<u>CONGRESS' WELFARE BILLS HAVE STATES WORRIED; LAWMAKERS SAY</u> <u>PROVISIONS MAY COST A BUNDLE</u>

St. Louis Post-Dispatch (Missouri)

July 30, 1996, Tuesday, FIVE STAR LIFT Edition

Copyright 1996 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.

Section: WAR PAGE; Pg. 11B

Length: 628 words

Byline: Fred W. Lindecke Missouri Political Correspondent

Body

Missouri Political Correspondent <u>STATES SAY</u> they'd like to be considered in <u>Congress'</u> <u>welfare</u> reform measure, because they could get stuck with paying the <u>bill</u>.

Leaders of the National Conference of <u>State</u> Legislatures <u>said</u> Monday they were in constant touch with House and Senate conferees on the final form of the federal <u>welfare</u> reform <u>bill</u> being written.

About 4,600 legislators, staff aides and people associated with <u>state</u> legislators are attending the national conference's annual meeting at Ameri ca's Center. The meeting runs through Wednesday.

<u>State</u> Sen. James J. Lack, R-N.Y., and <u>state</u> Rep. Jane Campbell, D-Ohio, <u>said</u> the conference had serious concerns about some <u>provisions</u> of <u>welfare bills</u> passed this month by the House and Senate. Lack is conference president, and Campbell is immediate past president.

Lack <u>said</u> a <u>provision</u> denying <u>welfare</u> benefits to legal immigrants would be "a nightmare" for New York and other <u>states</u> with high immigrant populations. He <u>said</u> the New York Constitution required giving <u>welfare</u> benefits to immigrants, and if **Congress** banned them, New York would have to pick up a potential \$ 1 billion in **costs**.

Nationwide, banning federal <u>welfare</u> benefits to legal immigrants could result in shifting \$ 11 billion in <u>costs</u> to <u>states</u>, a conference report <u>said</u>.

Campbell <u>said</u> the federal <u>bill</u> called for it to take effect Oct. 1. She <u>said</u> the <u>states</u> wanted the effective date delayed until Oct. 1, 1997, to give them time to adjust. Most <u>state</u> legislatures will be out of session af ter Oct. 1 this year, she <u>said</u>.

Although different in many respects, the House and Senate <u>bills</u> agree in setting a two-year limit on <u>welfare</u> benefits without the beneficiary being employed, and a five-year lifetime limit on <u>welfare</u> benefits. They would give <u>states</u> block grants, eliminating waivers <u>states</u> now must obtain to install their own <u>welfare</u> requirements.

Campbell <u>said</u> 36 <u>states</u> already had set time limits, and 24 <u>states</u> had set work requirements. But the conference staff reported that in only two <u>states</u> - Vermont and Florida - have laws been in effect long enough for the time limit to expire. So far, only eight families in Florida have been cut off, according to conference data.

Campbell <u>said</u> that if children were abused in a family cut off from benefits, they could be put in foster care, but this also has not happened.

Sen. James L. Mathewson, D-Sedalia, president pro tem of the Missouri Senate, <u>said</u> Missouri had passed a law in 1994 providing child care and job training for <u>welfare</u> mothers, but setting no time limit for them to get a job.

CONGRESS' WELFARE BILLS HAVE STATES WORRIED; LAWMAKERS SAY PROVISIONS MAY COST A BUNDLE

"There are 26,000 less people on <u>welfare</u> now," Mathewson <u>said</u>. "One of the reasons is the economy is good. For the present fiscal year, the <u>cost</u> of aid to families with dependent children is \$ 10 million less."

But he <u>said</u> Missouri had to get 19 separate waivers from the federal government to carry out its <u>welfare</u> changes. "If they would just give us 75 to 80 percent of the money we're getting now and leave us alone, we'll deliver a lot better system than they'll ever dream up," he <u>said</u>.

Mathewson <u>said</u> he had worked out a system in which applicants for food stamps in Sedalia were sent to the nearby Tyson Foods plant to get a job. He <u>said</u>, "The word went around, 'Don't go sign up for food stamps. They'll make you go pick chickens at Tyson.' "

But federal law has a **provision** that if an applicant is denied a job because of an employer requirement, food stamps cannot be cut off. Mathewson **said** Tyson had a drug test, so new advice hit the street: "Go shoot up, and then you don't have to take the job," Mathewson **said**.

He <u>said</u> he hoped the federal <u>welfare</u> <u>bill</u> would allow Missouri to use its own discretion on dealing with this problem.

Classification

Language: English

Subject: LEGISLATIVE BODIES (91%); US <u>STATE</u> GOVERNMENT (90%); <u>WELFARE</u> BENEFITS (89%); CONFERENCES & CONVENTIONS (89%); IMMIGRATION LAW (87%); PUBLIC HEALTH & <u>WELFARE</u> LAW (87%); SOCIAL ASSISTANCE REGULATION & POLICY (87%); US REPUBLICAN PARTY (72%); US DEMOCRATIC PARTY (72%); TALKS & MEETINGS (71%); GRANTS & GIFTS (50%)

Company: TYSON FOODS INC (55%); TYSON FOODS INC (55%); NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF **STATE** LEGISLATURES (84%)

Organization: NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES (84%)

Ticker: TYSN (NASDAQ) (55%)

Load-Date: August 2, 1996

End of Document