Welfare battle ends in Senate compromise

After taking a bad defeat in the Appropriations Committee Wednesday, state Senate Republicans Thursday could claim 'a modets gan' as the \$2.1 billion social services budget passed the full Senate. We are beginning to reprioritize,' said Sen. R. Robert Geake, R-Northville, who lost the committee battle. Added Doug Cruce, R-Troy. 'We hope it is the beginning of a new emphasis.'

They supported the bill on final passage, as did Democrats William Faust of Westland, Jack Faxon of Southfield, Philip Mastin of Pontlac and Patrick and Folial Control of Southfield, Philip Mastin of Pontlac and Patrick and Folial Control of Southfield, Philip Mastin of Pontlac and Patrick and Folial Control of Southfield, Philip Mastin of Pontlac and Patrick and Folial Control of Southfield, Philip Mastin of Pontlac and Patrick and Folial Control of Pontlac and Pontlac and Patrick The bill goes back to the House for concurrence in amendments.

THE 33-3 victory belied the earlier battle in the Appropriations Committee. There, Dr. Agnes M. Mansour, the former nun from Farmington Hills and Detroit who heads the Blanchard Administration's Department of Social Services, made an impassioned plen for removal of conservative amend-

tion's Department of Social Services, made an Impassioned plea for removal of conservative amendments.

She won and Geake lost in committee, but the final version reflected a compromise Geake and Cruce pointed to these changes in direction.

• \$43 million, which the House had earmarked for a home-heating plan and Manseur wanted for benefit increases, was put into a post-training fund.

• A caseload contingency account was set up Legislators contended the administration is crucial experience welfare expensions. The hill requires approval of a fund transfer by the House and See appropriations committees before Manseur 1885 can spend the money.

• A longer watting period for welfare applications when the former is and some first in the previous statements by the money of the propriate and some first in the previous statements. Democrate and some first plantages four lowers that the many valuative local guadeliness.

THE ISSLES were sharply onlined in a commit-tee debate. Annotating tighter rules were Geale and conservative Democrate Gilbert Divisiol of East Detroit. Opposing the changes were Mansour and Democrats Faron of Southfield and Lana Pollack of Ann Arbor.

of Ann Arbor.

Mansour advocated a benefit increase: "Is \$5 a
day too much ... to pay for everything? Look at
the whole budget. I'd sacrifice anything ... to get
a 5 percent increase for people who have been froensince 1992.

Geake: "If a Michigan family of four gets \$492 a
month ... plus food stamps, plus medicald ... how
do they arrive at a figure of \$315 a month in Indiana?"

ana?" Benefits in Michigan are no longer higher than the five-state average," shot back Pollack. "Indeed, we are lower. But does it make a difference? I'm not sure it does... And I don't hear anyone in this Legislature arguing for parity with what the Indiana Legislature is paid. They have different pay structures and different standards of living."

MANSOUR opposed an amendment that would have forbade higher benefits to persons on welfare who have more children. To put in boilerplate (feal language) that a woman should not have a child it she's on public assistance is blatant social control."

If she's on public assistance is blatant social control.

And Faxon likened the proposal to mainland China and Singapore laws which penalize additional children. I don't think that's going to impact on whether they're born or not,' said Faxon of the GOP amendment.

Geake replied: "We're not saying they can't have a child. We're saying that if a woman on welfare has more children, we should not have to pay. Whether the taxpayer has another child, no one increases his pay, Only when the welfare recipient has another child do we hercease benefits."

Diffelio added, "When my people are working for less wages and have to pay for your liberalism, Sens. Faxon and Pollack, we have to take another look at it."

The 'China amendment,' as Pollack dubbed it, was utilimately rejected when fellow conservatives descried Geake.

descried Geake.

REPUBLICANS sought to eliminate general assistance — a benefit to able-bodied adults, usually single men, who are ineligible for any other assistance—during the three summer months, thus saving \$40.5 million.

Geake contended, Pennsylvania has this now. It's working very well.

Pollack argued back, 'It would work, 'I) only if there are no lobs and, 'I) people refuse to work. Well, there are no lobs for the majority of these people. Keeping them (payments) low in order to encourage them to go back to work built valid, where are the jobar Show me the want ads and the employers. If you do, I'll retireat.'

The GOP amendment lost.

Republicans were successful in extending the waiting period, although one of their leaders, Sen.





Harry Gast of St. Joseph, and Senate Majority Leader William Faust of Westland argued it couldn't be done under federal guidelines. The fed-eral government matches the state welfare contri-bution, making the total social services budget \$4.1



When the taxpayer has another child, no one increases his pay. Only when the welfare recipient has another child do we increase benefits.

-8en. R. Robert Geake

'To put in boilerplate (legal language) she's on public assistance is biatant





CALL (313) 344-1300 FOR THE PERRY DRUG STORE NEAREST YOU!