

## **GOP Spending Plan Slashes Services for Thousands of California Women and Families, Handouts for Millionaires and Corporate Special Interests Untouched**

H.R. 1, the House Republicans' spending plan for the rest of fiscal year 2011, slashes funding for services vital to women and girls at every stage of their lives, while more costly tax breaks for millionaires and corporate special interests are untouched. For example, under H.R. 1:

- **More than 51,310 California children could lose Head Start and child care**, depriving them of early learning support and their parents of the child care assistance they need to work.<sup>1</sup>
- **1,042,000 California students, mostly women, could find college less affordable**, because Pell grants would be cut by up to \$845 (\$596 on average).<sup>2</sup>
- **1,026,530 California women and 143,610 California men could lose comprehensive family planning and related preventive health services** provided by the Title X Family Planning program, which H.R. 1 would completely eliminate.<sup>3</sup> In addition, H.R. 1 would eliminate **all** federal funding for Planned Parenthood health centers.
- **74,000 California workers – women, men, and young people – could lose job training opportunities** provided by Title I of the Workforce Investment Act, which H.R. 1 would completely eliminate, along with cuts to other job training programs.<sup>4</sup> Job training is especially important to women because they are concentrated in low-wage, low-security jobs with little opportunity for advancement.
- **59,250 California applicants for Social Security benefits – retired and disabled workers, widows, and children -- could face delays** because inadequate funding for Social Security operations will force layoffs or furloughs for workers needed to process new applications.<sup>5</sup> Nationally, a majority of new adult beneficiaries are women.<sup>6</sup>

**In addition, H.R. 1:**

- **Halts funding to implement the Affordable Care Act;**
- **Cuts funding for maternal and child health programs, which serve 2,663,790 people in California,<sup>7</sup> and nutrition assistance for pregnant and postpartum women, infants and children, affecting 1,459,460 people in California<sup>8</sup>;**
- **Cuts funding for community health centers, housing and energy assistance, and other services for poor and vulnerable people;**
- **Cuts funding for elementary and secondary education; and**
- **Cuts funding for food safety inspections, clean water, medical research, tracking and preventing epidemics, and public safety.**

While GOP leaders are insisting – under the guise of deficit reduction – on extreme and reckless cuts that will make women's lives more difficult and dangerous, they are protecting tax giveaways to millionaires and corporations.

- **Extend tax breaks for millionaires – or protect services for millions of Americans?** The extension of Bush-era tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and additional tax breaks for

multimillion dollar estates demanded by GOP leaders will cost \$69.5 billion this year, more than the total \$61 billion in spending cuts in H.R. 1.<sup>9</sup>

- **Keep the loophole for private investment fund managers – or restore job training?** Eliminating the tax loophole that allows multimillionaire private investment fund managers to pay lower tax rates than ordinary workers would raise an average \$1.48 billion annually,<sup>10</sup> more than the \$1.4 billion cut from key Workforce Investment Act programs.
- **Give handouts to big oil, gas and coal – or protect Head Start, child care, and Social Security services?** Eliminating tax subsidies for the oil, gas and coal industries would raise an average \$4.6 billion annually,<sup>11</sup> more than the \$2.8 billion needed to protect current Head Start and child care services plus \$1.7 billion to fully fund Social Security offices.
- **Give tax incentives to corporations to shift jobs and profits offshore – or restore funding for education and health care?** International tax reform proposals would raise an average \$12.9 billion annually,<sup>12</sup> more than the combined cuts to Pell grants (\$5.7 billion), schools serving disadvantaged children (\$0.7 billion), Title X family planning (\$0.3 billion), Maternal and Child Health Block Grant (\$0.05 billion), nutrition assistance for Women, Infants and Children (\$0.7 billion), and community health centers (\$1.3 billion).

---

<sup>1</sup> For Head Start estimates *see* Ctr. for Law and Social Policy, “Projected Reduction in Children Served in Head Start Based on H.R. 1- Fiscal Year 2011 Continuing Resolution” (Feb. 17, 2011), *available at* [http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/hr1\\_headstart.pdf](http://www.clasp.org/admin/site/publications/files/hr1_headstart.pdf), reflecting cuts in H.R. 1 and loss of ARRA funds. For child care estimates *see* Ctr. for Law and Social Policy, “Making the Case for Child Care and Head Start Investments” (Jan. 20, 2011), *available at* [http://www.clasp.org/resources\\_and\\_publications/publication?id=0856&list=publications](http://www.clasp.org/resources_and_publications/publication?id=0856&list=publications). Child care estimates include only number of children served by ARRA.

<sup>2</sup> James R. Horney, Danilo Trisi & Arloc Sherman, Ctr. on Budget and Policy Priorities, “House Bill Means Fewer Children in Head Start, Less Help for Students to Attend College, Less Job Training, and Less Funding for Clean Water” (Mar. 1, 2011), *available at* <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=3405>. This analysis assumes that cuts would be made to every grant, rather than entirely eliminating students from the program.

<sup>3</sup> C.I. Fowler, J. Gable, J. Wang & S.W. Lloyd. RTI International, Family Planning Annual Report: 2009 National Summary (November 2010), *available at* [http://www.hhs.gov/opa/familyplanning/toolsdocs/fpar\\_2009\\_national\\_summary.pdf](http://www.hhs.gov/opa/familyplanning/toolsdocs/fpar_2009_national_summary.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> Horney *et al.*, *supra* note 2. This analysis assumes that states reduce the number of program participants.

<sup>5</sup> Dem. Staff of the Cmte. on Ways and Means, “How the GOP CR Would Affect Social Security” (Feb. 17, 2011), *available at* [http://strengthensocialsecurity.org/sites/default/files/W%26M\\_52STATESAnalysisofCuts.pdf](http://strengthensocialsecurity.org/sites/default/files/W%26M_52STATESAnalysisofCuts.pdf). Estimate does not include cases processed in central processing centers, rather than local field offices, and some kinds of technical denials. Those cases would also be delayed.

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Social Security Admin., Annual Statistical Supplement to the Social Security Bulletin, 2010, Table 6.A3, *available at* <http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/statcomps/supplement/2010/6a.html#table6.a3>.

<sup>7</sup> Maternal and Child Health Bureau, Dep’t of Health and Human Services, “Title V: A Snapshot of Maternal and Child Health” *available at* <https://perfddata.hrsa.gov/MCHB/TVISReports/Snapshot/SnapShotMenu.aspx>.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, “WIC Program: Total Participation” (Mar. 2, 2011) *available at* <http://www.fns.usda.gov/pd/26wifypart.htm>.

<sup>9</sup> Gillian Brunet & Chuck Marr, Ctr. on Budget and Policy Priorities, “Unpacking the Tax Cut-Unemployment Compromise” (Mar. 1, 2011), *available at* <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=3342>.

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Dep’t of the Treasury, General Explanations of the Administration’s Fiscal Year 2012 Revenue Proposals (“Greenbook”), *available at* <http://www.treas.gov/offices/tax-policy/library/greenbk12.pdf>. Annual averages for the ten year period between 2012 and 2021.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*