

The following outlines audio clips with corresponding transcripts of the conversation of relevant floor debate on Senate Bill 24 from the 2015 session. The clips to audio displayed below were generated from the House Communications media archive, and the corresponding transcripts represent an accurate portrayal of what various members said on the House floor during those debates.

Debate on Third Read vote in the House - SB 24 (Sater/Franklin) - Inquiry by Rep. Carpenter of Rep. Franklin

- Date: 3/18/15, afternoon session
- **Link to audio archived by House Communications:** clip comes about 2 hrs 30 minutes into debate on third reading (copy and paste into browser):

mo.house.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?clip_id=66&view_id=1&embed=1&player_width=640&player_height=480&entrytime=8986&stoptime=9705&auto_start=0

JC: John Carpenter

DF: Diane Franklin

DF: Are we at the very crux of this program, is temporary assistance so that people can move off of the program at the very crux of it? And it's been a long time since we've sat down and said how can we help make that happen? And that's what this bill's about. Thank you.

JC: Thank you Mr. Speaker, to inquire the lady from Camdenton.

DF: I do. (In response to the Speaker asking if she yielded)

JC: I have a few questions about some of the basic facts and impacts of this legislation. If the legislature should pass the bill. Question number one would be on day one, when this legislation goes into effect, how many people, would we be kicking off of their current TANF benefits?

DF: Well sir, we're not going to kick anyone off?

JC: Well, no, there's already people who are beyond the 30 month threshold after which they can no longer receive benefits, so on day one a lot of people are going to get-

DF: The clock starts-

JC: No no. On day one, if you've already had more than 30 months, you're out, right?

DF: No.

JC: No?

DF: No.

JC: So if you've been on TANF for five and a half, or for 4 and a half years, for 55 months-

DF: You know what they'll do is, they'll just, how long did you say?

JC: Let's say they've been on for 55 months currently, the current maximum is 60 months, always has been-

DF: You're working towards 60 months-

JC: Right, but we're lowering it to 30 with this bill-

DF: First of all you have to go through the application process.

JC: Yeah, but lady there's already people that have gone through it and have been on it for more

than 30 months. So when we pass your bill, so let's say that you've been on it for 40 months-

DF: Right.

JC: Those people are going to lose their benefits when we pass the bill.

DF: They're going to move back into the process-

JC: They start over?

DF: Just let me answer your question.

JC: Absolutely lady.

DF: [sigh] Okay. So I understand your concern, it's a real concern. So what those folks are going to do is go in and do their orientation process and develop their plan. Alright? You know, I think it is a very real question, so the Department is going to promulgate rules and their rules can be "alright you have two and half years now," it's their job, it doesn't say in the bill what would happen.

JC: Well lady, the bill as written and it's in the numbers and your own fiscal note that are on your own bill very clearly state that anybody that is over 30 months on day one, Jan 1 of 2016 is going to be removed from the program. Currently that would affect 18,045 people, of which 12,000 are children. So on day one-

DF: I'm sorry but can you find that in the bill where it says they're going to be removed?

JC: It is in the analysis that the Department that runs the program provided

DF: Well that's their analysis

JC: I think it's pretty obvious that if we say there's a 30 month limit and somebody's been on it for 40 months they are going to be beyond the limit. And on your own fiscal note it says on day one 18,000 people lose their benefits. So why are we passing legislation today when the person who's sponsoring the bill in the house doesn't even know the number of people who on day one are going to be kicked out of the program?

DF: I do not agree with what you're saying. I do not agree.

JC: You cannot agree, but that doesn't make it true!

DF: It's an analysis. If that happened, this is what it would look like, show me in the bill where it says they're going to be off. It's a fiscal analysis.

JC: A pretty easy read of the bill-

DF: It's a good question-

JC: - Is that there's a thirty month maximum lifetime benefit and some people are already beyond 30 months.

DF: It's a good question, sir. But nowhere in the bill does it say they'll be removed.

JC: Alright. Well I think a commonsense reading of the bill is suggests that. And it goes into effect January 1, 2016

DF: Well commonsense is sometimes... Do you have anything else you'd like to ask me.

JC: I do have several other questions, thank you lady. My next question is since again we're passing legislation on this important topic, what is the average amount of money that a household receives per month from the TANF program?

DF: The average amount is about \$300.

JC: So it's \$227 a month and that comes out to \$2,724 per year for an average household. The average household is getting \$2700 a year. Do you really think that people are disincentivized from finding work because they're sitting at home, earning \$2700 a year from the state? Do you really feel like that that's a disincentive to go find work?

DF: What is the dollar amount of benefits totally that this person receives? Childcare, subsidies...

JC: You're reducing it from 60 to 30

DF: How much? You know how much?

JC: Well you're reducing it from 60 to 30 on this particular benefit.

DF: How much low-income energy, housing, what else is there?

JC: But you're not doing anything to change those benefits. You're not reducing those

DF: Food stamps, child care assistance, what else are they receiving?

JC: Lady

DF: They're receiving almost 26-32 thousand dollars

JC: Lady.

DF: For a family of four.

JC: Lady we're not reducing any benefit other than the cash benefit of \$2700 per year

DF: How much do you get paid to do this job? How much do you get paid to do this job?

JC: Well Lady if you don't answer the question it's okay but

DF: I did answer it

JC: Well you didn't because we're not talking about reducing any other those other benefits

DF: No

JC: We're talking about the \$2700 per year that the average household gets and that you are taking it from 60 to 30- you are taking it under the guise that by going from 60 to 30 people are going to be incentivized because they are no longer going to get their \$2700 a year for their household

DF: Okay

JC: That they're going to be incentivized to go finally find a job

DF: Can I- Are you ready for me to answer?

JC: Absolutely

DF: I don't think they're going to be incentivized by money, in that sense. I think that they're- they will be incentivized by making progress by personal interaction and putting together a plan that will move them from having to worry about two dollars to a point where they can take care of twenty dollars [unclear].

JC: Lady but we could pass those other provisions of the bill without doing the 60 to 30 month. We could say, let's have more face-to-face contact with the caseworker that kind of thing we could do all of that without the 60 to 30 provision. We're just choosing to throw that in there too so that folks who on day 1 are above 30 would no longer get that benefit.

DF: So you think someone at 60 months- that somehow a better- how do you arrive at the fact that 60 months- 5- think about a child that is born and then they're five years old

JC: Well frankly that's what our policy has always been in the state. I'm not the one posing 60 months

DF: We haven't looked at it for 20 years.

JC: 60 months has always been the proposal in the state. You're the one saying we should cut it by 50 percent because we've been doubly too high the entire time.

DF: I like it. I like it.

JC: Yeah well the 12,000 kids who on day one January 1st of 2016 they might not like it quite as much as you do.

DF: The kids are not cut off.

JC: Really so if the kids live in a household and that household no longer receives the benefit, those 12,000 kids are not affected by the loss of that \$2700 dollars.

DF: They will still have all of their other benefits, sir.

JC: All right.

DF: Okay.

JC: So what is the amount of money that gets saved by reducing from 60 to 30?

DF: I don't know. Because we don't really- You got it? Tell me.

JC: Again that's in- it's in your fiscal note, yes.

DF: I actually- If you want to ask fiscal note questions I actually have someone that can answer those questions better than myself.

JC: Well I'm going to stick with you for now if that's okay.

DF: Okay. Go ahead. Tell me.

JC: So I can say it's 20.48 million dollars of which we're going to take 4.3 million- so reducing the benefit paid to actual families by 20.48 million dollars and we're going to take at least 4.3 million of that and put it into anti-abortion measures. Is that right? [papers shuffling] Again if we're going to pass this bill ya'll we, you know, we ought to know what it's gonna do.

DF: I know what it does. What, where is that?

[Papers shuffling]

JC: And I bet, let's- alright

DF: Alright so what this says, the four purposes of TANF, the four federal purposes says prevent and reduce

JC: Yeah

DF: The incidence of out-of-wedlock pregnancies

JC: So money toward anti-abortion programs is going to reduce the number of out-of-wedlock pregnancies?

DF: I would think so.

JC: Would you?

DF: Yes.

JC: Okay, I think there's a- Well, all right. Uh, on the spending side we talk a lot about how we're trying to save money for the state and do we- are we, by passing this bill, are we going to actually lower the amount of money that the federal government or the state, uh, spends?

DF: The amount of the TANF block grant that we receive?

JC: Right.

DF: No.

JC: So the federal government is going to spend the same amount and then at the state level do we save any money? Are we going to spend any less money if we pass this bill?

DF: Initially to set up all the computer work to track the work activities

JC: Yeah

DF: For the participants- for the applicants and the participants there is a cost associated to that.

JC: Okay so we're actually- to be clear, not only are we not saving money in terms of government spending that either the federal nor the state are- we're actually increasing

DF: It's in your fiscal note. But what does your fiscal note say for 2017, 2018, 2019?

JC: Right it's-

DF: What does it say? What does it say?

JC: It's unknown. It says unknown.

DF: Yes.

JC: It does not indicate any savings whatsoever and in fact the only number that it has is an

increase in state spending of \$340,000 dollars to implement your bill. And that's state dollars.

DF: To set up the work. I had to explain to you what that was for.

JC: So we're increasing- just making it clear we're not saving any money in fact we're actually increasing spending with this bill.

DF: So yeah because rather than have folks spend this money on postage, let's say, what we do right now. We send them a letter, they send it back, whatever it is.

JC: Yeah

DF: We're going to create an up to date state of the art computer system, I- is that not what you use in your business?

JC: No.

DF: Do you not make an investment, when you want to make something better, an investment?

JC: Lady, I- that makes less sense.

JC: Mr. Speaker, to speak on the bill please.

Speaker: Please proceed Gentleman.

JC: Thank you Mr. Speaker. You know, I just think it's really important that when we pass bills here we understand what the actual impact on real Missourians is gonna be. Uh if we want to live in fantasy land where nobody gets kicked off of the program when we pass this bill you can say that, but it is not borne out of facts or common sense or by what the bill says. On day one, January first of 2016, 12,000 children and 18,000 people total, will be dropped. And that's only on day one. As people continue to go over the 30-month cap that number will continue to grow. So we can feel real good about getting rid of the \$2700 dollars a year that these households receive or we can vote against this bill, Mr. Speaker, and do the right thing. I'm gonna vote no. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

Debate on TAFP motion - SB 24 (Sater/Franklin); Rep. Pace inquiring of Rep. Carpenter:

- Date: 4/16/15
- **Link to audio archived by House Communications:** clip comes about 3:30 - 3:37 into debate (copy and paste into browser):

mohouse.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=84&starttime=12819&stoptime=13075&autostart=0&embed=1

JC: John Carpenter

SP: Sharon Pace

SP: Could you give me some of your concerns about this particular bill?

JC: Uh absolutely. And I appreciate the inquiry very much. I very much look forward to uh even more inquiries on this bill here today. My concern is last time we debated this bill uh on this floor I think it was pretty clearly misrepresented what the bill does and I think it's very important that uh before people put their name behind this revised version of the bill that they understand what the bill actually does. So for example, on the lifetime uh limitation that we are lowering

substantially, we're doing a 25% cut, uh, to the lifetime limit. Which is a pretty drastic decision to do, right, you know we're not trimming it by 5% or 10% we're doing a 25% cut to the lifetime limitation down to 45 months. And when we discussed the bill last time, you know, I inquired of the handler of this bill on this floor and asked how many people were gonna get kicked off the program as a result of doing that and the answer that was given to our fellow members was that nobody was gonna get kicked off, that the answer was zero. That somehow, the folks who are currently in the program would not be affected by the bill we're about the pass. Well that's not true. Uh, what's true is that on day one, January first 2016, thousands of people are removed from the program. Thousands. So people who were told when they signed up for TANF that they were going to be allowed to have a lifetime maximum of 60 months, people who were told that, will now be on January first of 2016, removed from the program. Uh, I believe the number comes out to 9,465 people and 6,310 of whom are children. Now, that's just day one. Right, that's just the people who as of January first are beyond the new 45-month limit. People will continue as the months pass hitting that limit, and that number will go up and up and up, and there will be many more thousands of people who will be kicked off of TANF who if we don't pass this bill wouldn't be. So that is one of many issues, and I think we need to have a debate on this bill today, and I think that the handler of the bill needs to discuss uh those questions of how many kids are gonna get kicked off, how many people are gonna get kicked off, and why we didn't do a grandfather clause to say to the people who are currently in the program, people who signed a contract saying- the state and the person signed the contract together saying here's the deal, here's what we're going to do for you and here's what you need to do, here's the requirements that you need to meet. Why we didn't do a grandfather clause for those people to exempt them since we already did the contract with them and those are some questions that need to be answered and I look forward to trying to get those answered and I appreciate the inquiry very much.

SP: Thank you and I think that's a very good suggestion, and I do applaud you for that. I also think too, what are we going to do with these, the people and the individuals right now currently, where are you going to find jobs? I mean, they've been looking. I'm sure everyone's not sitting home waiting for their TANF to expire. So, we have issues with that. These people do have children. And we have issues with that too. What are we going to do with the children and feeding them and taking care of them? So we need to be more open to what is actually going on. I'm sure somebody is touched by a loss of a job if and when maybe they get terminated for whatever reason, or then they just got laid off. There are circumstances here that go beyond what we're actually looking at and we need to look in the mirror because this can hit any one of us any day and time. Jobs are not available as they have been in the past, and there is training that we must give individuals as well to secure their future and make sure they have the ability and the opportunity uh to do the best and to be self-sufficient. So I thank you for accepting the inquiry and I thank also the Speaker for the time. Thank you very much.

Debate on TAFP motion; Inquiry of Sponsor Rep. Franklin:

- **Date:** 4/16/16
- **Link to audio archived by House Communications:** clip comes about 3:44 into debate (copy and paste into browser):

moohouse.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=84&starttime=13461&stoptime=13872&autostart=0&embed=1

SA: Rep. Sue Allen

DF: Rep. Diane Franklin

SA: I wonder if I could inquire the bill handler from Camden who just had a chance to sit down but I would like to inquire of her.

Speaker: Certainly. Lady from Camden, do you yield?

DF: I do. I do.

Speaker: Please proceed.

DF: Thank you. Thank you. Could- Lady, I think it's truly interesting, and I know the media was there as well. The house position and the house offer was, and our words were, you know we feel like we made a contract with these folks for 60 months, the participants, and what we would like to do is offer a bridge. A bridge that would take those folks that would reach these limits and stair step them out of the program. It was interesting to hear that maybe that was the suggestion that came from the other side, but hey you were there and the media was there. Did we make that suggestion from our side?

SA: You know Lady I wish you would embellish further on that because that was a key negotiating point and it looked to me that that was not a concept that the individuals who vote who did not sign this conference report, they kind of threw that out.

DF: They would rather 48 months, or 45 months, and you're off the program, than create a compassionate step-off the program process. They rejected that whole-heartedly, didn't they?

SA: They did and I appreciate the work that you and the um, uh other Lady from St. Louis County who worked on this put in on coming up with this scenario so that we would not just change the rules of someone who enrolled in TANF years ago. And they were- I believe weren't they still- those approaching that 48 month limit.

DF: Yeah 48 months was fine and they're off the program.

SA: And they were still going to be extended another year for that transition. I think that was pretty generous.

DF: Yeah I thought it was a way to- you know we had talk on the floor here when it was in here about that concern and so we took that to heart and we addressed that and we came up with a way to make it possible for folks to be stair stepped off. But yet, totally rejected. The other point that you made that I thought was really great is at the close of the year this year, the number of families that reach that 60 month limit was 83 families. So these numbers, they're emotional numbers. They're numbers that are used to try to say that we're not paying attention, that we don't care, that we don't have a grasp of the situation. However, we do have a grasp of the situation. Because rather than warehousing these folks for up to 60 months in different intervals, we're saying let's put structure, let's get them involved, and let's help them move forward. You know, the other part of it that I think is just so important for everyone to know is that our problem with the federal government is how we are- when we dealt- when we- we have to apply sanctions to people who are not meeting their work requirements as a motive, because we are accountable to the federal government when they give us these dollars and we don't- we don't monitor whether

or not folks are meeting those work requirements and I think in January of 2015, 8,732 participants were sanctioned for not meeting their requirements.

SA: This has been one of the largest frustrations because, because people would sign up um TANF recipients would sign up for a childcare program and- I've been in daycares where the staff knew the parent wasn't working, wasn't going to school. Maybe it's a young mom and she enrolls in a junior college class. And so, okay that allows her to have her child in childcare. But- Speaker: Ladies, please allow me to get some order in the chamber. Members and visitors in the side gallery, please keep your conversations to a whisper. Please proceed Ladies, you have 3 minutes and 53 seconds left.

SA: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Speaker. So, yes a young mom might enroll in a course at a junior college enough to be able to have childcare and then didn't maybe continue throughout that process, and there was no oversight. There was no one saying are you having problems with transportation? What is a barrier that's helping you?

DF: Right.

SA: So again this new process we have in that

DF: We can help now. There's someone with context that can help.

SA: Hands up to help them get beyond those barriers.

DF: Yeah.

SA: And again, oversight. So that we as a state are not jeopardizing and risking the millions of dollars that we put into TANF with no accountability. And I challenge anyone, read back four or five years of the state auditor's single state audits and every single one the uh mess ups of DSS social services and family support division and they do not implement, they do not pay attention. We waste our dollars, they risk them just so we can spend enough money to the feds. And that's stupid. Thank you ma'am.

DF: Thank you.

Debate on motion to Override in the House - SB 24 (Sater/Franklin)

- Date: 5/5/15, morning session
- **Link to audio archived by House Communications:** clip comes about 44:29 – 46:57 into debate (copy and paste into browser):

mo.house.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=100&starttime=2669&stoptime=2817&autostart=0&embed=1

Franklin: "...and at the end, the very last thing: we're going to keep track of how well the state is doing and how well our programs are working. We have been looking at poverty in this country for over 50 years, and we are unable to move the needle on poverty through our different federal programs. So it's time to look at them, assess them, and to bring them to a point where the folks themselves in these difficult situations can move forward. What we've been doing is measuring

success based on effort input and how much money we are spending, how many programs we're creating and how many people are on the program. What we're doing now is we're taking these funds and spending this money more effectively and more efficiently. We are not pumping more money into the same failed system because we will only get the same failed result for these parents and for these children. Recently I was at an event in St. Louis, it was the first championship that has to do with science, technology, engineering, and math. And one of the things they said that I thought was an interesting piece of information is that there are 3.5 STEM jobs available for every unemployed Missourian, certainly at different levels. So, you know there are jobs out there, we just need to get our folks in line to be able to have one of those jobs and bring a paycheck home to their family. I don't know if you've looked at your newspaper, but I looked at my newspaper over the weekend and it has 3 columns of help wanted ads. There are jobs out there, there are good jobs out there, but we have to have a program that helps those who have not been able to take advantage of education, employment, or even being involved in the work activities to get to those activities. And this bill, Senate bill 24, does that. With that Mr. Speaker, I'll take any questions."

Debate on motion to Override in the House - SB 24 (Sater/Franklin)

- Date: 5/5/15, morning session
- **Link to audio archived by House Communications:** clip comes about 1:33:17 – 1:47 into debate (copy and paste into browser):

mohouse.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=100&starttime=5592&stoptime=6464&autostart=0&embed=1

JC: John Carpenter

DF: Diane Franklin

TH: Tom Hurst

JC: There's a lot of misinformation to address today so I'm going to start from the top. Let's start with the gentleman from Osage. The gentleman from Osage had the audacity to stand on the floor of the Missouri House of Representatives and state that folks who receive benefits from the social safety net in this state, folks who are struggling, get \$80,000 a year in benefits. That's the kind of misinformation that leads to bills like this, that leads to people out in the state, when we lie to them and tell them that people are out there on welfare getting \$80,000 a year, that's what leads to bills like this. Where we feel like now we have to punish the poor and take away benefits from them. There is absolutely no basis in reality for that statement and then you listed a bunch of other benefits that folks get like Section 8, LIHEAP, and childcare assistance. How about some facts? On the overlap between TANF and those programs. Take child care assistance, 17% of people who are on TANF also get child care assistance. 17% overlap. And yet he comes on the house floor and states that everybody's getting all the programs. Same thing with Section 8. He

mentioned that specifically. 17% overlap between Section 8 and TANF. LIHEAP, only about a third of TANF recipients are also beneficiaries through the LIHEAP program. So the idea that people who are receiving this \$2,700 a year that they get from this cash payment under TANF, that they're all getting every other program that's out there too that adds up somehow to \$80,000 a year, is flat out wrong. It's a lie, it's not true, and it leads to bills like this one today, where we feel like we need to punish the poor. So those are the facts. Mr. Speaker can I inquire of the gentleman from Osage? Mr. Speaker?

Speaker: Yes gentleman.

JC: May I inquire of the gentleman from Osage?

Speaker: Gentleman from Osage, do you yield?

TH: Yes, I do.

JC: You look like you wanted to get up and chat. Would you like to do that?

TH: Yeah, I do. I don't appreciate being called a liar, I can tell you that.

JC: You said folks get \$80,000 a year in benefits from the state of Missouri.

TH: No, what I said was, that is the average for every man, woman, and child at or below poverty level-

JC: What's the average?

TH: I said not everybody receives the same amount, but if want to look at a fiscal note - look at the numbers, the numbers that I have here. Are you saying that those are wrong?

JC: If you're saying that people are getting \$80,000 a year, you're obviously wrong

TH: Did I say that people were getting \$80,000 a year? I said I have a family of 5, and if I were to get all of that, \$16,000, it would add up to \$80,000. If there was a mother with two children, that's times three, that's 40 - . [crosstalk] Why would you have any incentive at all to go to work when we're going to give you way above minimum wage? You talk about raising minimum wage, we've done it already.

JC: You're flat out wrong.

TH: Tell me how I'm wrong.

JC: Because there is not a single family in the state of Missouri getting \$80,000 a year-

TH: I did not say there were any families in the state of Missouri getting \$80,000

JC: You just said it-

TH: I just said I have a family of 5, and if I were to get those average benefits, \$16,000 times 5 is \$80,000. I do not take those benefits, I did not say that anybody did. I'm merely saying that anybody who likes to play numbers, and you do [crosstalk]

JC: Do you think there are families of 5 in Missouri right now? Do you think that's a thing? Do you think there are families of 5 in Missouri right now?

TH: Are there families of 5? Yeah, I have one! Am I getting \$80,000? No. But I work and I pay taxes and that money goes to those people who take it-

JC: Do you think any of those families of 5 are poor or struggling, or out of work, that kind of thing right now?

TH: I absolutely do.

JC: So we know they exist, we know that they might be on benefits as a result. You're saying that some of them are getting \$80,000 a year? Is that what you're saying right now on the House floor?

TH: It is not. And I did not say that earlier. If I recall, I said that is the average, and if you times that by five, that's what it would be- [crosstalk]

JC: Then why aren't they getting it?

TH: I'm sorry.

JC: If that's what it would be, then why aren't families getting \$80,000 a year, if that's what it would add up to according to your math?

TH: I think you misunderstood my point. My point is this is per person, man, woman, and child, at poverty level or below, so therefore if you want to play numbers, if it's one person, it's \$16,000, if it's two it's \$32,000. You can times it by a family of 50, which I don't know of any about. What I'm saying is if you want to look at numbers- if you take the number of people that are getting benefits at or below poverty level, times it by \$16,000... that is the number... that in the state of Missouri for every man, woman, and child at or below poverty level and how long can you do that? Are we supposed to give them money just because they don't do anything? I want to help them get a job.

JC: [Said simultaneously with quote above] The misinformation that you're giving right now is the reason we have this bill because there are people in the state who get the information from you, that people are out there getting \$80,000 a year in welfare benefits. And that makes people mad.

TH: I want them to become productive-

JC: That's not true-

TH: I want them to be true Americans and work for the better way of life and show their wives and their children how they can make their lives better and the lives of their children as well.

JC: Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: Is that you that just yelled? Gentleman I asked you a question. Okay. The proper way to do a point of order is to come to the microphone and seek recognition. We don't act like barbarians in here. Gentleman from Jackson.

Gentleman from Jackson: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: Please proceed.

Gentleman from Jackson: Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Clay was ceasing the inquiry with the gentleman from the Hurst district, and the inquiry was allowed to continue for about 30 or 40 seconds or so and so I was raising a point of order to see if we could get an end to that, but I believe that has ended and so-

Speaker: Next time let's do it in a more civilized manner gentleman.

JC: I will do it, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker: Please proceed.

JC: Mr. Speaker can I inquire of the lady from Camden?

Speaker: Inquire of who?

JC: The lady from Camden.

Speaker: Lady from Camden do you yield? Please proceed.

DF?: Alright, fire away.

JC: Thank you lady, I appreciate it. We're just going to have to move on from that issue, right? If people want to believe that folks are getting \$80,000 a year, then I don't know other than, anyone. I guess we'll just have to move on. Obviously not true. Onto other misinformation about the bill. Last time-

DF: The misinformation you feel like they are, so let's clarify that.

JC: Okay, well here's one piece of misinformation I think that we had when we did the bill the first time.

DF: Boy you don't forget do you?

JC: No, no, this was a quote from you, you said, 'I want to be very clear, children are not being removed from TANF,' that was the quote on the floor.

DF: Yes, you're exactly right because parents are being removed from TANF. So we're past that one, let's move on.

JC: Do any of those parents have children?

DF: They do. And whose responsibility are those children? The parents.

JC: [Said simultaneously with quote above] And do those children count toward part of the benefit?

DF: Do those children sign up, are their names on that program? Did they sign up, did they sign their names?

JC: Lady, two things. One, you can't get TANF unless you have children.

DF: So that's correct, so let's go to the next one. What else you got?

JC: Lady, part of the cash benefit that you are limiting with your bill-

DF: Yes.

JC: That money is partly for the kids. Right? That's actually explicitly spelled out in the program. A portion of the money is for the parent, a portion of the money is for the kids. That's explicit in the program. So when you take the parents off, they lose the full benefit-

DF: Go ahead.

JC: So when we pass the bill, thousands of children are going to lose that cash benefit. Isn't that right?

DF: Their parents are going to lose those benefits.

JC: And the average TANF recipient has two children in the household?

DF: And you know what? It's a sad state of a program that after 45 months, it's a failed program. It's a program that is not helping those children that you're talking about. So let's move on, let's move on to good things about the program that help children.

JC: [Said simultaneously with quote above] So lady, why am I going to move on when your statement was that children are not going to be removed from TANF? That's your statement-

DF: I'm glad I'm not married to you.

JC: -when that is clearly false. Thousands of children will, so let's get to those numbers. Do you remember the number of kids that we're going to be removing from TANF on day one of the implementation of the bill?

DF: Well do you remember the number of people, of families, wait, wait, I'm going to answer your question, are you ready?

JC: Well you were answering it with another question. I'm just asking for a number. How many kids are we kicking off?

DF: The number of families that left after 60 months was 83.

JC: Uh huh.

DF: They have 7 months now, so that's going to be reduced.

JC: How many- by lowering the lifetime cap from 60 to 45, do you know how many kids we're kicking off?

DF: Wait wait, let me ask you a question.

JC: No, no-

DF: How do you arrive at 6,000 children? How did you do that?

JC: Lady, the answer is about 6,400 kids.

DF: How did you arrive at that number?

JC: I know you don't want to say it on the House floor 'cause it kind of hurts to say that we're going to kick off 6,400 kids on day one as a direct result of passing this legislation but it's true.

DF: But you arrived at that from an aggreg- by extrapolating out the figures that you had before you in the fiscal note, which was in what, March?

JC: I know. I know you didn't want to admit to these numbers last time too but you know. By the way, in case anybody is curious, all these numbers are perfectly available in the fiscal note for us.

DF: But all these numbers are extrapolated out. It's not- we don't know how many children are going to be leaving the program in 2016. We don't know do we? Do we? Do we? No we don't.

JC: No, one of the things we did in the conference committee was we talked about the idea of maybe doing a grandfather clause and in fact you spoke in favor of a grandfather clause and basically what that would do, if you're already beyond the 45 month threshold, lets say you're at 46 months and when you signed up for TANF, you signed a contract in which you stated I would do X, Y, and Z in order to maintain, uh uh, this program. And the state of Missouri told the folks that signed that contract that your lifetime cap is going to be at 60 months. Now you, as my recollection, you said- you mentioned the contract, you specifically mentioned that they had signed the contract and we don't want to pull the rug out from under people who had signed the contract, so we should do a grandfather clause that says this new lifetime cap only applies to future TANF recipients. Do we do that in the legislation we're about to pass here today?

DF: Your side said NOOO!

JC: Oh, I did?? I said no to a grandfather clause?

DF: Yes! Yes!

JC: Well I'm here to tell everyone on the House floor that I did not say no to a grandfather clause, and why would I possibly say no to a grandfather clause?

DF: Well your leader- your leader did. Then you need to talk to your leader.

JC: Why would I possibly say no to a grandfather clause, why would I possibly do that, and when did I say it to you?

DF: Your leader then said no. And you should have risen up and said no.

JC: My leader? My leader said no to a grandfather clause-

DF: I want you to negotiate for that grandfather clause. You should've worked harder-

JC: A lot of misinformation on the House floor today folks. A lot of misinformation and it amazes me.

DF: Coming from your side.

JC: It amazes me. All right, uh, let's talk about the money. How much money are we saving the state by passing the bill?

DF: How much money are we saving?

JC: Yeah how much money are we saving the state?

DF: We're not saving the state-

JC: Right how much

DF: It is not state dollars. It's federal dollars.

JC: Well actually we have to increase state spending by about \$400,000 dollars to implement the bill, right?

DF: We do. And again, from your side, an amendment was added in the Senate to add the mo.gov that does the tracking, so we track better.

JC: You mentioned federal dollars. How many federal dollars-

DF: Because federal dollars are at stake if we don't track well. The whole program is at stake if we don't track well.

JC: Lady, how many federal dollars are we going to save the federal government and pay down the debt with those dollars? How many dollars are we saving?

DF: Well, uh do you have a figure there? I don't know.

JC: I'm asking if we're saving money in your bill.

DF: I didn't say anything about the federal debt.

JC: Okay.

DF: I didn't say anything.

JC: Put the debt to the side. That's fine.

DF: Thank you.

JC: How many federal dollars are we saving through passing this bill?

DF: I- Let me tell you. Hold on please.

JC: Well how much are we saving?

DF: Just give me a chance.

JC: Sure.

DF: The block grant is a grant that we receive- we receive \$217 million from the federal government. We're going to receive that, but we're gonna spend it better. We're gonna help people. We're not just gonna hand them a paycheck. Does that matter to you?

JC: Uh huh.

DF: It does. Good.

JC: So the question, are we saving the federal government money or the state money? That's the line of inquiry right now. The answer is no, to be clear.

DF: No, we're not saving any federal money.

JC: We're not saving any federal or state money by passing the bill. I just wanna be real clear, I just wanna-

DF: The state is making an investment so that they can keep federal money

JC: So how much money does it, how much does it add up to? The folks who are between 45 and 60 months, we're kicking them off on day one, and all the kids, uh thousands of kids we're kicking off on day one. So that's fewer cash payments going out. Uh, how much money is that? How much money do we save by doing that and where does the money go?

DF: We don't know, because we don't know how many people are going to be coming off the program. We don't know that.

JC: The fiscal note says exactly how much it is so-

DF: No you can't tell me exactly cause you don't know.

JC: Well it does, I mean, right?

DF: We don't know who might go out and have a job.

JC: Right well we know exactly how many families

DF: Which would be a very good thing for their family

JC: We know exactly how many families will be off the 45-month threshold, right?

DF: As I said before, in Missouri we have 3.5 STEM jobs available for everyone that is on any of these programs and

JC: I know. I understand you want to talk about STEM jobs and robotics and all the other things we can talk about. But I'd like to talk about what the bill does right now, if that's okay.

DF: My newspaper, I bet you can go back and look at your newspaper and there are two, three

columns in my little old county paper of jobs that are available.

JC: Lady. Lady the answer-

DF: Why not let them go to work? Why not let them work?

JC: Lady the answer is \$8.6 million. That's what your bill does.

DF: You don't know that this, that this, it's- we're going to save that much money.

JC: It's \$8.6 million. Okay and another stipulation of your bill redirects some of this money, right, that right now is going to families in terms of helping folks out who are struggling. And what do we do? We take about \$4.3 [clip ends]