

nutritional value foods that we talk about.

And that is what you are going to end up doing here.

Now, let me tell you about Michael and his family to finish this. Well, I do not have time, but let us just remember in this debate, this is not about numbers. This is about people with real problems, and we need to be careful.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE DEAL SUBSTITUTE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to say to my colleague from Georgia and the others over there that, yes, we do thank your leadership for bringing up some of these issues that we have worked very hard on over the past 3 years. And I guess I can say that, as a newer Member, I also think it is important that we shed our pettiness in terms of who is bringing up the issues and look more at what is happening to the American people. I think that is one of the objectives that I and many of the other colleagues that I have shared this bill with, the Deal substitute bill, in trying to put people above politics, and that is a very important issue that we have to do right now.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LINCOLN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thought it was the Democrat chart that had a T shape on our plan versus your plans. I was only responding to your plan.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just think it is very important for the American people to know our group and the bill that we have produced is very nonpartisan. It is a very practical bill. It is very realistic. And we are here because we want to put people before politics. That is what is important, taking the American people, looking at what their needs are.

Tomorrow we will have the options of looking at the bill offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], the Deal bill, and the Republican Contract bill.

We have worked hard. We have produced a bill that is really realistic in terms of what it does for the American people and in terms of what it does for this Nation in long-term getting people off of welfare, and that is what we want. We do not want to just throw them off of welfare. We want to get them off of welfare, get them off of the generational dependency and put them into a constructive, contributing life style.

People have a tendency really to ignore the voice of reason, and I think really that is what we have got to present in the Deal bill is real reason,

looking at what people need to survive and to become independent.

It is time that we finally hear what that voice of reason is. We have talked about priorities tonight. Are you going to talk about food and making sure children get fed, or are you going to talk about \$20 billion to \$40 billion of increases in military spending? Are you going to talk about putting people back to work and giving them the opportunity to provide for themselves? That is what is important. We have got to look at where this Nation is spending its money.

In terms of percentages, if you look at the money we are spending on both military, on interest, on the debt, the talks we have had here tonight in terms of nutrition, less than 0.1 percent are a drop in the bucket in what we need to do, and our voice of reason, the Deal substitute, puts more people to work than the alternative bills that will be offered tomorrow.

The Deal substitute is the only one that devotes its entire savings to deficit reduction, and if you are serious about deficit reduction for your children and your children's children, you have got to realize that we have got to put those savings toward deficit reduction. We realize the same amount of savings roughly that the Republican plan does, but we direct our savings to deficit reduction, because we are worried about the future of our children, not only in welfare reform, but also in deficit reduction.

The Deal substitute recognizes that it is impossible to work without proper job training and child care. You cannot ask a single mother to work for her benefits if she has nowhere to take her children.

And, yes, you are right, the family structure in this Nation is deteriorating, and that young woman does not have the support network of a family, a grandparent or a parent to look after that child. She has got to depend on some child care, and we have got to provide it, and we do in the Deal substitute. We not only provide it, but we pay for it, and that is an important part of what we do.

The Deal substitute identifies the problems that have been created in the crazy checks abuse, and it solves the problem. I have seen a tremendous amount of that problem in my district, and I have been working hard over these past years to look for a reasonable solution that does not throw out the baby with the bath water. It does not put that child with cerebral palsy out on the street, but it makes sure the disabled children, especially those that are multiply disabled, are going to be helped, but the ones that are abusing the programs, those loopholes will be closed.

The Deal substitute is the only one that sets a 2-year lifetime limit on welfare benefits, the only program that is going to be offered that sets a 2-year lifetime limit.

We give the States the option of extending benefits for 2 more years with

community service, and that is what we have heard from most people is that the States know better how to craft and to recraft those programs to get their people back into the work force.

The Deal substitute gives States more flexibility than any other proposal without passing massive costs on to the States, no unfunded mandates. We do not produce the unfunded mandates, because we know it is unrealistic, and in the long run it will not work.

The Deal substitute does not demand family caps. Instead, we give that flexibility to the States, that option of denying additional benefits to mothers who have more children while on welfare.

The Deal substitute includes welfare benefits as taxable income. It is the best alternative you are going to get, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

#### WELFARE REFORM AND DEFICIT REDUCTION

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is good to see my good friend from Ohio in the chair tonight.

At the outset, I yield to my good friend from Georgia for a moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say one thing about the Deal alternative. I do agree, Mr. Speaker, with the previous speaker. It is the best alternative that is out there, not as good as H.R. 4, the Republican plan, but in terms of an alternative, I agree that the moderate Democrats are showing some leadership over there, and I hope maybe you can inspire your official leaders to show some leadership, too.

One thing though I do want to say about the Democrats' newfound interest in deficit reduction is that, you know, for since 1969, the Democrats have controlled the House, and each year we have a new debt. Now, I say since 1969; that is the last time we had a balanced budget, but year after year the deficit has gone up.

But I say this: It is a Republican and A Democrat obligation to address it, because I believe both parties created the deficit, and I am glad now that both of us are talking about it, and let us have this one-upmanship. Let us see who can top each other's deficit-reduction plan. That is what two parties are all about.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just wanted to re-emphasize the fact if we are really truly talking about deficit reduction that all of what we have been talking about in terms of cuts, rescissions, and certainly in the welfare reform and the

moneys that we can save should be going to deficit reduction, and I would certainly encourage the gentlemen when those amendments are offered and certainly when we talk about the lockbox aspects of putting those moneys towards deficit reduction, that we will see that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I note with interest the gentlewoman from Arkansas preceded me in this Chamber by one term, part of the 103rd Congress. I know not her voting record personally, but I do not know the former majority is on record as voting for the largest tax increase in history, a tax increase which hit so many Americans in the wallet as to be just grossly unfair, and went on with the gasoline tax the average impact of which being in excess of an average of \$400 per year in additional energy payments for every family in America, regardless of their socioeconomic status. So I would contend with the lady and my other good friends on the other side of the aisle, I do not believe we can tax ourselves to prosperity, and nor, although there are certainly some noble aspects to the notion of a deficit lockbox, I believe we have to return the money to the people who earned that money in the first place.

If I could speak for just a few moments on the 5 minutes I have, I thank my good friends on the other side for their restraint. I would also add that I certainly welcome tonight's meaningful dialog in stark contrast to the hysterics we heard earlier today.

I mentioned that earlier today during the debate I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone from any political party would choose to compare their opposition to the Third Reich of Nazi Germany or to slave holders. I believe that was inexcusable, but I welcome certainly the tone tonight which has changed.

You and I just happen to have a difference of opinion. I think we also have a different interpretation on some of the numbers, but let me yield in the interests of fairness to my friend from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just want to say that we have also seen three consecutive years of deficit reduction. I would just like to encourage the gentleman to make sure that he knows that there are those of us who are speaking out for deficit reduction.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I would point out that deficit reduction came at the expense of hard-working taxpayers who would like to keep more of their money in their own pocket, and if we cut taxes and cut the deficit and build this economy, then that will be the answer for everyone including those trapped right now in the prison, if you will, of welfare, and a system that is broken, and we all agree is in need of some radical change.

We asked for that type of change, and that is what we are working to do with your majority bill, H.R. 4. We welcome your thoughts on it, but we would ask

you to take a much closer look at the numbers you purport with reference to the Federal lunch program. One is tempted to recall the words of our good friend from California, "There you go again," not talking about the real numbers. We call for increases in the school lunch program of 4.5 percent over the next 5 years, an increase over 5 years of \$1.1 billion in expenditures, and we are getting the job done while we are hearing a lot of rhetoric.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would like to reference your remarks where you just said there was an increase in school lunch program, and I want to, and I appreciate the time to respond to that, there is not an increase in the school lunch program. There is a cut.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentlewoman has to understand how on Earth can you increase a program, now, in fairness, if you are saying there is a reduction in anticipated increases, I would certainly contend that is an interesting way to define a cut.

Ms. PELOSI. I wish the gentleman would wait until my time so we can continue.

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

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

#### THE CURRENT WELFARE SYSTEM DOES NOT WORK

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

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about something that I think we all agree upon. There has been a lot of discussion, a lot of debate today, and it seems that one thing that we do agree upon is the current welfare system simply does not work, and instead of requiring work, it actually punishes those who go to work. Instead of instilling personal responsibility, it encourages dependence on the Government, and instead of encouraging marriage and family stability, it penalizes two-parent families and rewards teenage pregnancies.

We all agree welfare must be drastically changed, and that welfare should only offer transitional assistance leading to work, not leading to a way of life.

Now, I am one of the cosponsors of the Deal substitute, and we are committed in our bill to making some pretty major changes. Our bill is the only bill that will be considered which en-

sures that its savings are used for deficit reduction.

Now, I think that is an important goal that many of us share, and our bill is the only bill that ensures that our savings will be used for that purpose. We support welfare reform that emphasizes work. It emphasizes personal responsibility. It emphasizes family stability.

The Deal substitute imposes some pretty tough work requirements while providing opportunities for education and training and for child care and health care to support working people.

□ 2215

It provides States with the resources necessary in order for welfare reform to succeed without shifting costs to local governments or without creating unfunded mandates, and it gives the State the flexibility to design and administer welfare programs they need without sacrificing accountability of the Nation's taxpayer's dollars. We believe that real welfare reform must be about replacing a welfare check with a paycheck.

The Deal substitute's time-limited work first program is designed to get people into the work force as quickly as possible by requiring all recipients to enter a self-sufficiency plan within 30 days of receiving their benefits.

The Republican welfare bill allows recipients to receive cash benefits for up to 2 years before they are required to work or even to look for work.

The Deal substitute also encourages welfare recipients to leave welfare for work by providing adequate funding for safe child care and by extending transitional medicaid assistance from 1 year to 2 years.

The Deal substitute provides the necessary resources for welfare recipients to become self-sufficient, but it also requires recipients to be responsible for their own actions by setting clear time limits on benefits. No benefits will be paid to anyone, and this is extremely important, no benefits will be paid to anyone who refuses to work, who refuses to look for work or who turns down a job.

In addition to making individuals responsible for their own welfare, we demand that both parents be responsible for their children. The Deal substitute includes the toughest child support system ever to make sure that the noncustodial parents simply don't walk away from the children that they helped bring into this world.

The sponsors of the Deal substitute recognize that in order to reform welfare States must have the flexibility to design and administer welfare programs that are tailored to their unique needs, to the unique characteristic of their States. And we believe that States should not have to go through any cumbersome Federal waiver process in order to implement innovative reforms in their welfare programs.

The Deal substitute, in fact, puts into place a Federal model for the work