

P U B L I C H E A R I N G

before

WELFARE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE OF THE
NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE, CONSTITUTED UNDER
SCR 25 (1959), RECONSTITUTED UNDER SCR 5
(1960) AND RECONSTITUTED UNDER SCR 1 (1962).

Held:
October 14, 1963
City Hall
Newark, New Jersey

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Senator Anthony J. Grossi (Chairman)

Also:

Leonard A. Coyle, Secretary

* * * *

I N D E X

<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
Dr. Pasqual J. Baiocchi Director of Health & Welfare, Newark	3
Rev. John R. Green Greater Newark Council of Churches	15
Charles E. Reier Director, Essex County Welfare Board	21 & 95
Monsignor Patrick J. Trainor Executive Director Associated Catholic Charities Archdiocese of Newark	32
Mr. Scairpon	37
Al Cohen Chairman, South New Jersey Committee on Social Policy and Action National Association of Social Workers	39
Peter Schuyler Vice President Council of Social Agencies	47
H. William Fisch	53
Victor Liotta Director of Welfare Union County	56
Bert Hunter North New Jersey Chapter National Association of Social Workers	59
Arthur Fishbein	71
Fred Barbaro Associate Director Urban League of Essex County	75
Rev. Wm. T. Martin	86
Mrs. Howard Laden Maplewood, New Jersey	89

SENATOR ANTHONY J. GROSSI: If I may have your attention, please. I am Senator Grossi, Chairman of the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature, which is a bi-partisan committee appointed by the President of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

This hearing scheduled for this morning is the third in a series of four which have been held as a result of the Committee's work in the investigation of welfare conditions in the State of New Jersey.

The purpose of this meeting this morning is not to adduce any testimony with respect to any particular case, but the purpose of this hearing is in the nature of a public hearing on recommendations made by the Committee.

Normally when a committee finishes its work, it drafts legislation and then public hearings are held on those bills. The Committee thought that, in the interest of time, in the interest of clarity, and in the interest of getting as much unanimity as we possibly can with respect to the recommendations, we would hold public hearings on these 16 recommendations that we have made to be translated into legislation.

We know that some of the recommendations are controversial, to say the least, and we felt we should get a cross-section of opinion from the citizenry, from the social workers, from those people who are dedicated to the purposes of welfare and various officials throughout the State.

As I said at the outset, this is the third of a series of four hearings. The first one was held in Atlantic City; the second was held in Trenton; this one is number three and

the fourth will be held in Paterson, at which all social workers and all agencies are invited to give their views with respect to these recommendations. Your views, those of you who wish to testify, will be taken down in shorthand by our reporters and will be transcribed. The Committee will then read over all the testimony that it has adduced for the purpose of drafting legislation in conformance with the majority thinking.

The first two hearings that we held have developed thinking along the line that perhaps 12 or 13 recommendations meet with general approval, but there are two or three that are rather controversial and we are very happy to have your views.

Now, no one has been summoned to these hearings, they have been invited, and those public officials who care to say anything certainly are welcome to do so. And any citizen, of course, is also extended the same privilege.

Before calling on some of those people who have indicated to us by mail that they are desirous of being heard, I had expected that Mayor Addonizio would be here to make a statement on behalf of the City of Newark. However, the Mayor is very busy this morning with a water problem and he told me that he would not be able to be here and he has asked Dr. Pasqual J. Baiocchi, Director of Health and Welfare, to make a statement on his behalf. Is the Doctor here?

I might say, too, that when anyone comes up to the microphone I would appreciate it if they would identify themselves, give their address and the type of work that

they do.

All right, Doctor.

D R. P A S Q U A L J. B A I O C C H I: Senator Grossi, I am glad Mayor Addonizio has had the opportunity to express to you personally his regrets over not being here at this meeting. As you know, he is involved with this acute water shortage problem and the urban renewal program and, therefore, he has delegated me as Director of Health and Welfare to present to this Committee the basic philosophical views and recommendations that we are making. These are views as expressed by the Mayor, by The Local Assistance Board, by the Director of Public Assistance in this Community, and by myself as Director of Health and Welfare.

Now, as to my presentation, sir: As the Director of Health and Welfare of the City of Newark, I would like to point out that I firmly support the principles enunciated in the United Nations Declaration, The Fundamental Rights of the Child. One of these principles states: "The child shall enjoy special protection and shall be given opportunities by law and by other means to enable him to develop physically, mentally, socially, spiritually, and morally in a healthy and normal manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity. In the enactment of laws for this purpose, the best interests of the child shall be the paramount consideration."

The Department of Health and Welfare believes that the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature will keep these fundamental rights in mind when considering revision of legislation for the Aid to Dependent Children Program.

We further believe that all persons should have an income sufficient to maintain a living standard of health and well-being; that it is in the national and in the state's interest to provide public assistance for those who are unable, through their own efforts, to attain a minimum standard of health and wellbeing.

In consideration of the first recommendation of the Welfare Investigating Committee of the State Legislature: that residency requirements for ADC abolished in 1959 be reinstated; that temporary relief should be available immediately through the general assistance programs which should be limited to 30-day periods - renewed at the discretion of county and municipal welfare directors:

The Department of Health and Welfare goes on record to say it has forwarded to Governor Hughes its recommendations for public welfare legislation in the State of New Jersey. We have taken the position that the Legislature should, at the earliest possible moment, enact enabling legislation to bring into effect in this State the Federal Welfare Amendment of 1962, which includes recognition as a cause of dependency of children - unemployment of the father.

While we sympathize with the predicament of the Legislature and realize that about three-quarters of the states have one year residency requirements, we do not think that New Jersey should take any backward steps in its program of aid to families with dependent children. Should the Legislature decide that a one-year residency requirement is in the best interest of the State of New Jersey from a fiscal viewpoint,

then the City of Newark must respectfully request that the administration of General Assistance become a responsibility of County Government.

Concerning settlement laws for which the Committee recommends revision to obtain clarity, the Department of Health and Welfare agrees that a hodge-podge exists and if some clarity can be brought out of the confusion this would be a worthwhile accomplishment.

Concerning the use of a statutory maximum - which is in effect in certain other states - the City of Newark is of the opinion that this, too, is a backward step in ADC legislation. We cannot conceive of a statutory maximum amount which would be realistic and at the same time provide for the minimum needs of all the families who may eventually have to apply for aid to dependent children. A statutory maximum does not take into consideration costs of living in urban areas versus rural areas, does not consider what it does in effect, that is, punish families for having large numbers of children. A statutory maximum is rather like building a two-lane road when one knows that eventually a four-lane road will be needed. We would be less disturbed about this if actual shelter cost was not to be considered as part of a statutory maximum.

In Newark we are concerned with the spiralling costs of General Assistance which amounted in the past fiscal year to \$13,737,599 for municipalities in the state which receive State Aid.

The Essex County total was \$6,175,205. Of this total Newark's costs are close to half the amount. In Newark

the two major reasons for high relief costs are (1) unemployment in a home where both the father and mother are living; and (2) the need for emergency assistance to persons pending acceptance under one of the categorical assistance programs administered by the County.

In 1963 from January through August the total opened and reopened cases in the classification of unemployed, that is, no income and depleted resources, has been 2,134. This does not include heads of households in the classifications pending unemployment benefits, insufficient income from unemployment benefits or the unemployed with discontinued unemployment compensation benefits.

During the same period of time the total cases opened in the classification pending categorical aid has been 1380.

We enclose at the end of this paper a summary of home direct relief costs for Newark, January through August, 1962 and 1963.

At the present time according to statistics furnished by the Department of Institutions and Agencies Statistical Summary for June, 1963, the average monthly assistance payments for Aid to Dependent Children in Essex County was \$186.45 per month with a total per person aided of \$49.59. This does not seem an excessive average.

The attachment of real and personal property of the recipient and his or her legally responsible relatives for amounts paid to any recipient over \$500 is in our opinion a legal question which must become the concern of the courts as is the question of voluntary agreements for support or consent orders, appointment of referees, and so forth.

The recommendation concerning the locating of deserting putative fathers is a laudable recommendation as is the collection of delinquent accounts providing such recommendations can be properly implemented.

The recommendation to furnish a statement setting forth all income every six months is a helpful one providing its intent is to provide a basis for research, evaluation, and analysis of the program and is not intended to be a punitive measure.

One purpose of the aid to dependent children program is to make financial assistance available for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children, and children in danger of becoming delinquent. These children are found where a parent is dead or physically incapacitated, are in families where there is desertion and divorce, or where there is no marriage at all. For the most part, however, payments are made to the parent with whom the children are living.

The program is equated by many people with immorality and illegitimacy. We agree that funds are spent where there is family disorganization. For the very reason of family disorganization these funds are needed. However, there is no logic in the notion that rates of illegitimacy are reduced by withdrawal of assistance where mothers have borne two illegitimate children. It would be well if the committee heeded the advice of the Advisory Council on Welfare Services and considered broadening the present Aid to Dependent Children Act to include the 1962 Welfare Amendments relating to aid to families with dependent children and the child

welfare provisions contained therein.

These provisions include support for "those services that supplement or substitute for parental care and supervision for the purpose of protecting and promoting the welfare of children and youth, preventing neglect, abuse, and exploitation, helping overcome problems that result in dependency, neglect, and delinquency, and when needed provide adequate care for children and youth away from their own homes, such care to be given in foster homes, adoptive homes, child caring institutions, or other facilities."

We are in agreement with the recommendations concerning incapacitated individuals incapable of receiving and utilizing public assistance payments.

We, too, are of the opinion that case loads in public assistance agencies should be materially reduced and salaries of caseworkers increased.

Generally speaking, public assistance programs - if they are to have any meaning - must be a forceful expression of the needs and interests of needy persons and their families. Such programs cannot be planned, talked about, or judged apart from the social and economic context in which they exist. Over the years the context has altered somewhat. As a result, the scope and content of public assistance programs have changed.

The most important of the social trends influencing the categorical assistance programs is the gradual acceptance of increasing responsibility on the part of government for the health and welfare of its needy citizens. Evidence of this

has found expression in the 1962 Welfare Amendments enacted by Congress. Nothing which has happened since enactment of the Social Security Act in 1935 is of greater significance or of more importance to needy families and individuals.

The increasing influences of social forces, as shown by Congressional enactment of the 1962 Amendments, means that the public as a whole views "Public Assistance" as a right, not a privilege. It means that in the United States, neither the federal nor the state government can arbitrarily control the practices of a public assistance program without due respect for the wishes and needs of communities. It means, inevitably, that there will be changes in methods of organizing and delivering such programs.

Thoughtful leaders in community life realize that the trend toward more formal planning for social purposes is a reflection of a basic change in the attitudes of the public. The community leaders, who have an understanding of community problems and a competency in community affairs, can be a decisive factor in the development of public assistance programs which serve the best interests of the public and the clientele of public assistance agencies.

A sobering aspect of current public assistance agency practice is the increasing concern about problems of professional manpower, and the almost total lack of research in methods of program operation and administration. These are not problems to be dismissed lightly or excused on the basis of first things first. A real reason for being in public assistance is to put the findings of research to work for

the benefit of the public, to use knowledge with the greatest effectiveness in the shortest possible time. If we do not do this, then much of the point of learning about public assistance is lost, and the public is less than well served.

Effective organization of the facilities, services, and staff of a public assistance agency around the assistance needs of applicants for and recipients of assistance can be as significant in the ultimate rehabilitation of agency clientele as is the application of new programs of assistance. Acceptance of this concept could lead a public assistance agency to organize new means of providing assistance to needy individuals and families.

It would be helpful, in our opinion, if public assistance agencies were to tailor services to the needs of individual families by grouping them according to their degree of dependency and their requirements for assistance. The elements associated with this concept are the elements contained in the 1962 Welfare Amendments.

In closing, the Department of Health and Welfare must for its own sake go on record as opposing any change in the Aid to Dependent Children Program which would have the effect of increasing Newark's case load of General Assistance. You are aware that the costs of general assistance are met in New Jersey by a combination of state and municipal funds. There is no federal or county participation in the program, and the program currently represents a heavy burden on the urban taxpayers in this central core city.

Any more to tighten restrictions on ADC recipients,

while jeopardizing federal grants on a state-wide basis, would have the immediate effect of throwing on this municipality a heavy load of requests from needy families for emergency assistance in meeting their needs and add to the city's burden the problem of investigating these demands, evaluating the need, and disposing of cases. We bring to your attention the fact that Newark pays 100 percent of administrative costs of the Division of Welfare.

Now, it might be interesting for this Committee, sir, to be given a few brief statistics. Covering the period January 1 to August 31 in 1962 we added to our case load 3,512 cases; in 1963, for the same period, sir, there were added 3,750 cases.

In 1962, covering the same period, sir, we closed 3,452 cases; and in 1963 we closed 3,206 cases.

The applications rejected for 1962, the same period, sir, were 998; in 1963 we rejected 1,015.

In 1962 we serviced 15,880 cases; in 1963 we serviced 17,642 cases.

As of August 31 the case load was in 1962, 1,658; as of 1963, August 31, 2,270.

Now, as for the cost. In 1962, for the same period, namely, January 1 to August 31, there was spent \$1,855,641.41; for the same period in 1963 the cost has been \$2,259,713.24.

The average case cost in 1962 ran from a high of \$120.12 to a low of \$112.44; and in 1963 from a low of \$121.90 to a high of \$132.16.

As of the month of August, 1962 and 1963 respectively,

the average per person cost was \$36.29 in 1962 and \$39.32 in 1963.

Thank you very much, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: There is one point that is not clear to me. You made reference to the case load - case load per what? per worker?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Per case worker, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: One thousand per case worker?

DR. BAIOCCHI: No, that's the total case load, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, how many cases for each worker, what's the average?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Well, roughly about 75, sir. We are having difficulties, you know, in recruiting qualified social case workers because of our administrative costs, our salaries are not competitive with either the county or the state because of the fact that they get federal subsidy and we do not and, therefore, we are running a little bit higher than we would like to. And in the report I stated, as you will recall, sir, that we are well aware of this and we feel that we should, if possible, recruit more case workers to decrease the amount of load on their shoulders. I think they can do a better job with less number of cases.

SENATOR GROSSI: The case load then is about 75 per worker?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Yes, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: And in your opinion can the case worker sufficiently cover the cases under his jurisdiction with that

kind of a load?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Not as thoroughly as we would like to but that is because of our difficulty in recruiting, because of the veritables in salary range that we pay and that of the state, county and, of course, private industry.

SENATOR GROSSI: You also made reference, Doctor, to the average cost per case. That does not include medical assistance and other necessities, does it?

DR. BAIOCCHI: No, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: You don't know what that figure would be, do you, the average?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Do you have that, Bert? He's the financeer of the department, Senator. That's Mr. McFadden.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. Maybe you can get them for us sometime in the near future and send them to the Committee.

MR. McFADDEN: We can tell you what we pay for hospitalization.

DR. BAIOCCHI: Do you want the hospital costs, sir, or the entire medical program cost.

SENATOR GROSSI: The average for the entire program.

DR. BAIOCCHI: You see, in Newark we run public clinics in the Division of Health and these people are treated for nothing wherever possible. When they are too sick to attend the clinic then we have a doctors' list in which we pay for the calls of the doctor going to the home of these either indigent or medically indigent people.

SENATOR GROSSI: Do you have any remarks with respect to salary range for case workers?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Well, they should be competitive with the state and county, sir, in order that we may be able to hold what employees we do have and those who are qualified. But as you know, recruiting qualified help is a difficult task today. I understand that both the county and the state are having difficulty in that area.

SENATOR GROSSI: What is your minimum in Newark?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Forty-three, fifty-three, fifty-eight. Right?

SENATOR GROSSI: From forty-three to fifty-eight is your range?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Yes, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: And you still have difficulty in recruiting the type of people you need?

DR. BAIOCCHI: Yes, we do, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: Are you of the opinion too, Doctor, that a case worker should be or must be a college graduate?

DR. BAIOCCHI: I think they should have socialized training and background, yes, in order that they be able to understand the problems and do the rehabilitative work that I feel is part of conducting such a program.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, do you feel that a background in sociology without a college degree would be sufficient?

DR. BAIOCCHI: One is concomitant with the other. You can get the practical experience with an individual who is keen, alert and intelligent, and makes it his or her business to become well versed in that particular area. But, of course, you know that Civil Service requires either

an AB or BS in sociology as a condition for taking a civil service examination.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right, Doctor. Thank you very much.

I would like to ask now the Rev. John R. Green, representing the Greater Newark Council of Churches for his statement.

R E V. J O H N R. G R E E N: I am the Reverend John R. Green, Director, Department of Social Welfare, the Greater Newark Council of Churches. I am presenting the response of the Council of Churches as prepared by the Department of Social Welfare of the Council to the legislative report on Aid to Dependent Children, commonly referred to as the Grossi Report.

The Greater Newark Council of Churches is interested in the social and economic welfare of every member of the human race, and particularly those residing in Metropolitan Newark. We are likewise concerned with sound and realistic approaches regarding the problems and administration of social welfare.

We believe that the Grossi Report is a significant and useful document inasmuch as it focuses attention upon a vital, complex, and controversial social phenomenon. We heartily concur with a number of its recommendations and find ourselves in considerable disagreement with others. Perhaps our greatest concern with this report is that in the main it treats symptoms and does not sufficiently come to grips with causes. Its recommendations are centered upon unmarried

mothers and illegitimate children from what seems to be the standpoint of a chronic social condition with relatively little emphasis on the underlying reasons for the prevalence of this situation and preventive and rehabilitative factors. Because of the foregoing, we believe that further study by both legislative and community welfare personnel is strongly needed, and to enact legislation without such study might pave the way for long years of regret and inestimable social damage.

Regarding specific recommendations of the Committee, we feel that the one year's residency requirement for ADC and other welfare recipients is impractical and unrealistic. The people who would be denied welfare assistance because of the lack of residency requirements are either now in New Jersey communities, here in Newark, or will be at the time such a residency statute is enacted and will likely remain therein. Also, they will probably continue to come to New Jersey communities after such a law is enacted.

These same kind of people have been moving into states which have residency requirements. People in our communities who need public welfare assistance and do not receive same deluge our churches, clergy, private welfare agencies, individual residents, and business establishments with requests for help. These agencies and individuals can hardly ignore the plight of hungry children, but their resources are limited and providing those who should be receiving public assistance with financial aid results in depriving others in our communities from receiving services which

churches and private agencies are designed to give. Moreover, private agency resources are insufficient for the purpose of furnishing what public welfare is able to provide.

Frustrated and desperate, those ineligible for public assistance and unable to obtain resources through other legitimate channels turn to crime, prostitution, and pathological modes of living. Ultimately, public agencies foot the bill in prison cost, guardianships for children abandoned or removed from their homes and medical and other welfare costs resulting from privation and malnutrition.

Lack of public assistance does not necessarily discourage destitute people from remaining in the communities of their choice. Many prefer the agony endured in order to meet residency requirements to returning to the dismal and hopeless life experienced in the states from which they came. These people come to our industrial communities seeking employment and to better their standards of living. The bettering of one's self and seeking greater opportunities has been an action which has found high and justified praise in our nation. We have proudly presented our country as a land of opportunity. But glory also has its problems and responsibilities. These newcomers are people entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The Greater Newark Council of Churches likewise opposes the \$300 maximum for ADC recipients. While we deplore giving birth to children out of wedlock, failure to provide for the needs of each child so conceived, penalizes the individual child. And penalized children often wreak havoc and tragedy

in human society as their shattered lives unfold. Also, as previously indicated, the central issue in the unmarried mothers and illegitimate children's area should be concerned with prevention and rehabilitation.

The Council of Churches is in general agreement with the remaining proposals in the Grossi Report. The fact that we do not stress or emphasize any particular one in our report or testimony does not in any way interfere with our strong convictions regarding them and their worthwhileness.

However, we qualify our support of withholding funds from a negligent mother with an objection to the voucher system. We believe that the county welfare office now has the power to purchase essential items for the recipient and pay her rent to the landlord. There is nothing to stop possessor of a voucher from obtaining alcoholic beverages in exchange for vouchers. Also, vouchers can be sold or exchanged for non-essential items when a bona fide merchant does not recognize the person who presents him with the voucher.

The Greater Newark Council of Churches is grateful for the opportunity to be heard by the New Jersey Legislative Committee.

Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you Reverend.

Reverend, I want to point out - I don't know whether you are aware of this or not - but we find too that in our hearings New Jersey is one of the states regarded as an easy state with respect to receiving welfare. And in 1942-

1943 we had an assistance program in New Jersey of \$2,582,347 and in 1961-1962 it jumped to \$39,357,000. In 1963 so far projecting these figures it will be \$48,000,000 for 1963-1964. And the families compared in this manner at that time, in the early years there were 519 families on welfare in New Jersey and in December of 1961 there were 20,000 families which gave rise to people coming in in great numbers and immediately getting on welfare, despite the fact that the index of employment or unemployment would not vary much and the families still kept increasing. Do you have any thoughts on that at all?

REV. GREEN: Well, I note that other states, states having residency requirements not considered easy states, have a corresponding growth in the number of people coming in, great movement into other states.

Many people come here with the idea of obtaining employment and many do obtain employment. I don't think or I don't know of any figures that would be available or any research that would be available to indicate that this growth of the number of people coming in or the number of people receiving relief was due to the fact that New Jersey was an easy state.

We had growth before the one-year residency requirement was disposed of. It seems to me that this growth is a population trend. These people, even if we took back the law, re-enacted the statute, we would still have a phenomenal growth in New Jersey - I can't see otherwise - because of our industrial sections here and people coming here

Even besides this, as I pointed out in the report, people come here to stay. I mean, they don't go back - I mean they wouldn't like to go back even if the one year was re-enacted.

I don't see how this has quite a significant bearing on it, as many seem to feel and as the report seems to indicate.

SENATOR GROSSI: In our report, page 76 of our report, we have statistics issued by the federal government which show that the percentage of increase in New Jersey^{is}/214%, which is the highest in the nation; and the closest one to New Jersey is the District of Columbia with 170%. New York State had 43% increase. Other states are 70, 80, 40, 75, 95, but New Jersey had a 214% increase. On a national basis the average was 47% but New Jersey, in order to make up that 47%, had an increase of 214%. So it seems as if New Jersey has the largest percentage of people coming in who get on relief right away on ADC which gave rise to the fact that perhaps our laws are a little liberal to say the least.

REV. GREEN: What was our percentage prior to the enactment of the law, nationwide, - prior to eliminating the residency requirement.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, New Jersey always had a residency requirement, which is more or less fictional, in that we had a one-year residency for general assistance but we have no residency requirement for ADC but some states do. And the federal government does not frown, as I understand, on establishing a residency requirement.

REV. GREEN: My understanding is that - I mean, these people are coming in, they are not just ADC people that get

on relief, but as a result of many people coming here for employment the ADC situations result in their families.

New York with 43% - this is an interesting factor because one way or another in New York, coming in there you can usually get some assistance of some kind and yet, I mean, they are not flocking to New York but rather they are flocking to New Jersey.

I think there are other factors to be considered as to why they come to New Jersey. Of course, many of them are migrant workers who come for the summer labor. We have a huge migratory -- we have industrial and farming situations in New Jersey which are not applicable to other states. This is our contention.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right, Reverend Green, thank you very much.

REV. GREEN: Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: Now I would like to call upon Mr. Charles E. Reier, Director of the Essex County Welfare Board, if he will come up, please. And I want to apologize for keeping you waiting. I know you don't feel too well.

C H A R L E S E. R E I E R: Senator Grossi, members of the Committee, friends: I am Charles Reier, Director of the Essex County Welfare Board.

We have prepared comments and a response to each of the thirteen recommendations of your Committee and I have deposited here our complete statement.

I would, however, in the interest of time, especially after reading yesterday's newspaper that you might have 20 or

30 individuals testifying and that it might go on to another day, if it is agreeable to you, Senator, I would like to comment on two or three of the pertinent items and then submit to you the complete statement.

SENATOR GROSSI: Fine, Mr. Reier.

MR. REIER: On the first recommendation that a durational residence requirement of one year be re-instituted, on April 30, 1959, testifying on behalf of the Essex County Welfare Board before the Assembly Committee on Institutions, Public Health and Welfare, which was then considering Assembly Bill 5, relating to the transfer of the ADC program from State to county administration, we took exception to the elimination of any durational residence requirement in that bill.

Today, four years and 13,000 ADC cases later, we have had the benefit of experience with this program and should like to make our present position known.

Repeated surveys conducted in New Jersey indicate that something on the order of only 2 or 3 per cent of all applications approved for aid to dependent children are made by persons resident in this state for less than one year. Yet, in the almost four years we have had responsibility for the aid to dependent children program, our case load has increased by 165 per cent. You will, therefore, understand why we are far more concerned with the underlying causes and cures for the 165 per cent growth than with the 2 or 3 per cent non-resident question.

What I am saying, in effect, is that use of the word "residence" is both obsolete and unrealistic. It obscures the real problem. For New Jersey, and most especially for its

large industrial clusters, the problem is one of massive in-migration, coupled with an equally massive lag in assimilation of the in-migrant group.

Nor is this a problem restricted to public assistance alone. It has its impact on all government services, schools, hospitals, housing institutions, police, fire services, etc. Even with a re-imposed residence restriction, the major problem remains.

Any attempt to arrive at solution by means of restrictions on mobility is, in my opinion, doomed to failure. Instead, let us take a positive approach. Let us, on a communitywide, statewide and nationwide basis, provide all the services necessary to speed adjustment, integration and assimilation.

I should like to make one more point and to make it as emphatically as I possibly can and that is this: A massive problem exists in every large northern city. Each city must live with and work out its problem. But, since the root of the problem is national and not local, we ought to unite in demanding national help in massive doses to meet a financial burden which has become intolerable for local governments.

To split our forces in controversy over the obsolete concept of residence, reduces our effectiveness in securing that help which will solve our major problem.

On the second recommendation, the establishment of maximum ceiling on grants - with respect to the proposed maximum limitation of grant regardless of size of family, we should like to start by outlining the State's present method of determining the amount of grant.

The State has undertaken to provide for its needy people on

a "minimum health and decency" level. These minimum allowances are based on scientific cost-of-living and pricing surveys. The individual allowances thus arrived at are added together to arrive at a figure representing the family's need.

If we were to arbitrarily cut this grant, as would happen in large families, then the State would, in effect, be saying that some children are to be given less than the minimum necessary for health and decency that the State itself has established.

To bring it down to human terms, what is proposed here is that eight-year-old Johnny Jones, simply because he happens to have 5 brothers and sisters, rather than 2 or 3, is to be condemned by State law to malnutrition.

I for one would not like my State to place itself in such a discriminatory and basically untenable position.

A few states in our land have tried this arbitrary limitation. This naturally leads to one of the two following effects:

1. Another level of government, or a private agency, must supplement the inadequate income of families subjected to this arrangement, or,

2. Continued existence on a sub-standard level leads to social, health and emotional problems which, in the final analysis, cost the community more dollars than adequate grants would have.

In 1957, the Supreme Court of Iowa, found an amendment to the State law establishing a maximum grant such as is proposed here unconstitutional. In the words of the Court, and I quote "...the amendment is clearly discriminatory....and is purely arbitrary and unreasonable...."

For the reasons we have just cited, we must strongly

recommend the removal of this proposal from consideration.

I am going to skip, if I may, to the seventh item, which concerns centralizing desertion, paternity and support matters in the Prosecutor's Office.

Since the experience and operation of the Essex County Welfare Board in handling desertion, paternity and support proceedings seems to be contrary to the pattern described in the Committee's report, I would like to present some statistical data on our operation.

Prior to January 1, 1960, when we took over the aid to dependent children program, we asked the State Board of Child Welfare to provide us with a list of court orders which they had obtained. As of that date there were 35 cases on court order payable through the Probation Office in their entire caseload of 3300. It should be realized that some other orders were payable directly to mothers, but the total number, in our opinion, was small.

We quote this data only for purposes of comparison and with no intent whatsoever to criticize the State Board of Child Welfare, which was chronically understaffed, underpaid and over-worked.

On assuming responsibility for the aid to dependent children, we had in our agency one attorney and one clerk. Recognizing the need for proper processing of support and related proceedings, we constantly increased our legal staff. Today our Bureau of Legal Affairs includes counsel, six attorneys, two supervisors, five case workers, four special investigators and supporting clerical staff.

Along with our augmentation of legal staff, our Welfare Board saw the need for added court facilities and in December 1960 called upon the State Bureau of Assistance and the Administrator of the Courts to sponsor legislation to this effect. Such a bill was prepared and passed at the last session of the legislature and two additional judges are now operating.

In 1962, this Bureau made 3,000 court appearances in paternity, support and desertion cases, including some 720 - I'd like to repeat that - 720 consent paternity adjudications developed by our paternity unit case workers.

With the addition of the two new domestic relations courts recently in Essex, we estimate that in 1964 our legal staff will make over 5,000 court appearances.

Now some facts as to the productivity of these court appearances:

A study of orders obtained during the calendar year of 1962 established that our legal staff secured orders running at the rate of \$1100 per week gross. The study further established that 75 per cent of the amount ordered was actually paid over the course of the year. If we project these figures, realizing that they multiply on a cumulative basis week after week, we derived a benefit of more than \$800,000 per year, which would otherwise have been paid in public funds. At the risk of seeming immodest, I must say that I am proud of the record of our agency in this respect.

At present certain parts of work are not centralized. Our Bureau of Legal Affairs deals in some matters with Municipal

Courts and in others with the Domestic Relations Court. Warrants are served through the Sheriff's Office by a team of special investigators in the County Adjuster's Office and by the local police.

In view of the increasing volume of legal work, we do feel there is a valid need for centralization of functions. We suggest such centralization through a family court.

I have here the statistics to date which I will deposit with your secretary which shows the growth this year in the same particular items that I have just discussed.

I appreciate this opportunity, Senator, of being permitted to speak before you. I, in closing, would like to make one brief, but perhaps broad comment. In my opinion, and I realize fully that there is much to be done with the parent person in the aid to dependent children program, but I am honestly of the belief that our entire and main effort should be emphasized with the growing child. There are definite indications, Senator, that with a full education, with some vocational skills and with the teaching of respect and responsibility not only to themselves, but toward family life and the community, I believe that this group that we are now helping will do pretty much the same as the minority groups that you and I have seen over the years and have grown to be good citizens, doctors, lawyers, governors. I think our problem is with the growing child rather than with the mother or father at this time.

Thank you, Senator.

(The Activity Statistics and Recommendations 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 presented by Mr. Reier can be found starting on page 95.)

SENATOR GROSSI: Mr. Reier, before you leave, I would like to point out that according to the records of the Probation Department in Essex County when we made our first check, the total arrears of delinquent accounts of relief recipient cases involving persons under mandatory court order - there were 524 and the amount of arrears was \$961,907.00. Of course, this does not take into consideration the voluntary agreements made by fathers or those who support the children.

So that in your opinion, you agree with the establishment of a separate agency within the Prosecutor's Office, for instance, whose sole function it shall be or whose principal function it shall be is to follow through on deserting fathers and disappearing fathers.

MR. REIER: In answer to the first part of your question, Senator, as President of the County Welfare Director's Association, just within the last week a committee was appointed to work with Mr. F. Lovell Bixby, Consultant on probation, attached to the Administrative Office of the Courts, in the area of support and orders with the aim of proposing, if necessary, revision of existing statute to achieve effective enforcement. A committee of four Directors from different areas of the State is meeting with Mr. Bixby for that purpose.

Now that other question that you just raised - I think that it should be done through a Family Court and with them through the Prosecutor's Office.

SENATOR GROSSI: In your statement, and I quote, you say: "The concept of removal of children from the custody of parents without due process of law is contrary to our American

ideal of democratic justice." Yet the removal of children from criminal environment ---

MR. REIER: I believe that, sir. I believe that is the prerogative of the courts. I think we'd make our recommendation, but I absolutely believe that the courts should decide that.

SENATOR GROSSI: It was our intent (in any such case, if they were to be removed, it would be through the courts and not arbitrarily by the Welfare Director, but on his recommendation.

MR. REIER: Yes, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: I want to refer too to the number of cases or the percentage of cases that had residency of less than one year in the City of Newark. Do you have that at your fingertips?

MR. REIER: I have quoted from State figures, Senator, provided by our State Bureau of Assistance. It is my recollection that it was 2.7 on a statewide basis. I think the highest county in that study was Camden with 4 per cent. But I could get you those figures, Senator. It's a statewide study.

SENATOR GROSSI: If it's 3 per cent and we have 20,000 cases as of '61-'62, it would be 600 families in New Jersey.

MR. REIER: No, Senator. We had - well, of course, on the state level, you'd make it, yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: I'm talking about Newark.

MR. REIER: Yes, yes, with us it would mean perhaps 50 cases a year. That itself would be substantial, Senator, but that is a matter for the Legislature to decide.

SENATOR GROSSI: Do you find in a good number of families

that the amount of relief given under the ADC program often exceeds the earning power of the husband when the family was there as a unit?

MR. REIER: Yes, sir, that is true in many instances. But I think that could be cured in another direction.

SENATOR GROSSI: How?

MR. REIER: By adequate wages to the worker. I think if a person accepts a job in a restaurant as a bus boy and gets a dollar an hour and he has a wife and five children, he's going to have to be helped and he's going to be supplemented by an agency. New York right now has 7,000 families that are working full time that are receiving supplementation from the city because of inadequate wages.

SENATOR GROSSI: That would be under the general assistance program.

MR. REIER: That's right.

SENATOR GROSSI: -- not under the ACD.

MR. REIER: Well, you would answer that and answer Director Baiocchi's problem by adding the unemployed fathers or the partially-employed fathers to your ADC plan.

SENATOR GROSSI: How do you feel about the responsible relatives contributing?

MR. REIER: I think every effort should be made to obtain the support to the ability of the responsible person as named by law and we have done it.

SENATOR GROSSI: I think that under the law where there is a family of three not on ADC - this is a working family - if they are a responsible relative, they would be permitted to

keep an income of \$300 a month and all over that, they would have to contribute toward the support of the family for which they are responsible as a relative, correct?

MR. REIER: I agree, yes, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: Now let's assume that we have a family that is getting \$600 a month on ADC and now we have a hard-working relative who is responsible who makes \$600 a month, a family of three. Under the law he keeps \$300 and turns \$300 over towards the family for which he is responsible. Isn't that true?

MR. REIER: Well, in the ADC program, sir, that is hardly likely because the responsibility runs in a direct line and it is either the father or the mother or the son or daughter who is responsible. Now where in an ADC family other than a brother or sister will you find that particular point that you are raising?

SENATOR GROSSI: How about the grandfather?

MR. REIER: In the case of a grandfather, we have adjudicated those cases by bringing it into court, recognizing that a grandson is not responsible for his grandfather and we prefer adjudication in those cases rather than to impoverish a grandparent. That is up to a certain point.

SENATOR GROSSI: The fact remains that is the law.

MR. REIER: Yes, it is. But Judge Lindeman-- Judge Bellfatto has been very understanding in those cases.

SENATOR GROSSI: I would assume then you feel that law to that degree is a little unconscionable.

MR. REIER: It is true, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you very much, Mr. Reier.

MR. REIER: Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: I have several names here of persons who signed in who would like to say something. However, what I would like to do now is ask anyone who has to go back to their work or to their job and would like to be heard at this time, to speak. Monsignor Trainor, would you like to be heard?

MONSIGNOR TRAINOR: Yes.

MONSIGNOR PATRICK J. TRAINOR:
Senator Grossi, ladies and gentlemen: I am Monsignor Patrick J. Trainor, Executive Director of the Associated Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Newark, located at 31 Mulberry Street of this city.

The Archdiocese itself extends into the four counties of Bergen, Hudson, Essex and Union. There are three other dioceses in the State of New Jersey and each of these dioceses has a Catholic Charities office or bureau. It is the purpose of this office to coordinate the social welfare activities of the diocese as the need calls for it. You will not hear the word "Catholic," Roman or otherwise, for the rest of this statement.

Since the problems that are pointed out in the legislative report on ADC reflect the deficiencies in the over-all social welfare services for children in the State of New Jersey, we address ourselves to that deficiency.

The ADC program in its origin was a recognition of the

rights of the child, particularly that of living in a family setting. The rights of the child presume the responsibility of the parents to meet its needs. These responsibilities are reinforced by the laws of the State of New Jersey. When the parents are not meeting their responsibilities and the child is left dependent and in need, it is then the responsibility of the State. However, there is no body or agency, public or private, legally obligated to take up, as it were, the child in need.

The Bureau of Children's Services, formerly the State Board of Child Welfare, the State agency for the care of children in need, is enabled to act only on application, which application must meet certain requirements before the child is accepted for care. Were it not for the existence of interested citizens, and the dedication of the many private and voluntary family and children's agencies, many children in need would never be recognized. Consequently, there should be legislation pinpointing and outlining the responsibility of the State for the dependent, needy child. Such legislation would not return the administration of ADC to the State, but would focus on the right of the child in need as paramount. Such legislation should be a prologue to any legislation being considered by this Committee to remove the evils and alleviate the problems that presently accompany the ADC program. Such legislation is a necessary condition for the "balanced program" mentioned in the last paragraph of the report on page 79, since it would more than enable the public agencies administering the ADC program to call upon the private voluntary agencies concerned with the rights of the child in need, in a more concrete and constructive way.

The voluntary private agencies concerned with the rights of the child in need are philosophically in accord on the value of the ADC program. In fact, they were active in bringing about the original federal law. Most of the private family and children's agencies of the State are providing casework services for some ADC families and that without any remuneration from the program. The same can be said of some private child-care agencies providing care for children from ADC families without remuneration. Most of the voluntary agencies could and would do more were they financially able.

Despite the active interest of the voluntary private agencies in the effectiveness of the ADC program, there has been little recognition of the private agencies in the planning for this effectiveness. This is borne out by the report itself. Granted the primary purpose of the report, the only recognition is a belittling one, picturing the private welfare agencies as some kind of an ogre stealing caseworkers from the public welfare agencies. Actually our experience is the other way around. It may be picayune to observe that our being here today is as a member of the general public, according to the invitation. We mentioned at the outset that the problems pointed up in this legislative report reflect the deficiencies in the over-all social welfare services for children in the State. In this category New Jersey ranks very low. This is due in large part to the pattern of non-recognition of the private welfare agencies as important to the over-all social welfare program of the State. In areas where this recognition has been given, much more successful programs have been effected.

Contributing to this success has been the provision for the purchase of service or care from the private agencies.

The Bureau of Children's Services has some semblance of purchase of service. Their complaint is lack of funds. The Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, calling for improved services to ADC families, make it possible for the State agency to contract with private agencies. Up to now nothing has been done to implement this in New Jersey.

To further confirm the importance of private agencies in combating the evils in the ADC program, there is the problem of the immorality. Even if the caseworkers from the public welfare agencies were able to reach all their clients in need of such direction, it would be contrary to the principle of the separation of Church and State, if we extend the recent decision of the Supreme Court. Morality presupposes the Ten Commandments. These are in the Old Testament.

These observations are not intended to be contentious, but with a sincere desire to work and assist in a successful operation of the ADC program in the State of New Jersey. We appreciate the problems of the public welfare agencies and we hope that in the construction of legislation the suggestions will be taken in accord with the desire for the successful operation of the total social welfare program of the State. Thank you,

SENATOR GROSSI: Monsignor, would you mind expanding a little on your suggestion of implementation of the bill that we passed in '62 which permits the Institutions and Agencies to purchase care from private agencies? What would the nature of

the implementation have to be in order to satisfy the demands and do the proper job?

MONSIGNOR TRAINOR: Well, presently, the emphasis on the provision of the purchase of service is that it is purely permissive on the part of the Bureau of Children's Services. Then it is left to the Bureau to draw up the rules and regulations and this can be an obstacle if they are not pointed towards the over-all right of the child. If there is a desire to maintain a pattern which has been already established, then these rules and regulations can be slanted to render ineffective a program of purchase of service. You mean implementation?

SENATOR GROSSI: You feel it is inadequate as written.

MONSIGNOR TRAINOR: Of course, as I have mentioned here, one of the complaints is they do not have the funds. But one kind of goes with the other. If the rules and regulations are so stated or put down and they emanate mostly from the State department, unless there is this real recognition of the partnership basis of the voluntary agencies, as not something which is like a supermarket where you can go in and buy these services, but a working together which is not evident in the State of New Jersey today -- So that it would seem in the State legislation it would be necessary to so construct it that it wouldn't be simply permissive, but it would be on a cooperative basis and at the same time there would be provisions for sufficient funds. Of course, here again, you might have the cry "This is going to cost maybe ten million or so." But at the same time as it has been pointed out in the report, these costs if they're directed in the right places can prevent greater

costs later on and that is true even here today. Many voluntary agencies have had to curtail certain services, have had to close down facilities, because they have not had the financial wherewith to continue or to expand. So when you have an expansion of need, you do not have the voluntary agencies able and ready to meet it properly along with the public welfare agencies.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Monsignor.

Rev. Green, just to keep this nonsectarian, do you subscribe to what the good Monsignor had to say with respect to private agencies being able to furnish care at the request of the I and A in the same manner that they would an ordinary case?

REV. GREEN: I believe that there is something definitely to be said for purchase of services and that this is something that we should be looking into. I haven't delved into this matter as deeply and strongly as Father Trainor has, but I believe that this is something that is commendable, that we should be looking into.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you. I got you support, Monsignor, from the other side of the aisle.

I think there was somebody who had to leave. Would you come up here, please and identify yourself.

M R. S C A I R P O N: I am Mr. Scairpon. Senator and fellow visitors: I haven't a prepared speech, but I am pleased that we had a previous speaker that more or less agrees with me and that was the Director from Essex, I believe, in regards to grandparents. I am a grandparent and have been following your hearings, that is, as far as the newspapers are concerned,

and I have noticed that in regards to ADC no mention has been made in the papers of what you have decided to do with grandparents in regards to dependent children.

I am here and wondering what you intend to do about the present law in regards to grandparents which I believe is quite unfair.

On page 21 - I could be wrong in my figuring - but on page 21, for miscellaneous reasons - the last part of the paragraph says this amounted to 5 per cent, which I imagine would be the category in which the grandparents fell.

SENATOR GROSSI: One-half of one per cent.

MR. SCAIRPON: One-half of one per cent. I beg your pardon. I believe that would be where grandparents would come in.

Now I never realized that there was such a law and I found out since that I believe about 90 per cent of the attorneys don't know of this law. I have had several attorneys that I have spoken to, acquaintances, and they didn't realize there was such a law. It is so seldom used. I believe that the original law probably was put in a good many years ago, with probably not even a thought of welfare at that time.

But I think this encourages daughters-in-law and sons-in-law and so forth to break up with their family, figuring that if they don't get payments from their husband, they can always fall back on the grandparent. I know you mentioned you don't want any individual cases brought up here and I don't want to do that. But I believe there are only two states that have this law. Now I could be wrong. This is all that I could find out about. There are only two states that have this law where

grandparents are responsible.

An example could be - and this is true - where a daughter-in-law has gone to welfare in another state and welfare has told her she has no grounds for support. She has support, she has a room and a roof and bed, and she has no room for support - her husband was adequately supporting her. So her mother flies her back from this other state into New Jersey and goes on welfare. At that time she was living with her mother and children. She gets on welfare and then leaves her mother and goes to an apartment of her own. This is just an example of how a grandparent is taken in on this type of welfare treatment. I believe it is unfair and I haven't spoken to anyone - and, as I say, a previous speaker disagrees with this law and I would like consideration from you, Senator, and the Investigating Committee to try to eliminate this law.

SENATOR GROSSI: Do you feel that it is wrong to ask a responsible relative to contribute to the maintenance of the family unit?

MR. SCAIRPON: Not a responsible relative. But when you take an example of where a grandparent as in my case is 58 years old, is sick, has a serious heart condition, continuous medical care, has a daughter at home in the last year of high school and is striving to send my daughter to college - and under this condition, I won't be able to. I think our system of democracy requires that we educate our children. If you deprive a grandparent of any money to educate his child or to look forward to his support, his own support and his wife's support when he retires, I don't think in this case it should be.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, you are talking now in behalf of grandfathers because you are one.

MR. SCAIRPON: Right.

SENATOR GROSSI: You are talking now where you are not able to afford it. But do you think that the responsibility for grandchildren, for instance, should be that of the state rather than the grandparent where a grandparent is able to contribute?

MR. SCAIRPON: No, I think the grandparent should help and I have; I have before welfare brought me into court about this thing. But they are not concerned about that. They want money from me and this is what I have to do.

SENATOR GROSSI: In other words, you think the formula is too strict?

MR. SCAIRPON: I think so.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you.

MR. SCAIRPON: Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: Your objections are noted and the Committee will go over them.

I have been asked to call Mr. Cohen from South Jersey of the National Association of Social Workers.

MR. COHEN: Thank you, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: Will you identify yourself?

A L C O H E N: I am a psychiatric social worker. My name is Al Cohen. I am the chairman of the South New Jersey Committee on Social Policy and Action of the National Association of Social Workers. Today, I am speaking in behalf of more than 350 dedicated social workers of the South New Jersey counties who

have advanced degrees in the area of Social Sciences and Welfare on either a Masters or Doctorate level.

As a profession dedicated to the preservation of family life and human dignity through the elimination of social, economic, physical and emotional handicaps as well as the preservation of our democratic society, we are very much interested in the "Aid to Dependent Children" program both in the State of New Jersey and nationally.

The Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature fulfills a vital function and we welcome their inquiries and recommendations as a necessary and vital form of democratic government. However, we would like to point out that in regard to the ADC program, we are faced with a complex and costly program that does not lend itself to easy solutions that produce sensational newspaper headlines. Basically, the program enacted by Congress as part of the Social Security Act of 1935, and most recently revised in 1962, is a humane and responsible piece of legislation aimed at maintaining families in distress by providing for the care of dependent children in their own homes or homes of relatives. It enables the State to give financial assistance, rehabilitation and other services to their parents or relatives with whom they are now living and to help the parents or relatives to attain or retain capability for the maximum self support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection. The emphasis of the program, Mr. Chairman, rests on its rehabilitative and personal independence features and not on punitive or restrictive clauses.

We are all aware of the basic changes that have occurred within our country in the last decade. Perhaps the most talked about but least understood is the revolution that has swept industry - the revolution of automation - the replacement of manpower by machine power. Due to the technological changes, the flood of untrained teenagers on the job market and lack of spectacular economic growth have left us with a chronic jobless population rate of 5.5 per cent.¹ There appears to be a "close relationship between trends in the child recipient rate for ADC and the national unemployment situation. In the years when the unemployment rate was relatively low, the number of ADC children per one thousand population under the age of eighteen declined, when unemployment increased, the ADC rate did the same."²

We strongly suspect that the "man in the house clause" of the ADC program ties into the picture of chronic unemployment and lack of job opportunities for minority groups. Deserting fathers are responsible for 35 per cent of all ADC cases in New Jersey and yet we find that many of these same fathers continue to maintain ties with their families. How many of these fathers desert because of the emotional and psychological burdens placed on their families by their inability to secure a decent wage or even a job in a society where affluence appears to be at their very fingertips? Recipients of ADC have many of the same dreams as you or I yet because of historical circumstances or personal misfortune they are ensnared in a web of problems including poor and inadequate housing, lack of job opportunities,

¹
"Stubborn Joblessness Defies J.F.K. Deadline," by William J. Eaton in the Trenton Sunday Times - Advertiser, September 29, 1963.

²
Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of Families Receiving A.D.C. Late 1958, (U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare), p.5.

discriminatory practices based on race and social class position, illiteracy, etc.

We can evolve new departments and spend large sums of money to ferret out those who desert, letting them feel the wrath of the community by allocating them to our already crowded prisons, or we can adopt progressive steps that would aim toward the elimination of chronic unemployment and chronic dependency. The 1962 amendments to the Social Security Act provide Federal funds for the first time "to assist children in need because of unemployed parents thus eliminating the need for the man in the house ruling."³ To date, New Jersey has not adopted this plan. We wonder why? "The new law permits State welfare departments to assign employable recipients over age 18 in the program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children to community work and training projects so that they may be employed on useful work which will teach new skills. Such projects must serve a worthwhile purpose, not displace regular workers, meet standards of health and safety, and other statutory requirements. Workers must have reasonable opportunity to seek employment and obtain needed vocational training. Cooperative arrangements with public employment and State vocational and adult education agencies are to be in effect to make full use of all resources to help people enter or return to the regular labor force."⁴ These programs are not the end all or the be all. First we must give basic economic security to those children and families that need it.

³
Current Developments in Public Welfare at the Federal Level--
Changes Through Administrative Action and Legislation, by Andrew
R.N. Truelson, (U.S. Dept. of Health, Education & Welfare), p.22.

⁴
Ibid., p.23.

We are extremely proud of our fellow citizens of New Jersey who, out of their compassion for the less fortunate have chosen to give assistance to ADC recipients on the basis of need rather than residency laws and maximum allocations.

Once the economic underpinning is secured, we must do away with the myth that dependency breeds dependency - the cry of those individuals who, while responsive to the needs of "deserving, individuals in need" cannot comprehend the sufferings of thousands of "occasionally less deserving," but nevertheless needy brethren. As an alert and conscientious citizenry we must move from the archaic idea that the central mission of the ADC program or any other social welfare program is simply one of determining eligibility or ineligibility. The former Secretary of H.E.W., Abraham Ribicoff, stated that, "...we must have a more constructive goal: to move people off relief (thus cutting costs in the long run) through a program of rehabilitation and the prevention of dependency." Many recognize that individuals on ADC, as previously stated, are frequently beset by racial and social discrimination, domestic discord, faulty education, inadequate skills, ill health, chronic unemployment, lack of positive identifiable role models. To respond to these complicated and interlocking problems through the distribution of relief checks is to beg the question.

The Committee has praised those of our profession who serve in the front ranks of the ADC program as case workers, has paid tribute to their dedication and competence despite their overwhelming case loads and lack of a decent salary. The Committee has recommended in the text of its document that minimum beginning

salaries be established on a statewide basis with regular increments and promotions and that case loads be decreased to be more in line with the Federal recommendations of 60 cases per worker. We commend their concern and interest, but wonder why it was not included in the body of recommendations and not as an afterthought.

Has the State, or will the State take advantage of the Social Security provisions of 1962 - authorizing Federal help to the States for the training of social workers and staff development?

Though there are some "hard-core" cases that at present defy solution, it has been proven time and time again that skilled casework service in conjunction with a spectrum of additional social services and the opening of new economic and social horizons for the needy of our land has broken the back of many a dependency case. These services by up-grading the individual's feelings of self-worth and by giving him back his dignity and a chance to grow up healthy and strong have added to the vitality of our country.

The cost of these programs is high. However, the cost of continued dependency, family disruption and discord, and child neglect are higher. As President Kennedy recently said, "...our greatest National resource is our people." I might add, all our people. Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: Mr. Cohen, you mentioned about the children on ADC and, of course, children are of prime concern to everyone and certainly also the prime concern of the Committee and hence some of the recommendations with respect to the

immoral and amoral activities. Now you were mentioning that you felt that unemployment was in a large measure responsible. Do you think that there is any ratio or direct relationship between unemployment and the fact in 34 or 35 per cent of the families involved in ADC the parents have illegitimate children?

MR. COHEN: Well, I will refer you specifically, as I did in the report, to that 35 per cent where there are desertions from the home. Senator, if you will go over the figures in the Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of Families Receiving A.D.C. Late 1958, (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare), you will notice the correlation between unemployment and the number of cases of recipients of A.D.C. During the Korean War period when employment rose, there was a significant decrease in the number of applicants receiving A.D.C. payments. I also refer you to the statement made by the Commissioner of Welfare in New York City, Mr. Gunson, the other day, in which he has noted a similar correlation in New York City.

SENATOR GROSSI: A similar correlation to what?

MR. COHEN: Between unemployment and the number of recipients of A.D.C. I am referring now specifically to the man-in-the-house provision where we find that fathers who have deserted continue to maintain family contacts and we strongly suspect one of the reasons for this is because they cannot maintain adequate living standards on their salary and so desert.

SENATOR GROSSI: How do you feel about the removal of the child by court order, or whatever, from the environment in a family where morality seems to be the least of their concern -

not allowing these children to grow up in that atmosphere?

MR. COHEN: Well, I will defer slightly on this question. You will notice that I have made a general statement rather than referring to specific points. Some of my colleagues from North New Jersey will answer specific questions. However, generally we know that there is immorality, but we think that a discussion of this is an avoidance of the basic issue and that is the maintenance of families in need. We are primarily concerned with meeting needs. This is our primary concern, not with judging the immoral attitudes of some of the recipients of the program.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, the family is the prime concern, isn't it?

MR. COHEN: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: And the welfare of the child is also of prime consideration, is it not?

MR. COHEN: That is correct.

SENATOR GROSSI: And you feel that there shouldn't be any disassociation between the children brought up in the atmosphere of illegitimacy where it is permiscuous and where there are a great number of them in the one family where there are different putative fathers? You still feel that family should be kept intact?

MR. COHEN: We know that these conditions exist and I think that some of the people here today have presented some recommendations and a broad spectrum of programs to deal with this. We think statements such as this sometimes tend to cloud the issues and the basic program of ADC which was to offer assistance

to those families in need.

SENATOR GROSSI: I don't think you have answered my question directly.

MR. COHEN: Well ---

SENATOR GROSSI: All right, Mr. Cohen. Thank you very much. I would like to call on Mr. Schuyler.

P E T E R S C H U Y L E R: I am Peter Schuyler, the Executive Secretary of the Welfare Federation; Vice President of the Council of Social Agencies; and I am reporting here for the Council of Social Agencies today, Senator.

The Council of Social Agencies of Newark, Belleville, Irvington and West Hudson represents 125 agencies in the field of welfare, recreation and informal education. Its object is "to study social service problems and needs; to further cooperation and unity of action among the various social welfare, civic, educational and benevolent charitable organizations in the area; to assist such organizations in achieving higher standards of service, in correlating their aims, in coordinating their programs and in integrating the services rendered by them; to promote economy and efficiency in the administration and operation of such organizations, and in general to promote the social welfare of the area."

Our Council shares the concern of your committee for the welfare of the New Jersey children for whose financial support the public has assumed responsibility through the ADC program. We are aware that approximately 25,000 children in Essex County today receive their support from the public through this

program.

We know that, for the vast majority of these children, ADC checks mean the opportunity to maintain a parental relationship in an atmosphere of some financial stability, and that for most of the mothers, the monthly ADC check is an opportunity to maintain a home and raise their children that otherwise would be beyond their resources. I hesitated there because I would like to say that they could rear their children, but I am not sure that they can on their allotment even though it seems high compared to some states.

We recognize that life for these ADC children and their mothers is not easy. As presently written in New Jersey, the law insists that ADC eligibility, except in cases of disability, exists only for those children who have only one parent in the home.

A home from which the father is absent, for whatever reason, in whatever financial stratum, with whatever cultural background is not an easy one in which we can expect children to develop into responsible, well-adjusted adults.

The very nature of the program indicates that among ADC families, necessarily are to be found the most seriously disturbed families and children. The fact that the behavior of these families deviates from what generally is acceptable to us should come as no great surprise.

We agree with the Committee that "the problem goes deeper than dollars. It affects the lives of innocent children, often blighting their entire future by depriving them of their heritage

and right to live in surroundings free from great moral harm and risks."

We believe that it is the responsibility of the community to provide these unhappy families with more than a monthly check to cover the costs of food, clothing and shelter. Society's concern with the families, however, should be not so much with the symptoms of their difficulties as with the root causes.

Society's concern, too, as you indicate, should be with the future - to assure that youngsters who have been raised in inadequate homes will have the opportunity to become and remain self-supporting citizens of our community, to build useful lives and wholesome families when they reach adulthood.

A piecemeal approach to some of the more glaring and sensational abuses - superficial efforts to strike at symptoms of serious personality disturbances - is a less meaningful method of improving the program, however, than an overhaul of the entire philosophy behind the administration of the ADC program in our state.

Your Committee report itself places emphasis on this whole approach. On page 79, you state:

"What must be realized by the public, our news media, and our Legislators at both state and county levels and all other responsible citizens who are concerned with rising relief costs is that good casework, at manageable levels is not a cost expenditure, but an investment, which properly will result in the savings of thousands of dollars, not to mention the savings which accrue from the reconstruction and salvaging of whole families often comprising the lives of many individuals.

"A recent survey of county facilities and social casework programs reveals no positive efforts are in effect to

accomplish family stability and family rehabilitation. To date we have merely supplied money grants to families afflicted by breakdowns substituting for assistance a form of paternalism which in the absence of adequate supervision, has often aided and encouraged the very evils we hoped to obviate through ADC.

"Much is needed by way of rehabilitation, more intensive casework, education, training and the development of individual and family traits leading toward self-dependency and self-pride, which is altogether lacking in today's administration of ADC in New Jersey."

In this context, the Council of Social Agencies of Newark, Belleville, Irvington and West Hudson earnestly believes, after careful study, that the goal of an improved ADC program in our state can best be achieved through legislation which would bring into full effect in New Jersey the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 which Congress adopted at the request of President Kennedy.

We think that this is the one major step by which we could achieve much of what you in the Legislature and we in the social welfare field want to accomplish for this program.

President Kennedy described the philosophy behind this legislation in his State of the Union message in January, 1962, as that of "a new welfare program stressing services instead of support, rehabilitation instead of relief, and training for useful work instead of prolonged dependency."

When he signed the bill, he said: "This important legislation will assist our State and local public welfare agencies to redirect the incentives and services they offer to needy families and children and to aged and disabled people. Our objective is to prevent or reduce dependency and to encourage self-care and self-support -- to maintain family life where it

is adequate and to restore it where it is deficient."

Briefly, the amendments, now in effect in all of our neighboring states, encourage intensive casework services to ADC mothers; job training where it is indicated; provide incentives for an effort at self-sufficiency; provide training grants to upgrade the skills of caseworkers in our ADC agency; and most important, set standards of case work services to these disturbed families in terms of goals to be achieved within definite time limits.

In an effort to stimulate this new emphasis on the need to salvage the lives of ADC families, the amendments provide for an increase from 50 per cent to 75 per cent in the Federal share of the program's administrative costs which are directed to rehabilitation when Federal standards of service to clients are met.

By permitting payment of ADC grants to two-parent families where the need exists because of the unemployment of the father, these amendments strike at one of the most glaring social deficiencies in the program as it exists in New Jersey today. The premium the present program places on the real or superficial absence of the father from the home is hardly a condition for decent family life.

The fact that this provision would transfer a substantial part of the municipal tax expenditures to the Federal Government should not be overlooked in your Committee's consideration. In fact, 5.7 million dollars was the amount estimated by our Governor in his January 8th annual message to the Senate and General Assembly as available to the state were it to implement this

extension of ADC to the children of unemployed fathers. It should be added that he recommended this program for social as well as financial reasons. It seems ironic that the municipalities have been forced for two years now to carry a burden that could be largely assumed by the Federal government if the State Legislature would act.

In addition to the Public Welfare Amendments, we call your attention to Chapter 197, P.L. of New Jersey, 1962, which provided for the reorganization of the administration of public welfare functions within the Department of Institutions and Agencies. We make specific reference to the provisions dealing with "purchase of care" from private agencies. If the legislators would appropriate sufficient funds for this purpose, increased services to children would be provided. We urge the implementation of these provisions.

I have tried to be as brief as possible in stating the position of our Council on the question of new legislation on public welfare in New Jersey. We appreciate the time and effort that your legislative committee has put into this problem over the past several years, and respectfully suggest that legislation to implement the Public Welfare amendments be enacted with all deliberate speed by our Legislature, as the most comprehensive approach available to the problem of improving and upgrading the services we render to the dependent children of our State.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you very much. I am glad to see too that you stress the rehabilitation of the parents a little more than has been expressed up to now, which made me feel for a

while that the Committee was being regarded as being against aid to dependent children. You made two references - one, of course, where the counties now have to bear and carry the burden that could be largely assumed by the Federal government. I assume that this includes the transfer of Home Life which was done by the Legislature from the State to the counties which gave you an unconscionable burden to bear on a local level. Incidentally, I want you to know that I didn't vote for that transfer.

MR. SCHUYLER: Yes, sir, I know because I helped promote it.

SENATOR GROSSI: I don't mind ~~saying~~ here on the rehabilitation program we find that in the State there there are only two counties, I believe, that go in for any extensive rehabilitation and I know Essex County is one of the two.

MR. SCHUYLER: I know that and we are very proud of our County Welfare Board here and the work they are doing. What I had reference to was the fact that these families where the father is unemployed go on relief which is a burden on our municipalities. I was referring to the transfer of some part of that burden from various municipalities and, as you know, within the municipalities, the range of relief varies considerably according to the opinion of whoever is distributing it or the locale of the community.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Mr. Schuyler. You have been very helpful.

Is Mr. Fisch here yet? I believe you wanted to say something. Will you identify yourself, please.

H. W I L L I A M F I S C H: My name is H. William Fisch.

I am not a grandparent, but I am here on that grandparent ruling that you have in the statutes today. I haven't heard anyone here speak about the concept of a father or mother. I hear everything about ADC and figures and numbers. To me, the concept of a father is a person, married, who raises children, teaches them the Ten Commandments. I have two children in college, one at Douglass, a Senior, and one a Freshman at Riders. And my concept is that give them a good education, put them out in the world and, after they are out, they are on their own. Invariably they get married. You can't control that. Love is blind anyway. They get married and they have a little family trouble. I believe you are a grandparent. The first thing a grandparent does when he has grandchildren is carry their pictures in his pocket and he's proud to show them. If there is any money around, any money gift - I gave my mother some money, she took that money and bought the grandchildren a gift. The money didn't go for her - always the grandchildren. Anybody in trouble, if there is any grandparent around and they have any money, those children will be well taken care of. Maybe they couldn't do it every month because they might not have the money to do it every month. But they will see that they will help.

But to put a burden on a grandparent when they become around 50 and up when they have medical trouble - it might be with the mouth or it might be with their heart and what have you - at that age they get anything that goes by their windows, no matter what it may be. And I think that's an unfair, very much unfair, statute that we have in there because, as I said before,

the grandparents themselves, if they have the money, those children will be well taken care of in their own little way. They'll help out. It shouldn't be a forced statute that they must pay X number of dollars. Thank you.

Incidentally, I want to give you a lot of credit for a job well done. I have been following the newspapers and hearing about it around. Thanks a lot.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Mr. Fischel. Of course, I want to point out that the concept of responsible relatives is one that has been handed down from the beginning of society.

MR. FISCHEL: That's right.

SENATOR GROSSI: And under the old Common Law there is a direct line that runs to responsible parents and to change that particular law with respect to grandfathers might run into shoals in the Legislature. But we will take your recommendation under consideration.

MR. FISCHEL: Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: I see several hands raised. It's ten after twelve and I'd like to know how many people here would like to make statements before this Committee. If you will raise your hands, then I can make some determination as to the time. There are five. Let's take a fifteen-minute break so we won't have to break for lunch and then come back after lunch.

(Short Recess.)

AFTER RECESS

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. We will resume. Is Mr. Victor Liotta here?

V I C T O R L I O T T A: Senator, I am Mr. Victor Liotta, Director of Welfare in Union County. I do not have a prepared statement. Rather than to make the record cumulative, I would like to testify at this time that I subscribe to the issues and the statement made by Mr. Reier, Director of Essex County.

However, several points have been developed here this morning which perhaps may require some clarification. Mention has been made of the increase in case loads in New Jersey of 214 per cent as compared to 1956. This increase perhaps may be due to a change of regulation by reason of an interpretation and an opinion rendered by the Attorney General's Office. Prior to 1959 an eligibility requirement was an indictment of desertion. In compliance with Federal legislation, absence from the home was interpreted to the then State Board of Child Welfare, eliminating the necessity for indictment and resulting in a great influx of applications approved by the State Board of Child Welfare. That perhaps accounts for some of the increase.

A great deal has been said regarding the responsibility of grandparents. Grandparents are responsible because they are defined by law as such. We go back to the Old Age Assistance program when grandchildren were responsible for the support of grandparents. The Legislature in their wisdom seeing the fact that this was not producing the results, costing a great deal

of money administratively, amended the Old Age Assistance law relieving the grandchildren of responsibility. And if the Legislature so chooses in New Jersey, they may eliminate the responsibility of grandparents supporting grandchildren. This item has caused a great deal of difficulty. When a man has raised his family, given them the benefits of everything possible and is later called upon to support grandchildren, it does create a hardship.

We in public welfare are trying to promote family life and by citing grandparents in the court, we are not doing the very thing that we hold ourselves out to do.

We do stress the moral responsibility, but since the law says grandparents are responsible, when they refuse, we must go into court to fix that responsibility. But that is entirely within the province of the Legislature. I am certain that many of the Directors in New Jersey will support the Legislature should they desire to eliminate grandparents as legally responsible, bearing in mind that we'll carry out the moral responsibility.

This Committee or the Legislature should take into earnest consideration the matter of adoption of a Family Court on a countywide basis. Today, many of our affiliation complaints are filed in municipal courts and the practice varies from city to city. In one municipality the order may be \$8 a week, in an adjoining municipality it may be \$12 a week, and if you go out a little further, it may be \$25 a week. There is no uniformity. And the establishment of a Family Court on a countywide basis would do much to bring this matter of support payment by putative fathers on a uniform basis rather than on

the variable basis that we have today because of the number of municipalities and the number of magistrates which we have.

With relation to the survey being conducted by Dr. Bixby, I am a member of that Committee. We have worked earnestly for about a year and a half and hopefully the matter of the cooperation of Probation Departments with County Welfare Boards would be achieved in the very, very near future.

I want to reiterate that I subscribe to the statements by Mr. Reier and many of the statements by other speakers, and to emphasize this matter of residence - it's a migratory problem and we will have it as long as people move from state to state. And in Union County when we had our last survey, out of a total case load of 896 at that time, we only had 8 persons on assistance with residence in New Jersey of less than a year and of those 8, 7 were in New Jersey more than nine months.

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Mr. Liotta. Just one question: Where the grandfather or the grandparents are the only relatives of the family on ADC and even if they are able financially, you mean you would be in favor of eliminating the grandfather as a responsible relative?

MR. LIOTTA: I would be in favor of eliminating him as a responsible relative because that grandfather, if he has any love for his children or grandchildren, as the case may be, I am certain will recognize his moral responsibility and when approached on the basis of a moral responsibility rather than a legal responsibility, you will get more cooperation.

SENATOR GROSSI: What about the ones who don't want to meet their moral or financial responsibility?

MR. LIOTTA: I don't admit that there are very many of those, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, by eliminating a responsible relative, you are saying in effect that the State then should pick up the bill - the taxpayers of the State should pick up the bill where there is a responsible relative who is able to support.

MR. LIOTTA: I am saying that the State should be consistent. When the legislators in their wisdom eliminated the responsibility of grandchildren for the support of their grandparents, the reverse should also be a fact.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right, Mr. Liotta. Thank you.

Do we have a Mr. Bert Hunter here who will appear for Mr. George Reim, who is the Chairman of the ~~North~~ New Jersey Chapter of Social Workers?

MR. HUNTER: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: Will you identify yourself fully, please, for the record.

B E R T H U N T E R: I am Bert Hunter. I am a member of the North, New Jersey Chapter, National Association of Social Workers.

First, before beginning my testimony, I would want to commend the statement that you made earlier, Mr. Chairman, regarding the heavy burden that Essex County carries for this program. I appreciate your concern in this matter. I notice this was not included in the report here. But I believe, sir, that in New Jersey 27½ per cent of the cost of this program is

borne by the county taxpayers whereas throughout the United States 11 per cent of this burden - that is, for the country as a whole - is borne locally. This means a much larger share of responsibility is borne by local property payers and I hardly need add the further statement that the burden that Essex County bears is huge, particularly when contrasted with a neighboring county. I noticed, for instance, in statistics that came from Trenton recently, it was stated that one of our neighboring counties - the burden was only one-thirteenth per taxpayer as much as in Essex County. Now may I proceed with the statement?

I am testifying for George Reim, Chairman of the North New Jersey Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers with 650 professional social workers in nine counties. May we begin by expressing our strong affirmation of two statements in your report. These are, first: "Much is needed by way of rehabilitation, more intensive casework, education, training, and the development of individual and family traits leading toward self-dependency and self-pride;" and second, the goal of a proper public assistance program in New Jersey should be "that no person truly in need must suffer from want."

We also wish to affirm a view that, in drafting legislation based on this report, the best interests of the taxpayers who support this program as well as the families who receive such public assistance must be served.

Our Chapter wishes to speak to four of the Committee's recommendations. With regard to Recommendation 1, on residence requirements, we concur with your Committee that Title 44 be

revised and urge that no changes be made in ADC residence pending such comprehensive consideration. In such reappraisal of residence requirements, it should be considered that verification of residence is a complex and expensive procedure. Furthermore, a tighter residence law in the ADC program would increase general assistance costs (which have no federal participation). The increase in such costs would result from two factors: (1) The time required to complete ADC eligibility studies would be increased. Most of the applicants would require support from general assistance during this prolonged period. (2) Those families whose residence could not be verified would be an additional burden on general assistance for a greater or lesser period.

On Recommendation 2, suggesting a statutory maximum of \$300., the low budgetary standard now in operation should be considered. Present food allowances, based on 1958 prices, provide \$.49 a day for food for a child under 3, \$1.06 per day for a 13-year-old boy, and \$.90 for an adult. A man or boy employed as a laborer has a clothing allowance that provides for only one overcoat in ten years. There is no provision in the regular budget for household furnishings, bed linens, dishes, etc. With such limited allowances, the maximum on the grant could create further handicaps for the large family that already has extreme difficulty in finding housing. Fraud might be encouraged by the family's need to conceal income which would be deducted from a budget already below subsistence level. Such deprivation could increase school dropouts as children could be without proper clothing. Increased stress in the home

would aggravate existing problems.

Recommendation 9, voucher assistance, would eliminate federal participation, as the Committee recognizes. There could be a further loss since it can be anticipated that these families with the money problems have been selected for "Defined Services" - this is a category in the Public Welfare Amendments of '62 - with 75 per cent federal participation in administrative costs under the 1962 amendments. Such use of voucher is also a punitive measure against families already suffering severe family disorganization with multiple problems affecting the children. Vouchers are more expensive to administer, both for the agency and the vendor.

Recommendation 10 deals with the removal of children from the home if there is evidence of moral deterioration. It is our belief that the legislative intent of ADC program focuses on the assumption that the welfare of the child is best served through continuity of family life. Present laws and regulations require that children be removed from homes that have been determined to be unsuitable, with judicial process if necessary. May it not be judged that the recommendation to allow the county welfare director to remove children at his discretion without due process of law is a violation of civil rights? The long-range impact of foster home placement should be considered in light of the findings of a 1958 New Jersey State Board of Child Welfare report, which showed that only one out of ten homes were re-established when children were removed because of neglect. "The children grew up in foster homes and lost all meaningful contact with their own people."

That Report further comments on the "savings which accrue from reconstruction and salvaging of whole families." Social casework to prevent break-up of these families would show a financial saving; the average cost of monthly care for a foster child is \$79.00, whereas the cost for average person in ADC family is \$45.00, with no federal participation in foster care and, of course, up to 75 per cent in administrative costs for ADC under the new Public Welfare Amendments. Severe shortage of foster homes currently results in long delays in placement of neglected children; a marked increase in number of children to be placed would place the neglected child in serious jeopardy.

The plight of many of these families results from major social changes resulting from population explosion, decrease in infant mortality, rising living costs, urbanization and development of a "core city" and automation with resulting displacement of the semi-skilled and unskilled workers, and not the presence of ADC as a source of support. Public assistance programs are not responsible for the moral standards of their clients, whose a-social behavior may be the compounded effects of such factors as low income, mental deficiency, illiteracy, poor housing, inability to get work or training, and other broad social ills. We consider that the prime purpose of public assistance programs for families with children must be to alleviate poverty and to give the children a chance to break through to a better life. Illegitimacy cannot be punished out of existence. Three hundred years of social welfare legislation in America has not succeeded in doing that.

Too heavy emphasis on establishing and verifying eligibility, - with more restrictive and repressive aspects, leaves no time for the social work and diminishes the likelihood for constructive effort in behalf of the families and children needing their help. Thus, emphasis should be on prevention and rehabilitation, adequate financial assistance for those in need, better protection and education of children, and more and better prepared social work personnel. In the latter regard, we strongly support the Committee recommendations on well-trained staff and lowered caseloads.

We must ask: What is the public assistance recipient really like?

Two studies quoted in Michael Harrington's "The Other America" show that very serious problems such as mental illness are more prevalent in the lowest income groups. The Cornell University "Midtown" researchers described the "low status individuals: They are rigid, suspicious and have a fatalistic outlook on life. They do not plan ahead, a characteristic associated with their fatalism. They are prone to depression, have feelings of futility, lack of belongingness, friendlessness, and a lack of trust in others." The bottom of society is "three times more depressed than the top." The Hollingshead and Redlich study in New Haven found that in the lowest group in society, 1,659 per 100,000 were treated for psychiatric illness, 90 per cent of which were the graver disturbances of psychoses as compared with the higher income groups with an incidence of 556 per 100,000, and 35 per cent treated for psychoses.

Unless basic economic, social and cultural factors are understood and placed in their proper perspective, we contend that there is little hope of effecting the constructive changes which are needed in all public welfare programs.

We deeply appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee. Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: I am quite interested in some of the statements made. One of them was that you thought the voucher system of payment where the director of welfare felt that it was conducive to the best interest of the household, particularly the children, would be punitive. Why would you consider a voucher system to be punitive when it doesn't take anything away in the total amount? Where would the punitive aspect come in on the voucher system? I don't quite get it.

MR. HUNTER: Well, for one thing, I think the major thing is that it takes away the client's self-determination as to which store he will go to where he will buy such and such a service. It also would immediately identify him as a welfare recipient wherever he went.

SENATOR GROSSI: But this would only be for those families where the welfare director found there was abuse - in other words, where a mother gets x number of dollars per month in her check, but she doesn't use it for the welfare of her children - she spends it on her paramours, she spends it in a saloon, she spends it on everything except her children and her children are still bedraggled and the atmosphere has not improved any. Where would the voucher system imposed there be punitive on any member of the family outside of the promiscuous

mother so she wouldn't have so much cash to dally around with? Where would it be punitive?

MR. HUNTER: I can't elaborate on what I said earlier. I would like to raise the point that -- Excuse me. I have lost my train of thought just on that point. Oh, yes! The thing that I wanted to say was that I had an experience once in Chicago, working in the public welfare program there many years ago. There was an alcoholic father who was given his groceries in a basket because of his inability to manage and he immediately upon the arrival of the groceries started peddling them around the neighborhood for money. I just wanted to indicate that this doesn't work out as easily as it might seem sometimes.

SENATOR GROSSI: We are sure it wouldn't eliminate all the abuses entirely, but I think that the voucher system would at least insure the children would get a larger measure of the benefits than they do under these circumstances. It wouldn't mean we recommend a voucher system for all families, only those who abuse it. And you would still object to that?

MR. HUNTER: I would think in very rare instances there might be cases in which either this or a protected payment where perhaps payment might be made to a third party who would sort of oversee that ---

SENATOR GROSSI: One of our recommendations is to have somebody designated as the payee - that is one of the recommendations too - in order to oversee the effect of the payments, to make sure they are spent properly.

One of the other things that you said that startled me a

little bit was: The purpose of welfare is not to be concerned, if I remember correctly, with the morals of the family or the moral atmosphere; they are more concerned with the children. And you pointed out too the financial aspect of it by saying that when a child was kept in this home, the cost to the State would be \$45 whereas if you put the child in a foster home, it would move to \$79. Is that approximately what you said?

MR. HUNTER: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: We have found in so many instances in one household there are five or six or seven illegitimate children, and in one household, fourteen, where there are six to eight different putative fathers. In a case like that, do you feel it would be better to leave the child there? For instance, I would like to read you some of the testimony in one particular case which was just brought to my attention. This was the questioning of a woman who was an illegitimate child herself and who had seven or eight illegitimate children in her household and her children also have illegitimate children. This was the questioning: (Reading) Q "How about Jane Doe, is she with you?" The name is obviously fictitious on my part. A "Yes, she is." Q "And her father was also John Doe?" A "That's right." Q "She is 15?" A "Yes, she is." Q "Does she go to school?" A "No." Q "When did she quit school?" A "When she was 12." Q "What grade was she in then?" A "Sixth." Q "Why did she quit?" A "Because she was pregnant." This at 12 years old and we have found them at 15 years old in foster homes too for that matter and she, herself, this one that became pregnant who was now 15 became pregnant at 12 and at 15 had two children and was pregnant with the third and all under the same roof.

Do you feel rather than taking those children away from that household and placing them in foster homes because of the extra cost involved, they would be better off remaining in that household?

MR. HUNTER: Well, I'd better explain here that, of course, there are situations where children should be taken away from their parents and this is done every day in the Juvenile Court. I think probably here it's more a matter of degree. We are only pointing out that removal of children from their families is not the total answer in a lot of situations and it is sort of a last resort. It has also been indicated that sometimes a child gets a better background in their own home, even though it be not the highest type of home than they would in a foster home which had good standards because of the intangible feeling of belonging. I think it is a matter of degree, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, we, of course, will never have a code answer, I am sure, but I would be surprised that there would be any objection to taking the child or children away from that kind of an atmosphere and placing them in a foster home or even in a child shelter to give these children an opportunity to be raised in a moral atmosphere where they will know the difference between right and wrong. So I think that the extra cost involved between leaving a child in a home of this type and putting it in a foster home is negligible. Certainly, I don't think that anybody would want to keep them there just for the sake of keeping the cost down. There are so

many instances where we have found this to be so that the Committee recommends that steps be taken in cases of this type by the welfare director applying to court to have these children removed from this atmosphere.

Do you subscribe to that statement that I heard you read or, at least, I thought you read that the purpose of welfare is not to be concerned with the moral tone or moral aspect of the family, but rather with the children? Do I get that correctly? What is your own feeling about it? You are an assistant there.

MR. HUNTER: Yes, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: What is your own feeling on that? I know that statement is not yours - it belongs to your superior - is that right - the statement you are reading?

MR. HUNTER: That's right, sir. He had to go back to his office.

SENATOR GROSSI: How do you feel about that? Do you feel the welfare should not be concerned with the moral tone or moral surrounding of the children?

MR. HUNTER: Well, here again, it is a matter of degree as I have indicated, sir. The Essex County Welfare Board is recommending from time to time that families of recipients of relief are presented to the Juvenile Court for taking the children away and placing them into the custody of the State Bureau of Children's Services. I think the question here, sir, is not that this shouldn't be done, but as to how much of an answer this is when we consider the real difficulties in finding homes, the high cost of the program and the fact that the experience in some of these replacements has been that it has

not worked out as well as the original home. They might have been in the original home. I think, sir, though, I would have to say to the original question "Should social work be concerned?" - yes, it should be. But there also needs to be a concern with the financial needs of those children.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, the financial situation wouldn't deteriorate if they made a recommendation that the child be taken away from that kind of an atmosphere. Don't you think it's the duty of the social worker to report such cases as the testimony about which I just read to his superior and recommend his or her superior ---

MR. HUNTER: I certainly think to discuss it. Yes, sir, I would agree.

SENATOR GROSSI: And perhaps the fact that they haven't done it in a great number of cases could be attributed to the fact that up until recent months, the caseload per worker kind of prevented that type of thing.

MR. HUNTER: That's right, sir, plus the inadequacies in the program of placing children through the State Division of Children's Services because they have operated under --- You, of course, have made a previous study of that organization so you know of the handicaps under which it operates.

SENATOR GROSSI: That is why the recommendation of the Committee was to establish these children's shelters in the various counties.

All right, thank you.

There was one other gentlemen who wanted to speak.
Will you come forward?

A R T H U R F I S H B E I N: My name is Arthur Fishbein, 951 Bergen Street, Newark, New Jersey. I come here as a citizen and I believe, Senator, you are doing a good job and I commend you for the job you are doing. However, I would like to give you my views on some of these matters, if it is possible.

I have at times been attending not only council meetings, but also Freeholders' meetings and have made certain recommendations. Whether they can be incorporated in this law or not, I do not know.

One is that if there are more than two illegitimate children, any children beyond the two should be taken away from the people and put in these homes that you have now recommended. It would be cheaper in the end to build these homes than to have prisoners later on. It would cost more money to support them later on.

With regard to families, it seems to me at the very beginning for some of the members that come into the municipal courts or into the county court with domestic problems should be given a viewing of the mental health films that the State now has. In other words, it would be by group therapy in order to keep the families together and would save certain sums of money for the county and the state.

With Aid to Dependent Children you have a Federal law which makes the rules under which you are bound. If that can be kind of modified in any way, shape or form, I believe it is up to the state so to do.

I would like to give you some experience that I have had

MR. FISHBEIN: Well, that is the law at the present time. I don't think you want to change that. I mean, after all, the Federal government is supposed to do certain things for that and is supposed also to give them the funds. But the fact still remains that when we take away the right of dependents - in other words, to make a person dependent upon the state or upon the county - we do away with the background that we have started our country on because families would take care of themselves until it got too far, then they went on welfare. At one time that was. Now, of course, the state comes in and it does certain things that it has a right to do and the county comes in and, of course, the Federal government - and all this money has to come from somebody. In other words, at one time we were dependent upon ourselves and we were proud of that fact. Now, we depend upon the country and I don't think that any country can take care of its people. People must take care of the country.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you very much.

MR. FISHBEIN: Thank you.

F R E D B A R B A R O: Senator Grossi, my name is Fred Barbaro. I am the Associate Director of the Urban League of Essex County. The Urban League appreciates the opportunity to present its views to the Committee.

In the interest of time, I will only state the six major points in this testimony with very little elaboration. Each statement made is accompanied by supporting evidence that is documented in the written report. I am submitting here the report for the record and invite you to read the text at your leisure. This (indicating) is the report I am referring to.

1. The Urban League of Essex County is aware of the many deficiencies in the public assistance program. However, inadequate as this program may be, it is the only program that prevents thousands of American families, who are not eligible for social insurance benefits, from experiencing a complete economic disaster. We also foresee the need for a strengthened public assistance program in the future as greater demands are made on the program due to the increasing unemployment problem created by automation and related factors.

During the winter months unemployment in New Jersey has exceeded the 8% level every year since 1959 and during the summer months it has exceeded the 6% level.

Conditions are sufficiently severe to warrant the inclusion of certain labor market areas in New Jersey among other depressed areas in the country that now qualify for federal economic assistance programs.

2. The Urban League strongly urges the State of New

Jersey to adopt and implement the provisions specified in Title IV, Section 407 of the Social Security Act. These provisions extend the benefits of the aid to dependent children program to families with unemployed parents. It also provides for the establishment of a cooperative arrangement with state agencies responsible for the administration of vocational education programs in the State with the intent of retraining individuals capable of being retrained.

We feel that if the 1962 amendment is adopted the local general assistance agencies will be partially relieved of the increasing demands made on their services which many of them cannot presently meet. It will also help to keep marginal families together during periods of severe unemployment.

3. The Urban League of Essex County believes that a modern industrial society demands a large mobile labor force. We further believe that residence requirements are outdated and inconsistent with fiscal reality since 50% of the ADC program is financed by the federal government. We, therefore, urge the State of New Jersey to continue its leadership in the public welfare field by extending the provision that eliminated residence requirement from the ADC programs to all public assistance programs.

Reviewing the migration patterns for the past ten years reveals that states that have the largest increases in their population are among the most industrialized states in the nation. People are coming to New Jersey and other states for jobs and better living conditions. They will continue to come despite the hazard involved. Some of them will need

help. They will receive this help from the public assistance agencies or they will not receive it at all.

4. The Urban League strongly recommends that the State of New Jersey abandon the punitive investigation approach in the administration of the public assistance program in favor of a social service approach. We feel that the punitive approach has never led to the rehabilitation of a single family nor has it decreased dependency. We believe that the introduction of social work services will help to rehabilitate families where this is possible and ultimately decrease the cost of the program.

This report includes examples of demonstration projects conducted across the country that have taken the rehabilitation approach and have helped families in need and in the process decreased program costs.

5. The Urban League urges the State of New Jersey to introduce an effective inservice training course, improve working conditions and establish a realistic and statewide salary scale to increase the effectiveness of the staff, increase morale and thereby increase the efficiency of the program.

6. The Urban League believes that it has been firmly established by federal, state and private investigation groups that recipients that deliberately attempt to perpetrate fraud in the ADC program comprise a very small percentage of the entire ADC caseload. In New Jersey this amounts to 1.2%. We urge the State of New Jersey to appropriate sufficient funds to administer a sound rehabilitation program.

We believe that this approach is not only morally desirable but also fiscally sound.

A recent study ordered by the Senate Appropriations Committee revealed that states that appropriate adequate funds to administer the ADC program, grant realistic benefits and require realistic eligibility requirements will have only a small percentage of ineligibles in the program. A program whose entire energy is directed toward the elimination of the two or three percent who are ineligible is wasteful and cannot possibly assist the majority of the families in the program. A program with social services will enable the caseworker to counsel families and also assume the other task of determining eligibility.

The most striking example of community support given to a public assistance program took place in Marin County, California, when the State Taxpayer's Association supported the efficiently administered rehabilitation program on the county agency.

The people of Marin County do not differ greatly from the people in any county in New Jersey. They are motivated by the same considerations that motivate the people of this State. They have supported, and the people of this state will support, public assistance when they know that it is more economical to rehabilitate, where possible, than to investigate. In short, they will support it when they know that this program is adequately meeting the needs of the citizens of the State of New Jersey.

Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: Did I hear you correctly that the Urban League recommends very strongly that the investigation be ceased?

MR. BARBARO: No, I did not say that, sir, I mentioned that the investigative approach - I mean, the emphasis on investigating of spending most of our energies in detecting fraud, where this is not a real basic factor to the whole program. Investigation as to eligibility can be carried out as stated by the caseworker in the normal therapeutic or casework situation.

SENATOR GROSSI: You don't think it's the duty of the social worker to investigate in cases under their jurisdiction?

MR. BARBARO: It is the duty of the caseworker to determine eligibility, yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: And not to attempt to find out if there is any fraud? That is not the social worker's problem?

MR. BARBARO: Well, in the matter of eligibility, to determine eligibility, and in normal processes you have those relationships with your client - the case of fraud, the whereabouts of the putative father, all that information comes out. If there is fraud, naturally the caseworker should come forth and report it.

SENATOR GROSSI: Wouldn't that require investigation?

MR. BARBARO: Yes, but I am saying that the emphasis should be on the therapeutic level and not the investigative level.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, do you think the emphasis in New Jersey is on investigation rather than on the therapeutic level?

MR. BARBARO: Yes, I do.

SENATOR GROSSI: You mean since the Committee began or always?

MR. BARBARO: I think it has been true over the entire country except in limited cases here and there, and Marin County is an example.

SENATOR GROSSI: You mean that the Urban League would object to an investigative process from time to time to determine whether there is any fraud permeating the relief programs or any program for that matter?

MR. BARBARO: You mean outside the normal work done by the caseworkers in the regular county agencies?

SENATOR GROSSI: Yes.

MR. BARBARO: Well, I am not criticizing your Committee if that is your thought.

SENATOR GROSSI: No, no. I am just interested in your philosophy. So far as the investigation is concerned, it is completed so far as this Committee is concerned. We have made our report and we are trying to get views on our recommendations .

You also made mention of the fact that in New Jersey fraud is 1.2%. Where did you get your figures from?

MR. BARBARO: This report was ordered by Senator Byrd of West Virginia after he had ordered a primary investigation of Washington D. C. This was nationwide and the results appear on one of the pages in my report which will be available for the Committee.

SENATOR GROSSI: Would it interest you to know that

Senator Byrd got much of his information through this Committee?

MR. BARBARO: Only the results.

SENATOR GROSSI: And our figures show more than 1.2. Our figures show more than 3%.

But what is your definition of fraud? In the relief program what would be your definition of fraud?

MR. BARBARO: Wilfully and deliberately withholding facts, and it came out 1.2%

SENATOR GROSSI: Any facts, whether there was any extra income they were receiving or if they were working surreptitiously and not reporting to the Welfare Department, that would constitute fraud?

MR. BARBARO: Yes, sir. It is also broken down in the report. In case you haven't seen it yet, it's the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, July, 1963, and it's entitled "Eligibility of Families Receiving Aid to Dependent Children."

SENATOR GROSSI: We have it.

MR. BARBARO: Oh, you do have that. That is broken down. And when I mentioned the 1.2% I was specifically referring to the fact that this was the number that was determined to be wilfully withholding facts to become eligible for the program.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, do you feel that the social worker should conduct investigations at all times, even after the person has been declared eligible? We are not talking about people who have been made eligible when they

should not have been made eligible, but those people who were determined to be eligible and fraud came after the eligibility, not before the eligibility. So that requires constant surveillance by the social worker or whatever agency that would be charged with that duty. For instance, collusion with fathers. We have found cases where the woman made a complaint against the father for desertion and then found him living two blocks away or one block away, and in one instance in the same house on a different floor, which was a very convenient way of getting ADC.

Those cases are fraud too, wouldn't you say so?

MR. BARBARO: Yes, I would but wouldn't you also agree, sir, that if the 1962 amendment were implemented many of these so-called deserter fathers would not desert and would remain in the home and would receive these benefits also.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, we have the recommendation that the prosecutor's office be set up with an agency whose sole or prime function would be to trace deserting or disappearing fathers. Does that meet with the Urban League approval?

MR. BARBARO: I have not investigated that and I don't like to make a statement on that.

SENATOR GROSSI: How would you feel about it personally, to set up an agency in the prosecutor's office whose sole function or prime function would be to trace deserting fathers or disappearing fathers who have an obligation to their families and make them pay up or pay the penalty for not paying up.

MR. BARBARO: I believe that's the second step, sir.

I believe that if adequate case work relationships are established for each family that in difficult situations where this has not proved to be helpful, this is the second step. But I don't see adding additional funds to investigate a change until each case worker can have a relationship at least on a once a month or twice a month basis with each client, the type of relationship where they will know the family history, would know the whereabouts of parents, and the ability to get this information quicker than any investigative committee, I believe.

SENATOR GROSSI: How else would the public have known today that there are more than \$10 million owed to the State of New Jersey by virtue of voluntary agreements that have not been lived up to, and that in Essex County, for instance, under court order some 524 cases that owe \$900,000 to the taxpayers of Essex County - how else would these facts be gotten together if it weren't for the investigative committee? Or do you think we should just slough over that?

MR. BARBARO: No, sir. You misinterpret my question, sir. I don't say that your committee, the Senate or anyone does not have the right to investigate this program, in fact I'm happy that it's being done. I said that if additional funds are made available to set up a separate office within the prosecutor's division to investigate families who are - or fathers who are not contributing, I believe the extra funds should be put into actual case work in the county board where additional staff can be

hired, trained and in sufficient numbers to do the job.

SENATOR GROSSI: But you feel that the funds that were to be made available to the various prosecutor's offices would be of such great extent that if they were transmitted over to the welfare work directly it would be much more beneficial?

MR. BARBARO: Yes, sir, if they were adequately increased.

SENATOR GROSSI: What would you do with the \$10 million owed to the State, and what would you do with the nine hundred and some odd thousand dollars that is owed to Essex County, or would you just let that go?

MR. BARBARO: I feel that a great deal of that money could be forthcoming without an investigation.

SENATOR GROSSI: By whom?

MR. BARBARO: By the caseworker dealing with the client, indirectly.

SENATOR GROSSI: But the caseworkers have been unable to do it up to now.

MR. BARBARO: They haven't been given the proper chance, I mean, do they actually have a rehabilitation program in effect in all the counties? I believe your report states it doesn't.

SENATOR GROSSI: They have been charged with that responsibility and evidently they have not been able to meet it, for one reason or another.

MR. BARBARO: For lack of administrative costs.

SENATOR GROSSI: Maybe they have too many cases but I think, even so, if their case load was brought down to

40 or 50, which is a good norm, we would still have people who would try to get away from their obligation. Certainly we can't expect the social worker to chase into another county or even throughout the State to locate the man who should be paying support.

MR. BARBARO: I agree with you in that case, but I rather see the statistics and the money owed after an effective program is in effect on a county level, where every caseworker can have not 60 but 40 cases and compare it on a degree of consistency.

SENATOR GROSSI: You would like to see more money made available for the purpose of rehabilitation.

MR. BARBARO: Definitely.

SENATOR GROSSI: You don't want to take it away from the prosecutor's office where they are going to have these investigators going --

MR. BARBARO: No. I say that, sir, because I know there is only a limited amount of money available. If an equal amount was made available to both departments I certainly would see no difficulty.

SENATOR GROSSI: It would be infinitesimal in comparison with what you need for rehabilitation.

MR. BARBARO: I agree, but where would the results be? that's my question.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you very much.

MR. BARBARO: You're welcome, sir.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right, is there anybody else? Yes, sir. Will you come up and identify yourself.

R E V. W I L L I A M T. M A R T I N: I am Reverend William T. Martin. Senator and Citizens of Newark: I am glad to be here to listen to the work that's being done by this Committee.

I do think that in the past much work has been done and I can see now that much improvement has been made.

I also have taken notice of the different organizations, what they have had to say. We've heard about the different figures that have been given and the efforts that they have made. I don't think that we have been able to get much help from the organizations that we now have. I have always believed that no help was as good as self help. And I feel that something else is needed.

I think the fathers need an organization of their own where they can get together and help one another in various ways. And I think if the fathers had this organization it would be one of the means by which they could find out where work was available and many other problems they may have, such as a man may have a slight problem in educational requirements. He may not be totally illiterate but there may be some subjects on which he is not capable of measuring up to, other subject of his education. And that would be another means by which this organization would be of self help.

I was also interested, as I listened - I don't think anyone brought out quite clearly or made enough emphasis on the moral conditions. And when I say that I mean, not only as it concerns Newark, New Jersey, but I mean where Newark is concerned or has concern with other places.

I think where money goes from Newark to other places then I certainly think that Newark should have some say as to the moral conditions. I mean, just because a woman leaves this city and goes to another city or another state, if help must come from Newark then I think Newark should be responsible.

The moral condition is one of the main issues that I think we ought to look at. I know that a man can be poor and yet he can be honorable. I think with men like Abraham Lincoln, who was poor, and as Jesus in the Bible, - these men they lived honorable lives and they proved of invaluable help to society. And I think the men would be more willing to cooperate if the morals of the men and the women were somewhat improved and if they knew that they couldn't get away with these things.

I don't think children, not even one child, should live in a home where there is immorality. I think something certainly needs to be done about this. I think every child should have the privilege of living in a place where he can realize the benefit of good bible study. I know I was brought up on the bible. My grandmother - I used to see her reading it when I was 12 and she didn't even have the electric light to read by. She used to read by the lamp as long as she could. Sometimes her eyes would run water but she would read the bible. As a result of that I come up doing the same thing. And I think it's necessary to put these children in an institution. Especially I think this should be done where the father is

concerned.

I do think the social worker, if that family is fortunate enough to have a social worker who is concerned about the moral condition of the family, it's good, but I think something especially needs to be done where the father is concerned about his children.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Reverend. In other words, you mean that we should place more stress than we are now on the rehabilitation and improving the moral tone of the household to which you have been referring. Is that it?

REV. MARTIN: Yes, sir, I do. I think that even the reciprocal court should be concerned about the moral conditions. Otherwise we probably will be raising human vegetables with no soul, no thoughts of God and purity. And I think we should strive to live a more pure and satisfactory life in the presence of God.

SENATOR GROSSI: You agree, then, that in these homes to which reference has been made where there is this immoral atmosphere of four, five, six, seven, eight or twelve illegitimate children by six or seven different fathers, that the betterment of these children would dictate their removal from that home and placing them in an atmosphere where they would have a chance to grow up like decent human beings?

REV. MARTIN: I think that's the only thing you can do if we are conscious of the bible, which is God's word. I don't see how we could do anything else.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Reverend, you have been

very, very helpful.

Now, is there anyone else, any citizen, who would care to make any statement for the record? Or if there is anyone who might shy away from standing up here who possibly has something to say as a result of what they heard this morning, they might sit down and write the Committee a letter telling us your views or what your suggestions might be and the Committee will include it in the record so that when we study it we will be able to get as many different opinions as possible.

Will you come forward, please, and state your name.

M R S. H O W A R D L A D E N: I am Mrs. Howard Laden. I'm a citizen and a case worker but I am not representing the agency which employs me.

SENATOR GROSSI: Where do you live?

MRS. LADEN: I live in Maplewood, New Jersey and I have been a resident of Essex County since birth.

I wish to commend the Committee for suggesting a maximum grant. I do agree with other speakers that illegitimacy cannot be legislated out of existence. But I do firmly believe, on the basis of answers given me by clients that I have interviewed, that life has become very easy and this would serve as somewhat of a deterrent in many cases.

I do not say that this would affect all clients. I do say that many people would think the first time before having several or more illegitimate children.

I also believe that it might even be practicable to

suggest that we accept as a welfare client any mother who comes with whatever number of children she arrives with, whether they are legitimate or otherwise. I think following this she should be on her own, in terms of not increasing the grant, that she should have to do with what has been granted her as she arrived at the agency. I think that this would be a great deterrent.

I say to many of my clients, "Suppose welfare was abolished tonight, what would you do tomorrow?" I get answers such as, "Well, I guess I will just have to get a job." Or else when they are having a fourth child after you have gotten almost a sworn promise that after the third one they are through - "Well, I guess I should have thought it over." But they know that they are not going to have to suffer too much and, therefore, this is not a matter of too great concern.

I know that there are many people who do not agree with this at all. They consider this a totally unsocial-workerlike approach, and whether it is or not, as a citizen of this County, a taxpayer all of my life, I do think that sooner or later there will come a taxpayer's revolt unless some measures are taken to inhibit this carefree attitude toward the population explosion.

Now, that's one thing. I don't know if the next thing I am about to say has any validity in terms of the province of your Committee but I would like to put this thought forward.

We have people on welfare who move about, every three

or four weeks, six weeks, two months. Now we can't pass a law, I am sure, to keep people in one place, but if we are really and truly concerned with the welfare of children and their education, I submit that no child, not even a genius, can learn if he is plucked out of a school every month, every two months, sometimes not even registered in the next school.

We have crowds of youngsters floating around, unaccounted for. Almost any social worker can tell you that she will see groups of children in her district. They are not in school. They are not 16. And they will present the same problem as I noticed commented on in the New York Times of last week when they called these "The Roaming Children."

I don't know how many there are but there are many hundreds of them, I'm certain. And I think a lot of it is due to the too great mobility of the welfare recipient. Now, if they are not on welfare we have no control but if they are on welfare it would almost be sensible to insist that, except in cases of emergency or on the recommendation of a social worker for improper housing conditions, they should stay in one school district at least for one semester because these children will never learn anything, they cannot. It takes time to adjust to each new school situation and I don't believe that these kids have a chance otherwise.

SENATOR GROSSI: You mean moving within the same municipality --

MRS. LADEN: Right.

SENATOR GROSSI: -- or are you talking about moving out of it?

MRS. LADEN: I'm talking about moving around within Newark.

SENATOR GROSSI: Within the same municipality.

MRS. LADEN: Right. Because these children - they tell you they're registered and when you call the school the school has never heard of them. They are not registered. And when you tell the mothers, it's a question of "Well, I didn't get to it yet." But no truant officer could possibly keep up with the large groups of children who are just lost in the shuffle.

SENATOR GROSSI: What is the reason for this movement?

MRS. LADEN: Well, a lot of it is sheer instability, the basic cause of their being on welfare to begin with, the instability of the parents. They are always looking for something which doesn't happen. And whatever their problems are, I don't think they should transmit them to the children in terms of having them miss their opportunity to become educated. And I don't care what child it is, no one can learn under those circumstances.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, perhaps if a person is on the relief program before they move they should get permission of the Welfare Director who would be able to determine whether the shift is for the betterment --

MRS. LADEN: Right.

SENATOR GROSSI: -- or just a case of moving around.

MRS. LADEN: Exactly.

SENATOR GROSSI: I think there is a lot of merit to

that.

You said something earlier that poses quite a problem. You talked about the woman maintaining a status quo when she gets on relief, so if she had future indiscretions and future illegitimate children she still would maintain her status quo. Well, what about the children, the innocent victims?

MRS. LADEN: I know that this is the other side of it. I say, I don't know what you could do to legislate this but I think even a threat of this kind.--

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, I think maybe there might be some deterrent if we established that department in the prosecutor's office that goes after these putative fathers or disappearing fathers.

MRS. LADEN: Certainly it would help.- no question.- because the answers come, "you promised me you wouldn't have any more children." "I know but I might marry this one." "Well, you thought that about the last one." It's too easy. If the father does not take care of it somebody else will.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. Thank you very much for your views.

Is there anyone else who would like to be heard?

Well, first of all I want to thank all the interested citizens who came here to listen and I want to thank those who participated in giving us much valuable information and suggestions.

Our job is a distasteful one but, nevertheless, a

necessary one. It has taken a lot of time and we will gather all the material that has been adduced, that is on tape, that has been recorded by stenographers, the statements submitted to the Committee, and we will study all this in complete detail before translating anything into legislation.

Now, the Committee will have one more hearing of this nature. It will be in Paterson within the next several weeks. So those of you who know anybody who might like to appear before this Committee, you can tell them to watch the papers as notification will be made.

Again I want to state that those of you who want to drop the Committee a letter telling us what your views are, we are perfectly willing to have you do so.

With those few words, I adjourn this meeting.

Thank you very much.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS AND ACTIVITY STATISTICS
PRESENTED BY CHARLES E. REIER, DIRECTOR, ESSEX COUNTY
WELFARE BOARD.....

RECOMMENDATION 3 - ATTACHMENT OF REAL PROPERTY

We are of the opinion that no absolute rule, such as is proposed here, can be laid down as applicable in every case.

The statutes charge us with determining "sufficient ability" in exploring the financial status of responsible relatives.

In 70 C.J.S., Paupers, Section 60b, the courts have interpreted these words for us, and I quote:

"In interpreting the words "sufficient ability", as used in the statutes, each case.....must depend on its own special circumstances, and to a large extent also on the discretion of the court. Ownership of property does not necessarily show ability. Ability is to be determined with reference to the existing state of things, and to the present state of defendant's property and debts, his income and probable earnings, and his present reasonable expenses."

In the light of this judicial opinion and its recognition that establishment of ability to support requires a highly complex evaluation on a case by case basis, we cannot support the arbitrary and restrictive measure proposed here.

RECOMMENDATION 4 - ATTACHMENT OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

We are opposed to this proposal for essentially the same reasons as those we put forward in reference to Recommendation 3.

RECOMMENDATION 5 - VOLUNTARY SUPPORT AGREEMENTS

We are in full accord with the proposed objective of achieving effective enforcement of support orders. The Committee's reference to "Voluntary Agreements" is unclear to us.

I can report, as president of the County Welfare Director's Association, that a committee of this body is currently working with Mr. F. Lovell Bixby, Consultant on Probation, attached to the Administrative Office of the Courts, in the area of support and orders with the aim of proposing, if necessary, revision of existing statute to achieve effective enforcement.

RECOMMENDATION 6 - APPOINTMENT OF REFEREE ETC.

Since this proposal relates to the structure and operation of the Courts, we feel that it is a matter for study by the administrators of our Court and Probation system.

We will, however, have some general comment on the establishment of a family court system in New Jersey when we discuss recommendation #10.

RECOMMENDATION 8 - SEMI-ANNUAL STATEMENT OF INCOME

County Welfare Boards are currently required by regulation to reinvestigate cases every six months. On these occasions, our staff reviews and verifies resources and social situation as well as the income review called for by this recommendation.

There is some merit to this recommendation calling for a more detailed statement of income. We agree, in principle, with the recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION 9 - LIMITING OF CASH PAYMENTS AND
PAYMENT BY VOUCHER IN CERTAIN
CASES**

The Federal Public Welfare Amendments of 1962 make possible a system of protective payments in certain instances without loss of federal matching funds.

This tool, combined with other administrative procedures now in effect, should be more than adequate to meet the problems presented, without recourse to the archaic voucher system, which in the past proved to create as many new problems as it reputedly solved.

We further believe there is a need for public assistance agencies to exercise a high degree of care in utilizing this tool. It should be invoked only when absolutely necessary and always as a temporary measure while case work is used to help the improvident mother understand her responsibilities.

We would, therefore, recommend amendment of our State law to enable us to utilize the "protective payment" provision of the Federal Act.

**RECOMMENDATION 10 - SUMMARY REMOVAL OF CHILDREN FROM
PARENTS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE
WELFARE DIRECTOR**

The concept of removal of children from the custody of parents without due process of law is contrary to our American ideal of democratic justice.

We do believe, along with a Supreme Court Committee and the Board of Control of the Department of Institutions and Agencies, that a restructuring of our court system to establish a separate "family court" with specific responsibility for neglect, abuse and support problems of children, is the most effective action available to us.

RECOMMENDATION 11 - VESTING AUTHORITY FOR RENT CONTROL & HOUSING SAFETY & SANITATION WITH WELFARE DIRECTORS

The goal of this recommendation, which is to secure for welfare clients safe and sanitary housing at reasonable cost, is laudable.

We would be in favor of rent-control for all modest-income dwellings. We would be in favor of the most stringent safety and sanitation inspection and control of all housing.

But both of these tasks require entire organizations with administrators having special skills in the particular area. To saddle Welfare Directors with these responsibilities in addition to the already sufficiently complex ones involved in public assistance administration would be to create an administrative monstrosity.

RECOMMENDATION 12 & 13 - RE AMENDMENT OF PATERNITY
LAWS AND ESTABLISHMENT OF
REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES FOR
INCOMPETENT CLIENTS

We are pleased to report that in June 1961, the Essex County Welfare Board proposed to the State Bureau of Assistance, amendment to the Probate Laws enabling illegitimate children to inherit from their parents. A bill to this effect was introduced at the last session of the Legislature.

We agree that there should be a summary and simplified judicial proceeding under which a representative payee could be appointed for incompetent clients. We understand that legislation to this end has already been proposed by the State Bureau of Assistance.

ACTIVITY STATISTICS

	1961		1962		1963 (9 Months)	
	Total	Moly Av.	Total	Moly Av.	Total	Moly Av.
PATERNITY COMPLAINTS FILED:						
Consents (D.R.Court)	498	44	813	68	549	61
Non Consents	845	70	1265	100	389	43
DESERTION COMPLAINTS FILED: (D.R.Court)	860	71	1145	95	538	60
HEARINGS SCHEDULED:						
D.R.Court (figures do not include pre- liminary hearings on deser- tion complaints)	1449		2427	202	2171	241
M G Courts			687	57	583	64
ARRESTS ON DESERTION WARRANTS (by Cty. Adj. Unit)			236	19	*169 *(to 6-30-63)	*28

ESTIMATE:

PATERNITY:

1961 Summary: 25% of approved cases involved ow children
166 cases involved 1 or more ow children
(Total ow children 287)

Jan. Feb. 1962 Summary of 319 cases

As of 1-1-63 Nwk Fam. Ct. had warrants on 641 cases in-
volving 1018 children

DESERTIONS:

Summary 12- -60 - 60% of cases granted aid involved des.

Experience for first six months 1963 indicates 68 new cases
per month.

AUG 07 1991

