

their money wasted. It is our responsibility and obligation to pass welfare reform.

THE DEAL SUBSTITUTE

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

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague from Tennessee, who joins me along the Tennessee-Georgia border, Mr. WAMP, on the Republican side. He said that we do not need partisanship in this issue. I would come here tonight to suggest that we have a solution that breaks the status quo, that changes the existing programs, and we do it in a way that we think works.

We ought to all be seeking solutions that work, rather than political rhetoric. I have listened to the debate all day today, and I have come to one conclusion. We probably need fewer speech writers and more mathematicians. The only trouble is, I am reminded of the saying that "figures don't lie but lies sure can figure." We seem to be caught up in that business of arguing about figures.

Now, there is something that is true, and I think my colleague made the point earlier, and that is this, you cannot have it both ways. In your welfare reform package you are either going to make cuts to have the savings to offset the tax cuts that are coming or you are not. You cannot have it both ways.

Now, we have talked about various aspects of this plan, and we focused just recently on talking about the child nutrition programs. I am looking here at a document that came from the majority leader's office in which he is talking about the savings from the Republican bill. Now, they are either savings or they are not savings. And according to this, it says that there are \$66.3 billion of savings over 5 years. I understand that figure may have increased now because of some other changes.

And the one area of title III of the bill of child care and nutrition, according to the majority leader's office, saves \$11.8 billion over 5 years. Well, I do not know whether you are talking about cuts or whether you are talking about cuts from base line. The point is, either you have savings or you do not have savings. They are either cuts or they are not cuts. You cannot have it both ways.

Now, let us talk about a few of the things that I think are significant, and I pointed this out today. My chart has had to be amended as a result of an en bloc amendment that came on the floor today. But this is a chart that compares and contrasts the Republican version of welfare reform with a substitute that I, along with several of my colleagues, will be offering. It talks about the concept of work.

I think all of us should agree that work is the best solution to breaking

the welfare cycle. And the question is, how do you get people off welfare and into work and how do you achieve that goal of keeping them in a work force?

We both have in our plans percentages of the population that must move into the work force at certain levels. As you will notice, the Republican plan started off at 4 percent. It is has now been amended up to 10 percent. Ours starts in 1997 with 16 percent going to a total of 52 percent at the final termination in the year 2003 and thereafter.

As a result of the amendments on the floor today, the work percentages of the Republican plan have now been increased significantly. In fact, cumulatively those percentages are about 52 percent, I believe. But the interesting thing to me is that if it costs to put people into a work program to move them off of welfare into the work force, if it costs money, and it obviously does, if it did not cost any money all of us would say 100 percent from the first day must be in the work force.

I would point out, however, that under the Republican plan, they allow people to stay on welfare for 2 years and do not require anything of them.

We require within 30 days that they must sign a self-sufficiency plan and they must begin the job search process. We also have a 4-year limit once they enter a work first program. Two years in work first, at the most 2 years in a community service plan, and then a State option if they choose to put them with a voucher system for 2 years at the maximum.

Now, if it does not cost any money to move people from welfare to work, then we ought to all put our percentages at 100 percent from the word go. If it does cost money to up the percentages, we have seen the percentages on work under here by an amendment but we have not seen any revenue flow to the States to pay for that. It does not work both ways. It either costs money to do this or it does not cost money to do this. If it costs money to increase your percentages, then we ought to have some reflection in the funding proposal to pay for it. We do not see that.

WELFARE REFORM IN ARIZONA

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

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 years I have been serving in the Arizona State legislature prior to coming to this noble institution.

One of the privileges that I have had is to co-chair the Joint Select Committee on Children and Family Services. What I have seen over the last several years has really frightened me.

I think that government has become the great enabler. Those of us that have dealt with programs with alcoholics, people that we have tried to help to get off the problem, recognize that first of all, they have to have a desire deep

inside that they want to change that terrible situation that has been plaguing them for probably many years. But if they do not decide that they want to change, it is not going to happen.

I think government has become the great enabler with welfare programs in that we have basically robbed people of self-dignity. We have told them, we do not want you in mainstream society. We will pay you to stay at home because you really have no value to society. I think it is a very counterfeit type of compassion. Just as it would be with the alcoholic that is going through detox, when they are writhing in agony and going through the pain, to offer them a bottle of scotch to solve their problem, I believe that the government programs that have really trapped people in a snare of government dependency and replaced it with nothing, which has robbed people of their self-dignity. They have got to be replaced. We have to flee from those programs as fast as we can.

I do not mean to belittle the efforts tonight of the minority party in trying to reform the system. But I will say, with all due respect, you have had 30 years to do it so I am not sure that the sincerity of the effort tonight is truly noted.

I really feel that it is time for us to get off of our duff. It is time for us to help people to help themselves.

It was a great President on his inauguration that said, ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country. How quickly, it has only been three short decades since that prophetic declaration was made, and here we are today trying to be mother and father to people that really on their own are crying for dignity and they want the ability to be able to help themselves and get out of the trap that they are ensnared in, the destructive trap that they are ensnared in.

In Arizona, we were able to pass some really key reforms within the last couple of years. In fact, I would like to talk a little bit about one of my favorite people in Arizona. It is Charles Barkley.

Mr. Speaker, there are at least two huge differences between President Bill Clinton and Arizona's own Charles Barkley. Sir Charles, for one, backs up his big talk with big action. We have no such luck with Bill Clinton.

In my home State, we have been waiting for the Clinton administration HHS to grant us a waiver so we can implement our State's innovative welfare reform proposals.

Let me tell you about one of the pilot programs which would cash out the value of food stamps and give it to an employer to subsidize them to hire an employee, to hire a welfare recipient. It is a win/win. They get a job. They get dignity and self-respect and the employer gets a valued employee.

Our bill was signed by the governor a year ago but the waiver paperwork was done last August. I personally wrote

the President in February, the first of the year. Still nothing. But there he was, just a few days later, talking big before the National Association of Counties, while the President's waiver application grows cobwebs on the President's desk, Bill Clinton declared, to applause in fact, here it is in the paper, in the Washington Times, "Clinton wants States to have freedom to adjust welfare."

□ 2145

He basically said, to applause, that we should abolish the waiver system altogether. Well, Mr. Clinton, we are waiting.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SALMON. No, I will not yield.

Approve the waiver now, President Clinton.

Mr. Speaker, I also forgot to say that there is one other crucial difference between President Clinton and Charles Barkley. I still believe Charles Barkley somewhere in the country could win an election.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to tell the gentleman we will have a great deal for you tomorrow, because in the Deal substitute plan we give the flexibility to the States to not have to deal with those waivers. It is a wonderful proposal that will be presented tomorrow and it is an opportunity for you to take a look at things that we will be able to offer to the States, flexibility to deal with their own plan.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim the balance of my time, and I would like to say I believe in private sector jobs and in more government-funded programs.

Mrs. LINCOLN. That is exactly right; that is what we do.

Mr. SALMON. I do believe people ought to have the dignity to be able to go out into the private sector to be able to get jobs, and really, if sincerely you do believe that this is a good idea, would you call President Clinton for me tomorrow and tell him to pass that waiver?

DIGNITY OF WORK IS WHAT WELFARE REFORM IS ALL ABOUT

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say as I start here, I have been here 6 years and we have been working on this welfare reform program almost from the day I got here.

The people who have been working on the Deal substitute have been working tirelessly for the last 3 years that I know of, and we appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor tomorrow and offer the Congress, the House, a chance to vote with us.

I have been disappointed in the debate tonight. I still have trouble determining why a school lunch program has anything to do with helping people go back to work. When we started our welfare reform plan, we went from the principle that work is dignity, work is what people need, work will make this country stronger, and we insist that if you want something from the Government you must do something for yourself.

For people who are talking about the school lunch program, the school lunch program started 49 years ago and it was a national program. The reason it was started by President Truman was because so many kids from around the country in poor, rural States were unable to pass their draftee physical.

School nutrition, what kids have for lunch is not what we are about. We are about reforming the welfare system so people can go back to work and earn their own way.

We give more State flexibility in the Deal bill than anybody does. Right here, provisions, AFDC benefits, State option; mandated in H.R. 4. Families, States option, mandated in H.R. 4. Child support pass-through, State option for Deal, mandated in H.R. 4.

It is ironic that on the day the President signs the unfunded mandates legislation, which many of us have been working on for 2 or 3 years, and again we thank the majority for bringing that to the floor, that we have seen a bill now come before the floor on welfare for mandating to the States many of the things that we leave to State flexibility on the wonderful theory that many Republicans have professed through the years that local people know best.

We have work first. We give States flexibility in how they do that, and we do one other thing for those people that are just barely getting by and they are working, they are living by the rules, playing by the rules and that is this: We include public assistance for purposes of taxable income on the basic fair theory that a welfare dollar should not be worth more than a work-earned dollar. We are the only plan that does that.

Now we have, many of us who have been voting for some of the contract provisions as conservative Democrats, have asked some of our moderate Republican friends to join us on the theory, as the gentleman said earlier tonight, neither party has a monopoly on wisdom and virtue, and I think anybody who does not subscribe to that theory is fooling themselves. We asked for some bipartisan support on our plan. The Deal plan is the best plan in this Congress. You would not have had to have all of these amendments today you have had to put up. It is already in our package, if you would just give us the same consideration you ask from time to time from us, and it would be bipartisan. Come on over, read the Deal bill. If you have not, you ought to, because what we do in this substitute is exactly what many of you all have pro-

fessed you want to do, and that is bring back the dignity of work to the American people and help them get off of welfare.

That is what welfare reform is about. We can talk all night about whether there is a cut in the child school lunch program or not. It does not have much to do with helping someone get back to work, an adult, and that is what we try to do, and that is what we will do. And we know this: Real welfare reform has to be a Federal-State partnership and you cannot just block grant it and say States, here is some money, do the best you can with it. That will not work. That will not put people back to work. And that is why we got this letter today from the United States Conference of Mayors. They know what is going to hit them and they do not have the equipment or the ability to handle it, quite frankly, and you cannot just say block grant it and let the States do it any way they want to.

We do, and we enter into a true Federal-State partnership and we clean up the mess here in Washington in the Deal bill before we turn it over to the States. And I believe, and I would ask everybody here to read our bill and to give us serious consideration tomorrow.

I think you will find it is by far the best approach.

WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on the comments of the last speaker. I think it is important to note that the gentleman from Tennessee thanked the majority party for getting the unfunded mandates legislation to the floor of the House as has the majority party brought welfare reform finally to the floor of the House. And I will say this to my moderate Democrat friends over there, that we are glad you have a plan.

I was real disappointed when the President decided to end the welfare debate as we know it by not offering a plan. I thought he was going to end welfare, but it was just end the welfare debate. So I am glad you all have stepped in and filled what is obviously a leadership vacuum and tremendous void over there both from the White House and I would say the party leadership. I am glad to see the Deal plan is on the floor. A lot of good aspects on the Deal plan, a lot of good aspects in it and I am looking at it.

Favor H.R. 4 though. It is a bill that offers hope and independence and opportunity for people. I think it is important.

Today I had an opportunity to meet a lady named Felicia Patterson from Savannah, GA. She had been on welfare. She is right now living in public housing and she has now got a job. She is