility Act.

That bill turns all Federal child nutrition services into State block grants. I have already said that many of the children who benefit today are not even on welfare, but that does not seem to matter. Now, the idea of block grants is not all bad. We have other block grants for community services and community development that go to the States and work well. But look again. This is not just a shift in who runs the current nutrition services, it is really a dangerous shell game.

The Republicans washed their hands of any responsibility for the welfare of America's children, shifted that responsibility to the States, and at the same time cut billions of dollars needed by those States to adequately feed those children.

The second front of this war is the rescissions bill which was approved by the Committee on Appropriations just today. The Republicans today cut \$25 million from the WIC program. WIC provides nutrition to pregnant women that reduces the risk of having low-birthweight babies, thereby saving heartbreak and billions of dollars. WIC helps mothers buy infant formula for their babies, milk and juice for their preschool children.

These are a child's formative years, when good nutrition is crucial. Today's cut is just the beginning. Republicans