

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of trees just like this one in the Pacific Northwest. When in full operation, Mr. Carlson could run his mill with only 150 trees like this one each year. He would employ 60 direct, full time workers, with a payroll of over \$1 million from a yearly sales total of \$7.5 to \$9 million. He would pay \$200,000 to \$400,000 per year in corporate income tax, and would pay \$1 to \$2 million to the Forest Service in stumpage fees. His employees would pay personal income tax on the over \$1 million. In addition, Mr. Carlson would employ up to 40 other people in subcontractor positions. These would be the timber cutters and haulers that would get these logs out of the forest. Sadly, if these giants are not harvested within 2 years of being blown down, they are of no value as timber, and thus, no value to us as taxpayers. This is part of the emergency situation that we face in our forests. Unless we pass this important legislation, these giant trees will rot back into the forest floor from which they sprang. We must use common sense to make the best use of our forest resources.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this evening to help try to have a reasonable discussion to set the record straight here. Tomorrow and Thursday this House will have a major debate on actions to balance the budget of this country, starting with the goal of \$17.3 billion, trying to find money to cut across the government, and I think that the goal of trying to balance the budget is absolutely worthy, and each of us in our capacities, as chairs of committees and as Members, has to be a part of this very serious task. I think that, however, as we try to plug the dike, the holes in the dike of our increasing debt, this \$17.3 billion action is really going to be somewhat fruitless because at the same time there are billions flowing out the other side of the dike that we are not even taking a look at, and I want to talk about that tonight.

But let me say I am very proud to rise as a Democrat this evening and say that this will not be one Member who will vote to eliminate the summer jobs program, and I would love to be the opponent of any Republicans who votes to eliminate the summer jobs program—on that basis alone. In my district there are over a thousand young people; in fact there are 4,000 in line, for the summer jobs program. We want to provide the best opportunities for our young people, and yet the first place they look is the summer jobs program for our young teenagers; probably for most of them, if not all, the first

opportunity they have to have any kind of gainful employment.

□ 2015

As a Democrat, on the second program, I will not vote to eliminate the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program. Twenty-five thousand senior citizens in my district benefit every year from that program. And for anybody who comes from the north and you know how cold the winters get and you know how tight those senior dollars are, I would love to be the opponent of any Republican who votes against the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program.

Let me also say as a Democrat, I will not vote to hurt seniors who are forced to buy these medigap policies when they really cannot afford supplemental insurance. And that is hidden in this rescission bill. I am proud to be a democrat and stand at the side of every poor senior citizen in our country who depends on that medigap insurance.

Now, what is interesting about this discussion is what the Republican Party will fail to go after and this is where my challenge lies with them.

Why do you not do anything about plugging the tax breaks that are there for corporate welfare? We hear a lot about welfare for ordinary citizens. What about corporate welfare? How about getting rid of the \$5 billion that is there to let these pharmaceutical companies leave the United States and manufacture offshore? There is \$5 billion of the \$17 billion right there.

How about \$30 billion worth of transfer pricing? All these foreign corporations that operate in the United States do not pay a dime of taxes. That is twice as much as you need right now to deal with the 15.3 billion.

How about all the multinational corporations that have got their hands out to the taxpayers of the United States like the market promotion program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture? We are subsidizing Pet Milk. We are subsidizing Mars Corporation. We are subsidizing Archer Daniel Midland & Company to the tune of millions of dollars a year.

But who do you go to to try to cut when you want to balance the budget? You go to the kids in my district who don't have work this summer. You go to my senior citizens who cannot pay their heating bills.

You know, I heard the Speaker say something really interesting. He is interested in privatizing NASA. Well, I do not know if I want to privatize all of NASA, but I would be happy to be a Democrat that supports privatization of the space station. That would be \$40 billion. That is three times as much as you need this first time out of the box before we start taking all of the nicks out of the weakest and most vulnerable people in this country.

And I just want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], who I know labors under great pressures of that particu-

lar committee in trying to find these spending cuts, you know, Mr. GOODLING, I do not really think—and you cannot say this and you would not say this, because you are a very loyal servant of the people—but I do not think the Speaker of this House should go to the weakest people in this society and try to balance the budget on their backs.

I would have more respect if he followed through with some of the suggestions he had, for example, with NASA, in trying to get the money we need by cutting off some of the biggest leeches we have in this country who have their hands out and can pay for the lobbyists in this town to take out people's money and then they get kicked in the gut back in districts like mine.

I am proud to be a Democrat who is going to vote against this particular rescission bill.

BLOCK GRANTING CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS IS A BAD IDEA

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, block granting child nutrition programs is a bad idea, but it is not a new idea. In 1982, members of this body felt it necessary to pass a bipartisan resolution opposing nutrition block grants and one of the signers of that resolution was House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

And in the resolution it said, "Whereas the nutrition benefits provided to our Nation's schoolchildren contribute significantly to the development of their learning potential, the Federal Government should retain primary responsibility for the child nutrition programs and such programs should not be included in any block grant." And that is a quote.

These statements, Mr. Speaker, are as true today as they were in 1982. Our Federal child nutrition programs work. They help to fight hunger. They keep our kids healthy, alert, and ready to learn every single day. Block granting child nutrition programs was a bad idea in 1982 and it is a bad idea in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that sunshine is the best disinfectant, so I rise today to join my colleagues in shedding some light on the Republicans' plan and its devastating impact on Federal child nutrition programs and specifically the school lunch program.

The Republicans are at it again, insisting that their proposal actually preserves and strengthens the school lunch program. The very opposite is true.

As these charts behind me show, each year that the Republican block grant is in place, school meal programs will be cut. Over 5 years, funding for school meals programs will be cut resulting in a total loss of \$2.3 billion in the year 2000.