

of these programs rather than make quick decisions in the name of downsizing federal government. It is time to end childhood hunger, not successful nutrition programs that feed hungry children.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the elderly and the millions of Americans, most of them children, who rely on the various nutrition programs funded by the local, State and Federal Governments.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle would have us believe that these nutrition programs are welfare and should be included in welfare reform.

Further, they indicate that these programs are overlapping, and that there is no need for several separate programs at the Federal level.

So they propose that these programs all be consolidated into a block grant to the States.

Then they take the next step—they would remove all nutrition guidelines currently in the programs, leaving it to the wisdom of State administrators to develop their own guidelines.

That proposal is wrong-headed from the start.

Federal nutrition programs, such as the School Lunch Program, were not created because of the welfare state.

At the end of World War II, as America looked back on its 5-year effort to rid the world of Nazi tyranny and Japanese aggression in the Pacific, a Republican Congress considered this country's state of readiness to field massive armies to deal with future aggressors.

Review of military physical records disclosed an alarming fact—many of the Nation's young potential recruits were barely able to pass selective service physicals—because of the effects of poor nutrition during their maturing years.

It was because of the necessity to ensure that future calls to arms would find healthy young people available to serve the Nation in time of war that the Congress developed the National School Lunch Program.

The program provided assistance to the Nation's local elementary and secondary educational schools with one purpose in mind—to ensure that the children attending those schools received at least one fully nutritious meal every school day, and, in cases where the child could not afford to pay for the meal, he or she received it at reduced or no cost.

So this was not created as a welfare program, and it is not a welfare program now—it is a program that enables the Nation to be more sure that its children will grow up healthy.

What are the direct economic costs of eliminating that program—let me list a few:

Our already out of control medical costs will increase as people age with a history of poor nutrition as children.

Studies confirm something we have known for over 50 years—poor nutrition as a child leads to increased illnesses as an adult.

Our economy suffers from increased employee absences, lower production at the workplace, and increased direct medical costs.

It this Congress removes the school lunch program direct funding, many school districts will find it impossible to sustain school cafeterias, and will terminate hot school lunch programs, leading to poorer nutrition for all students—and I mean all students—whether rich or poor.

Focused school lunch programs are also good for the economy because the national

school lunch industry—and make no mistake about it, it is an industry—from the farmer who produces the milk and other foods, to the former welfare mother who finally landed a job in the cafeteria, and all of the processing, packaging and delivery workers in between will find themselves unemployed.

According to the Agriculture Department a loss of as many as 138,000 jobs.

At the other end of the spectrum we have the nutrition programs for senior citizens funded in part by HHS and the Agriculture Department.

The Federal contribution to senior citizen nutrition programs, along with significant funding by States, localities and private individuals and organizations, provide nutrition to senior citizens in two ways.

Where a senior citizen is homebound, either because of physical frailty, remoteness of the residence, or other cause, and regardless of the economic status of that individual, the nations aging services network can and does provide home delivered meals.

In some localities, this means a volunteer comes to the home every day and prepares the meal, or delivers one that the homebound senior can reheat.

In others, meals are delivered once a week, and the senior or a caregiver prepares the meal on a daily basis.

If the senior citizen can get out of the house, he or she may visit a senior citizen center—either one sponsored by the local area agency on aging or a private group—a church or synagogue, or a senior citizens' association—and join fellow seniors for lunch, and sometimes for dinner.

Where federal funds are used in these programs, no specific charge is made for the meals, although most senior centers solicit contributions.

Seniors of all economic classes are very willing to eat these meals, and 225 million meals were served in 15,000 community nutrition sites all over the United States.

In my discussions with senior citizen groups who operate congregate meal programs, I have often been told that it is in our Nation's poorest neighborhoods that elderly participants contribute the most money in voluntary collection boxes.

Why is this program so important. Because, again as studies over the past few decades have consistently shown, good nutrition among our aging population translates into significant savings in out health care system.

These meals provide highly directed nutrition, and a strong sense of social integration to a population that benefits immediately from those meals.

A healthy senior, who does not feel isolated from society and his or her peers, is active, productive and far less likely to need very expensive medical care or hospitalization.

Studies have shown that for every dollar spent on senior nutrition programs, a direct savings of three dollars in health care costs results.

So, if you want to save Federal dollars, and we all do, make sure you know where the costs are.

Protect the elderly who are responsible for the greatness of our Nation, protect the children who are our future.

Reject the Republican's misguided effort to destroy America's nutrition.

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

[Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED \$40 BILLION UNITED STATES LOAN GUARANTEE TO MEXICO

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1993, I cast my vote against the NAFTA, not because I oppose free trade; not because I oppose the economic integration of the Western Hemisphere; and not because of the incomplete, albeit substantial, movement toward political and economic reform in recent years in Mexico. No—I cast my vote against the NAFTA because I believed that Mexico as an economy was not prepared to enter an argument of this magnitude with the United States.

I believed then as I believe now, that a more gradual approach toward economic integration, such as that adopted by the then-European Community toward nations seeking membership, is wiser. These nations were required to meet high economic and political standards before enjoying European Community benefits.

The hard-working families of the 13th District of New Jersey, which I represent, do not join exclusive clubs which they cannot afford. They do not buy expensive homes if they can't afford the down payment. They do their sweating at work—not in fancy health spas. These middle class families know their limits.

We should have anticipated the possibility of a peso devaluation. We should have regarded Mexico like the developing economy that it was—not as the developed economy we portrayed.

Many supporters of NAFTA told me that if I were to vote for NAFTA, I would be doing the right and responsible thing. Now they claim that the