

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:
September 23, 1963
State House
Trenton, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Senator Anthony J. Grossi (Chairman)

Senator Charles W. Sandman, Jr.

Also:

Grover C. Richman, Counsel

Leonard A. Coyle, Secretary

* * * * *

I N D E X

	Page
James E. Huddleston Director, Burlington County Welfare Board	3
Mrs. Edith Padderatz Instructor of Nurses, State of New Jersey	29
Raymond A. Dougherty Director of Welfare, Mercer County	35
Carmine Armenti Councilman, City of Trenton	46
Robert Rice Family Counseling Service, Middlesex County	47
Mrs. Elsa Alsberg Social Worker, Middlesex County	53
* * * *	
Letter from Federation of Jewish Agencies of Atlantic County	55

SENATOR ANTHONY J. GROSSI (Chairman): This is a resumption of the hearings of the Welfare Investigating Committee, and this particular hearing is not in the nature of adducing testimony with respect to conditions in the welfare program, because we have gone all through that in the various communities in which we have held hearings. However, the Committee has made a series of recommendations for legislation. Normally bills are drawn first and then submitted to public hearing. We find that, where the subject matter is controversial, this method produces a lot of waste of time, amending, and reamending legislation to conform to the wishes and the best thinking of those people who are concerned with this program.

We felt that we would have a sort of innovation. We thought that we would have our public hearings first on the proposed legislation in order to adduce from you your comments, criticisms, suggestions, approbations, or whatever form your comments would take.

This will all be made a part of the record and the Committee then will go over the testimony or the comments submitted and from those comments we probably would be able to draft legislation with a minimum of dislocation and introduce legislation without further necessity of public hearings which might develop controversy that could very well be eliminated at hearings of this type.

Our first hearing was in Atlantic City two weeks ago, at which some 20 persons testified - various welfare directors, county directors, local assistance board directors, and just

John Q. Citizen.

Today we are in Mercer County. Two weeks from today or approximately two weeks from today, at the earliest opportunity, we will have a similar hearing in Essex County. Then following that, another hearing in the North Jersey area, probably in Paterson, New Jersey, after which, if we see that a pattern develops of similarity with respect to suggestions and comments, we feel that it will be of great assistance to the Legislature in formulating the bills that we think will correct the abuses that have been in existence.

So, with those preliminary remarks, I might point out to you that on my right is Mr. Leonard Coyle who is Secretary to the Welfare Investigating Committee, and on my left is the Counsel to the Welfare Investigating Committee, Grover C. Richman, former Attorney General for the State of New Jersey and also former U. S. Attorney for New Jersey.

Are there any comments that you would like to make, General, prior to the inception of this hearing?

GROVER C. RICHMAN: I think not. I think everybody is familiar with your feelings and mine. I would rather hear what the other people have to say.

SENATOR GROSSI: First of all, I would like to read this telegram that just came in to this Committee:

"New Jersey Association of Chosen Freeholders appreciates your invitation to testify today September 23 on review of recommendation on ADC program. Will submit written statement for the record by our Welfare Commission Chairman Denise W. Alexander due to our meeting Board of voting members today at Newark Airport. Congratulate your forthright efforts to improve human welfare relations in New Jersey. James L. McKenna, President, N. J. Association of Chosen Freeholders."

Now, is there anyone here who is here by direct invitation of the Committee, first. (No response.)

All right. If there are others who would like to make a statement for the record, if you will just come forward. I think you, sir, asked me earlier in the day - if you will come up and sit at this first desk where the microphone is and keep your voice up so that the stenographer can properly record your statement.

Will you identify yourself, please. There will be no oaths taken here today. These are just declaratory statements by interested citizens and officials.

JAMES E. HUDDLESTON: My name is James E. Huddleston. I am a member of the South New Jersey Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers, and am Director of the Burlington County Welfare Board. My statement is based on experience in our agency, however, and is not the statement either of the association which is testifying separately, or of the Welfare Board.

SENATOR GROSSI: Will you give your address, please.

MR. HUDDLESTON: My home address is 3 Windsor Place, Mt. Holly, New Jersey. The Welfare Board's address is 49 Water Street, Mt. Holly, New Jersey.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right, proceed.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Recommendation No. 1 in the Welfare Investigating Committee's printed report was for a one year residence requirement in ADC, and for a recodification of the public welfare laws.

It seems to me that we should not make a one year

residence requirement. There is a great deal of family movement as reported by the U. S. Census Bureau, but as far as our very few clients with less than a year's residence are concerned, this movement is usually to seek jobs, to reunite families, or to be near relatives. Our agency has not found that dependent families travel to New Jersey to seek assistance.

Regarding the recodification of welfare legislation, this would be a good idea, as there are inconsistencies at present.

Recommendation No. 2 calls for a maximum grant of \$300 per month regardless of family size. I am opposed to this because of the penalty to a large family. The grants are set at a "minimum but adequate" level, and I believe that a maximum grant would work a hardship on the very large family. The average ADC grant in New Jersey is below \$200.

An argument for a maximum grant sometimes advanced is that some families, not on public aid, even with full time employment, do not net \$300 after taxes per month. This is true, but it may indicate a need for general assistance for those families and not need for a maximum grant for the ADC families.

Recommendation 3 provides that the County Welfare Directors should attach real property of each recipient and of his legally responsible relatives when the amount paid a recipient exceeds \$500.

This could not be administered in this form. Most of our ADC recipients are children, and if the recommendation

contemplates keeping a record to attach any future property of these children, this would not seem quite fair. Children are entitled to be supported through their childhood, and not have to begin adulthood with a lien.

Some adult recipients care for children other than their own; sometimes the adult's needs are included in the grant, sometimes not. Presumably only the property owner's personal share of the grant should be considered in the \$500 amount suggested. This appears to me to be administratively cumbersome. Only a few ADC families own their property free and clear.

The suggestion that property of legally responsible relatives be attached would require basic changes in the law. It does not seem to me that grandparents's property should be attached, but perhaps the court support order procedure against absent husbands and fathers could contain some method of attaching their real property.

Recommendation 4 states that personal property owned by each recipient or his legally responsible relatives should be attached when the aid exceeds \$500, except where ability to earn would be affected or undue hardship caused.

This recommendation would have all the difficulties of Recommendation 3, plus the additional ones of identifying and gaining control of personal property.

Recommendation 5 provides that voluntary agreements for support should be given the effect of law or be eliminated altogether in favor of consent orders signed by a judge of a court of competent jurisdiction.

As far as I know this is not a problem in our county,

as the cases involving ADC families have a court order, not a voluntary agreement. The actual collection of the court orders probably could be improved by stricter laws and increased court and probation staff.

Recommendation 6 calls for a court-appointed referee and investigator in each county to function in connection with support orders and agreements.

This might be beneficial, as would any improvements in the court order collection system.

Recommendation 7 calls for a separate staff in the prosecutor's office to locate and proceed against deserting and putative fathers, and to collect delinquent support orders.

Increased staff in the prosecutor's office or other law enforcement agency would no doubt help in bringing actions and in collecting.

I would like to suggest that we consider a change in the law permitting wage attachments for support orders, as can now be done by court order for default in paying for an ordinary purchase. I understand that Pennsylvania uses this method for support orders.

Recommendation 8 would require recipients to furnish a statement of income at six-month intervals, with legal sanctions for evasion or falsification.

Our agency has been securing such signed statements at each reinvestigation, which we try to do every six months.

Recommendation 9 proposes that ADC payments shall be limited to not more than \$25 cash per month, supplemented by commodity vouchers redeemable for "food, medicine, clothing

and fuel for home heating, lighting and cooking" only, when an ADC mother engages in any of the following forms of behavior: demonstrating an inability to budget and care for children, leaving a child alone over 12 hours, giving birth to an illegitimate child, making an unreasonable credit pledge, frequenting alcoholic beverage establishments, habitually using alcohol or narcotics, or behaving in a dissolute or immoral manner.

This is quite a variety of personal and social problems which present a challenge to the social work staff in helping the mother to improve her self-esteem, her child care, her budgeting, her physical and mental health, etc. The suggested cure by vouchers does not begin to get at the complex roots of these multiple problems. For this we would need, at the least, an expanded and better trained social work staff, strengthened by consultation from medical, psychiatric, psychological and legal personnel. Commodity vouchers are very poor at accomplishing the simple purchase of food for a needy family; they are surely out of their field in the treatment of the deviant behavior mentioned above.

Recommendation 10 provides that children shall be forthwith removed from a recipient, at the discretion of the county welfare director, if the recipient or any member of her family gives birth to an illegitimate child.

Removal of children from parents is a judicial function and I do not believe that the power should be given to the county welfare director.

Here again, the proposed cure of removal is very

violent. I can think of nothing to recommend illegitimacy; nevertheless it is not illegal to give birth to an illegitimate child, and furthermore any laws proposed in this regard should take into account that the majority of illegitimate children are not on public assistance.

Recommendation 10 also calls for legislation authorizing county welfare directors to locate and maintain foster home facilities concurrently with the State Board of Child Welfare.

There is already a policy calling for cooperative action with the State Board of Child Welfare - now the State Bureau of Children's Services - in approval and use of foster homes in certain instances.

Recommendation 11 provides that the county welfare director should set the rental and require repairs of landlords who lease premises to public assistance recipients.

Since there is no rent control in New Jersey, it does not seem feasible to assign this legal function to county welfare directors for certain clients. Caseworkers, however, should report health and safety violations to the proper municipal authorities.

Recommendation 12 proposes to amend the inheritance laws to permit an illegitimate child to inherit from the father if paternity has been legally established.

This would appear to afford a benefit for the illegitimate child.

Adjudications of paternity are made by both county and municipal courts. I would like to suggest that the State Administrative Director of the Courts and the State Registrar

of Vital Statistics confer on the problem of having the local adjudication of paternity be made a part of the state birth records.

Recommendation 13 would provide for the appointment, under judicial auspices, for representative payees for recipients of public assistance who are incompetent.

This legislation would improve the granting of aid to certain persons.

Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right, Mr. Huddleston, we would like to go over some of these things with you very briefly.

You say that you object to the one year residence requirement because this interferes with the movement of people who probably would be moving to seek jobs, etc.

MR. HUDDLESTON: So far as I can tell there has usually been some reason. In the few cases that have come to our attention that are not long-term residents of Burlington County, practically all of them, that I know of, had some reason to come here. They didn't just pick Burlington County as a point in geography and buy a ticket that far and get there.

SENATOR GROSSI: But our recommendation goes further than just the one year residency requirement which, by the way, while it is ambiguous today is still on our statute books, there is a one year residency requirement which is a fiction in the law because they can get around it on the local assistance level, I'm talking about.

MR. HUDDLESTON: The general assistance program, it's

true, does not have that.

SENATOR GROSSI: But this, in addition to requiring the one year residency for ADC, it still would make provision that these same families, if they are in need, would be eligible for public assistance, that is, for general assistance, and that this general assistance should be administered in the discretion of the welfare director renewable every thirty days. And, of course, after the 12th 30 day period they would be eligible for ADC.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: And the purpose of that would be, not to give them permanent residence with an income immediately on the ADC program because in the meantime the Welfare Director on the local assistance level would be able to see to it that these people either went back to where they came from or to secure a job and in the meantime would not clutter the ADC roll permanently, so as to provide an incentive for these persons to stay on ADC and not to seek employment elsewhere. So that our one year residency recommendation is coupled with the fact that no one would be deprived of assistance, who needed it, except that the welfare director would renew it every 30 days until the residency requirement had been met.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well that, as far as it goes, would possibly take care of it. The problem which we have in our county, and I can't speak for the others, is that the municipal welfare service is quite limited. There are a lot of people who are not eligible for one reason or another for ADC, Old Age Assistance, Disability Assistance, etc. and,

presumably, they are candidates for service by the municipal welfare department. The municipal welfare department, however, does not use the same standards as the county welfare departments do. Aid is often not available. The reasons for this, I don't know. The way I hear it, the municipal welfare directors sometimes report early in the year - February was my earliest hearing of this statement - that the money for the year was just about gone and they couldn't help a family that was applying.

Furthermore, anything done on the municipal level would be without the federal aid. That's not necessarily an all-controlling factor but it might be important.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well that is not necessarily so because those municipalities who accept state aid also get the federal aid.

MR. HUDDLESTON: No, they do not. It's just state and local.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, they're combined.

MR. HUDDLESTON: No. That which the state puts in is state money only. There is no federal money in general assistance. The federal government does not put any money toward general assistance by the municipalities. About three-fifths of the state's municipalities apply for state aid and receive it, and that's about --

SENATOR GROSSI: It is true though that the municipalities get up to 80% from the state.

MR. HUDDLESTON: From the state.

SENATOR GROSSI: So that the municipality would not be

put to an undue burden so far as the municipality was concerned and, of course, there are some municipalities that do not take state aid --

MR. HUDDLESTON: Two-fifths, that's correct.

SENATOR GROSSI: -- so, therefore, the burden would fall strictly on the municipality.

MR. HUDDLESTON: That's right.

SENATOR GROSSI: But so long as no one is deprived of assistance when they need it, because under the statute they must give assistance to persons whenever and wherever found, as you probably know --

MR. HUDDLESTON: There is that in the statute, that is true, but there is also another statute, and this is indication of the need for recodification, which says that the municipal welfare director shall give assistance in his discretion. And if he has discretion not to, he does not, even though there is another law under which we can see that he should if a person is in need. You do not necessarily get assistance in my hearings in Burlington County, I will say.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well don't you believe that the municipal director should have control of whether a person is in need or whether a person needs assistance; or do you feel that just because some person comes up and says "I need assistance" that he should automatically give it to him?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, surely that's his job but there are people who are definitely in need and who are refused by the municipal director, possibly because they say

that the municipal funds are not sufficient. For one reason or another they are refused assistance.

SENATOR GROSSI: Do you know of any series of incidents of that kind where a person who was actually in need was turned down by a municipal director?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, I have not had --

SENATOR GROSSI: And had to turn elsewhere.

MR. HUDDLESTON: They have to find some other means.

SENATOR GROSSI: But that wouldn't be the norm anyway, would it? That would be an isolated case here or there, and not the welfare directors in the municipalities as a whole? I know that in my experience in the City of Paterson, which is the third largest city in the State and which probably has as great a share of welfare assistance as any other city on a percentage basis, and even if the money is not there if they feel they are going to run out of money they put these people on anyway and then ask for an emergency appropriation from their governing body.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: So that I don't think it would work too great a hardship on anybody. It wouldn't work a hardship on anyone but at the same time it would provide stronger controls.

Of course, these are statements that we make as a result of the study and we want your reaction. But I want you to know too that we like to hassle back and forth so that we can get something concrete.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Fair enough.

SENATOR GROSSI: I think I have marked here recommendation number 3 which provides that the county welfare directors should attach real property, etc. You have made some objections to that and General Richman has a thought on that or at least the answer to it. Would you mind, General?

MR. RICHMAN: As I understand your objection, you object to burdening recipients as children because you feel they should be supported throughout childhood and not have to start off with some sort of an indebtedness.

Well, now, I don't believe that the word recipient, as used in this recommendation or as used anywhere in this program, is intended to mean the children. Of course, we never intended it to mean that at all. We intended to mean by recipient the person who gets the money, that would be the mother or someone else.

MR. HUDDLESTON: A lot of times that person - we have what we call "O" grants, that is there are no adults on the grant, a grandparent, or an aunt, uncle, brother, sister, etc. is caring for the children. He gets the grant made out in his name. Actually his needs are not included in it at all. He has sufficient income for his own purposes.

MR. RICHMAN: But doesn't he have a responsibility to support his children or grandchildren?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Now there are two groups there. The legally responsible relatives do, that is grandparents.

MR. RICHMAN: Yes.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Aunts, uncles, brothers, sisters and cousins, who also take in ADC children, are relatives and

qualify as relatives under the federal ADC statute but they are not legally responsible relatives.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, would you draw a distinction between the two? Would you say it would be unfair to saddle the grandfather with the indebtedness when he is legally responsible to support them?

MR. HUDDLESTON: But he's not in the grant, you mean?

MR. RICHMAN: Right.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, I don't know. I think that there is probably a distinction between --

MR. RICHMAN: He has a legal responsibility to support, true?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Right.

MR. RICHMAN: So he ought to be required to reimburse.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Right. Suppose, however, he is supporting to the extent of his legal responsibility; suppose, according to the state standards, he has an excess income of \$25.00 per month which he should give to the support of his grandchildren. Okeh, suppose he's doing that but then the children, say numbering about four, have a grant of about \$150, and he's paying his \$25 which we say he can afford, would it be right to not only take his \$25 but also put the extra \$150 as a lien against his property? That would seem to me to be going a little far.

MR. RICHMAN: If that's the basis of your objection, then you want to qualify his legal responsibility. Is that right?

SENATOR GROSSI: It would seem that way.

MR. RICHMAN: In other words, you want to have a qualified legal responsibility. You don't want him to be wholly responsible.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes, well we have that now.

MR. RICHMAN: He is wholly responsible now, isn't he?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, he's responsible now if he has an excess over the exemption schedule. And by the way, the amounts in the exemption schedule for legally responsible relatives are quite liberal now. Starting December 1, 1962 there was an increase, and if I can think of one example, a legally responsible relative who is a man and has a wife and three children and say his father or mother goes on Old Age Assistance, not until he has \$7500 per year gross do we say he has any evaluated capacity to support. So what we have found in this change in the exemption schedule is that very few of our clients in any category have relatives with a capacity to support. See the relatives complained before that we had it set too low before, at least the relatives thought so and said so. It's up there now so that it is more or less unusual now when we have a relative of a dependent family that has enough extra money to really be able to support, according to us, and not be doing so.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, I think that's fine but suppose there are some that are not. How do you feel, for example, about the brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts and cousins - not cousins, I won't go that far - brothers and sisters, let's limit ourselves to that. Don't you feel that as opposed to

society generally supporting children of this family, the obligation ought to be on the members of the family where the relationship is as close as that?

MR. HUDDLESTON: As brothers and sisters?

MR. RICHMAN: Yes.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Or aunts and uncles, that's pretty close. Well, they are not now regarded as legally responsible relatives under the law.

MR. RICHMAN: I know that. I'm asking if you think they should be.

MR. HUDDLESTON: I do not think they should be.

MR. RICHMAN: Why not?

MR. HUDDLESTON: If we are going to make any changes in the list of legally responsible relatives - this is just my own opinion --

MR. RICHMAN: Sure.

MR. HUDDLESTON: -- I would rather see it reduced than added to. I believe this is the trend in the country also.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, is it a good trend to diminish family responsibility and increase the state's responsibility? Is that a good trend?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, no, I don't think we should discourage relatives. In fact, instructions in investigating any application for assistance is to inquire and request any of these relatives, legally responsible relatives or otherwise, to help, but we do not have a way of forcing these non-legally responsible relatives to do so at this point.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, I take it you would be opposed to having such a requirement.

MR. HUDDLESTON: It is just my opinion. If I had a vote, I would be opposed to adding brothers and sisters to the legally responsible relatives.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, is it any longer true in this Country that the family is the nucleus or the basis of our society, or has that concept been discarded and the state is now the protector of all?

MR. HUDDLESTON: I hope that is still true.

MR. RICHMAN: You hope the family still is.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes. But so far as --

MR. RICHMAN: Shouldn't they be brought in to contribute and not just sit on the sideline and let the state take care of it?

MR. RICHMAN: By making a law saying that you are responsible for your brothers and sisters? I don't think so.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, I would like to see how you could reconcile some of the statements that you have just made, some of the feelings you have. You made mention of the fact that under the new exemptions --

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: It's true, isn't it, that where there are three in a family that exemption amounts to about \$375 a month before they are asked to contribute?

MR. HUDDLESTON: That's gross. I'm sorry I didn't bring those figures with me but that's probably about right.

SENATOR GROSSI: That's about it, isn't it?

MR. HUDDLESTON: It's pretty high up there, yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. Now, please reconcile that fact with your feeling of being opposed to a maximum of \$300 a month to a family that is getting relief. Now, why would you be in favor, why do you point out that a legally responsible family or relatives with an income of up to \$375 a month they don't have to contribute but over \$375 they would be expected to contribute a proportionate share - is that right?

MR. HUDDLESTON: They would be expected to contribute the entire amount.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. The entire amount over the \$375. And yet you object to placing a limit of \$300 maximum aid to a family. I can't see how you can reconcile that, those two items, because here on the one hand again we are going to the welfare state where you feel that there should be no limit to the amount of aid that a family should get despite the fact that we have on many occasions adduced testimony that shows that where a father has deserted a family after desertion they get more aid per month than the amount of money that he was earning to support his family.

MR. HUDDLESTON: That's right.

SENATOR GROSSI: So that while we do not go so far as to say that this type of program encourages fathers to leave their families, certainly it doesn't --

MR. HUDDLESTON: It doesn't discourage them.

SENATOR GROSSI: -- encourage them to reunite.

MR. HUDDLESTON: No, it does not.

SENATOR GROSSI: And we have found many cases of that. Now, why would you object to a maximum? Let us forget the \$300 a month. But why would you object to a maximum amount being placed even when that maximum amount is a whole lot more than a family was able to get when the earning head was at home?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, first you asked me about a family receiving assistance with a proposed maximum of \$300 --

SENATOR GROSSI: Right.

MR. HUDDLESTON: -- as compared to this other group which may have some legally responsible relatives in it and they have said - using the example of the \$375, actually I think it's a little more than that but, at any rate, one of those is an assistance recipient group and the other is relatives who don't have a direct legal responsibility. The fact that one would have a maximum and the other not, I don't quite see why one of those would have to ride on the other.

Let me answer your second question first and maybe this will help. You mentioned the fact that a man may leave his family, say he wasn't earning very much, and, therefore, enabled his family to receive more assistance than he was able to provide for them by wages before. This results from the fact that the requirement in ADC is that the children have to be deprived of the support or care of the father or mother because of his death, incapacity or absence. Now, if we should change the New Jersey statute to correspond with that which the federal statute now offers, namely, eligibility for ADC for unemployment, that would at least not offer a prize to a man to desert. If a man was not earning

enough under employment or unemployment, he might be eligible for - his family might be eligible for ADC, whereas now he in truth does have to become either dead, incapacitated or absent to enable his family to receive the assistance. So I would say that one answer to that would be to change the New Jersey statute to make ADC available for unemployment rather than leaving that burden too on the municipal welfare department.

SENATOR GROSSI: Do I understand then that you are unalterably opposed to any maximum whether it is \$300 or \$400 or \$500? Are you opposed to the principle of a maximum?

MR. HUDDLESTON: I am opposed to the principle of a maximum. That phrase "unalterably opposed" is a little --

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, I changed it.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes. In this sense, you might say that we have a maximum now. We work from this budget manual which was prepared on a home economics basis. The amount per child for his personal and household needs is a definite amount. It goes down as the number of people in the house increases. So in that sense, it is not purely up to the discretion of the county welfare board to just make any kind of grant. It is held to a maximum now by the size of the family.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, we had one family - of course, this happened to be the highest one, but there were any number of families that came in the same category - where there were 15 illegitimate children in three generations under

one roof, and the head of the household, the recipient, was getting \$969 a month from ADC plus \$65 or more from Social Security, making a total income into this family, an amoral family, of over \$1,000 a month. Do you feel that because the present formula says that they shall get so much for each child, no matter what the figure might amount to, that that's an obligation that the state has despite the conditions that exist?

MR. HUDDLESTON: I would say that there shouldn't be a maximum on that basis. I think there is some question about that one family with the \$969. I don't have the --

SENATOR GROSSI: What question is it?

MR. HUDDLESTON: The way I heard about it, that was a combining of more than one grant in some way.

SENATOR GROSSI: There were three families, not three families but three generations under the same roof - illegitimate child breeding illegitimate child breeding illegitimate child, all under the one roof. There were 23 in the family but 15 of these children were illegitimate. This was strictly on an ADC basis, wasn't it, Mr. Coyle?

MR. COYLE: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: There were no other grants in there. And there were any number of families getting \$700 a month, \$600 a month, where the income in that family very seldom had exceeded \$90 a week or even \$100 a week from men who were truck drivers and making a hundred or one hundred and ten dollars a week.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes. Well, this illegitimacy is a problem. So far as we can tell, the illegitimate child needs the same home economics amount of food, shelter, clothing, etc. as the legitimate child.

SENATOR GROSSI: There is no question about that. And our aim is not to be punitive, our aim is to be corrective. Our aim is to be able to remove, if there is any, incentive to lead that kind of a life knowing beforehand that the state and the taxpayers are going to pick up the bill. We are not trying to be punitive and that's not the objective of the Committee.

MR. HUDDLESTON: That's right.

SENATOR GROSSI: However, we don't want to subject you to any more cross examination here, Mr. Huddleston. You have been very helpful with your statement and your views, and if you have a concluding statement to make you may do so.

MR. RICHMAN: One more question. On recommendation number 9, that has to do with the various types of behavior in the voucher system --

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes.

MR. RICHMAN: I don't think the Committee ever intended that the establishment of this system was to be a method of treatment of the deviant behavior, or that it be in any way some attempt to reform. I think more than that the Committee suggested this method, which none of us believe is the greatest method in the world but it's the best we could devise under the circumstances - but don't you agree that where these types of people exist and where they do these

sort of things and where they continue to receive cash and where they obviously are not spending the cash in the proper places, that the effect upon the whole program is deleterious?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, these forms of deviant behavior which you mentioned here are assertedly not good.

MR. RICHMAN: I agree with that but we are not trying to correct these. We are recognizing this person as having done these things and for that reason disqualified herself from the position of having free money to spend wherever she wanted to. We are just trying to shut that one area off without even believing that this is going to cure this business.

SENATOR GROSSI: Because that will be for the benefit of the children and that's our aim. We have found many, many cases where the recipient, the mother, has not utilized this money for the care of her children but has utilized it for her own wishes and desires, keeping a boyfriend on the side. We have even found them buying clothes for their boyfriends; we've found them going into saloons and spending this money in a dissolute manner to the deprivation of the children.

Now, wouldn't the fact that a woman who acts in such a manner - she is not being deprived of any aid so far as the children are concerned, but we are trying to make sure that the children get the aid. In other words, the amount of money to this family would not be diminished except that she would only have \$25 in cash and everything else would be by voucher, everything else would be by order to make sure

that the children receive the money which was allotted to the family. That's the purpose of the Committee.

MR. RICHMAN: We don't say this would work but shouldn't we try something like this? Should we let this thing go on with these people spending this money?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Oh, I think we should try something but it seems to me that vouchers are not the solution. This is a very hard social and family problem. Some of these people that do certain of these things I would think would have a mental problem of some kind. Just putting them on a voucher system I don't see how it would help them. That's what the county welfare boards and the bureau of assistance want to do, I believe, is help the families as much as possible.

SENATOR GROSSI: Aside from the administration end of it and aside from the cumbersome detail work to which you refer, what harm would there be, in instituting this type of a system, to the children? Where would the children suffer? Outside of a mother suffering inconvenience or the administering agency having to do a little more paper work, would the child benefit or be harmed by such a system?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, this attacks the self-esteem of the mother. A mother with reduced self-esteem is not as good a mother, would be my answer to that. Now obviously she has done something to her own self-esteem by some of these problems.

SENATOR GROSSI: I was going to say, do you think there is any self-esteem left after you go over this list?

MR. HUDDLESTON: There is some, yes. I think there is some.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, would you balance her self-esteem against the welfare of the children?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, I would think that they are sort of together in that a woman who does not have self-esteem is not going to do a good job of caring for the children. On this list here, if there is anything here that is against the law, I believe that the ADC parents who violate them and also the other non-ADC citizens who violate them should have to meet the same standards by law. I don't know just which ones are illegal. Leaving a child alone over 12 hours seems to me to be a terrible thing to do whether you are getting ADC or not. Whenever this occurs I would think somebody ought to do something about it.

MR. RICHMAN: You wouldn't expect this Committee to undertake the whole gamut of that social problem. What we are trying to do here is a very limited thing, trying to prevent the dissipation of this relief money and trying to channel it in the right direction. And that's all we are trying to do.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Right.

SENATOR GROSSI: The social aspect still remains with your group, with your agency, with the social workers and the entire concept and philosophy of welfare assistance. We are just trying to close some of the loopholes and do the things that we think will help the children get away from an immoral and amoral environment and have a decent

opportunity to grow up to be useful citizens instead of being raised in an environment where they themselves witness, as they grow up, in their formative stage they witness a dissolute mother who takes in different men and who sleep in the same bed with her and the children know he is not their father.

MR. HUDDLESTON: It's a terrible thing.

SENATOR GROSSI: These are the things that we are trying to eliminate.

MR. HUDDLESTON: It's an awful environment, I'm sure, and we should do something about it but I wonder if it should be vouchers.

SENATOR GROSSI: Did you want to ask something, Mr. Coyle?

MR. COYLE: I just wanted to make clear that there is one thing that we did run into in this type of family, in a good majority of the cases, a number of these children, girls especially when they are 12 and 13 years old got into trouble the same way that their mothers were in trouble.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Vouchers wouldn't stop that.

MR. RICHMAN: I agree with that.

MR. COYLE: We don't expect to stop that but we hope to have a greater local control over these families than has been exhibited in the past.

But there is one question that I have that I would like to ask you. It seems to be your viewpoint on this maximum of \$300 - it seems to be reconcilable with the fact that we do have a maximum income on legally responsible

relatives - they can keep so much money to live on and anything over and above that has to be contributed toward the support of their legally responsible relatives.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Yes, that's right.

MR. COYLE: Now, am I right in assuming then that you would also be in favor of abolishing?

MR. HUDDLESTON: No. Maybe I haven't gotten the comparison that you and the Senator mentioned. To me it is two different problems. One is that you have an assistance family, a certain number of children, should their maximum grant be limited either by a set figure or by a reference to some former level of earnings, or by whatever. I don't see that it should be. This maximum amount that we can give each child, that is, the amount we give each child is really not a very great amount at the present. It's around - including their share in the rent, I think the average amount is in the neighborhood of \$50 as a person in the household and his share of rent. Of course, as the number of children goes up the share of the rent goes down, so the rental stays the same. But it does cost a little more to feed 8 children than it does to feed 7, not the same amount but it does go down.

SENATOR GROSSI: How about if you took those families getting this formula A, without depriving them of any assistance but to set a maximum for the future in order to show that once they get the \$300 they can't expect any more? Wouldn't that be a deterrent, perhaps, on some of these errant mothers to not have any more illegitimate children, knowing that no aid will be forthcoming?

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, all I can do is guess on that. I doubt if that would be a deterrent. There was an earlier deterrent which was used in Elizabethan England against illegitimacy, namely, the mother who bore an illegitimate child was decapitated. Even this did not serve as a deterrent to others.

SENATOR GROSSI: It did on that particular mother.

MR. HUDDLESTON: I grant you that. So, say there is to be a maximum grant of \$300, to me you would not get to the deep psychiatric problem of why a person gets into the position of having illegitimate children or an illegitimate child.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. I guess we have subjected you to quite some harassment here.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Well, I am very glad the Committee is going into this and you wouldn't have taken the trouble to make this whole study if it wasn't for the welfare of the children.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Mr. Huddleston.

Do you have any questions, Senator?

I would like to acknowledge the presence here of Senator Richard Stout of Monmouth County (R), who is also a member of the Senate Committee.

All right. Thank you, Mr. Huddleston.

MR. HUDDLESTON: Thank you.

SENATOR GROSSI: Did you have a desire to address this Committee?

MRS. EDITH PADDERATZ: Well, I really am not here in an official capacity but I certainly have a tremendous

amount of thoughts.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, will you step right up here and identify yourself, please, and speak into the microphone and tell us anything that you want to tell us.

MRS. PADDERTZ: At the moment I am Instructor of Nurses for the State of New Jersey.

I happen to be in a position where I have seen this welfare setup tremendously abused. At the moment I am extremely interested in a case where there was one illegitimate child before marriage, the husband finally deserted actually because he was forced to, and since he has left there have already been two other illegitimate children. Two of the children supposedly, which I must say, by the father have been legally adopted by the father's parents which left two other children, supposedly his children, with the mother.

This mother spends most of her time out. Four little children, the youngest one less than two years of age, the older one will be seven in February, are frequently left alone and if they are not alone they are with a child who is 14 years of age, attends a special class in our local public schools because she does not have the ability to learn. This mother may run in and out of the situation during the night to check on the children and then goes off to another bar.

These children are not taken care of, they are not fed, they are perfectly beautiful children. My sincere thought is that these children a long time ago should have been taken away from this mother.

I myself happened to come face to face with her on Friday evening and in my experience, after having done public health nursing for 20 years, I would say she is of the lowest character.

She was on welfare. She came from Pennsylvania and immediately went on welfare here, giving a false address, and the first thing I saw her buy with welfare money was a swimming pool, one of the very large ones with a filter.

Another public health nurse and myself went to this situation one evening and here was this new swimming pool filled to within an inch of the top and four little children with no supervision. They all could have been drowned.

I think the laxity within the welfare setup, not intentional perhaps this is where the problem seems to be.

This woman definitely does need psychiatric help. And I feel the same as our friend here that we have to start perhaps in this category if we want to do away with some of our illegitimate setups.

I know the local police have been called in on this situation and while they are checking at the front door the men are running out the back door. I also know that last summer she went on a vacation with a local body and fender shop owner and left these children for that length of time with this 14 year old child who is not even capable of taking care of herself.

At the moment two of the children have been placed in a parochial school. And here is another step. I agree with parochial schools. I covered St. Paul's parochial school in

Princeton for 20 years. I know the situation very, very well. But this mother cannot afford to put her children in parochial schools. She now has a bill of \$10.07 for the coming school term for the first grade child who just entered. It means buying uniforms, yes, which I know are cheaper than clothing, especially the type of clothing she buys. I know she goes to every store - Arnold Constable, for instance. She has run up almost a \$900 bill which she cannot pay. She spends most of her life away from these children. She does not spend the money which is given by welfare funds to take care of these children.

So I sincerely feel that there does have to be some kind of control, that certainly this particular person is not in a situation to be receiving hundreds of dollars, which are given to her for rent and for the care of four minor children, because she does not do it. She has a closet full of, for instance, crinoline slips. If you walked in and looked you would think you were in a store. And, of course, most of you being gentlemen, you very likely or you may know what a crinoline slip costs.

SENATOR GROSSI: Don't underestimate us, Mrs. Padderatz.

MRS. PADDERATZ: So here is a girl who has enough to keep all of your wives. In other words, she can resist nothing. Anything she cares to buy, she buys. Then here are grandparents whom you are willing to penalize. Here are people who are supposed to change their mode of living because of an unfortunate situation of this type. No, I do not think this is fair. When grandparents are in at least

their middle fifties they should be planning for their own future. And how can they, if they have already adopted two minor children and are fully supporting and planning on educating these children? And yet you also want to attach their salaries?

Now, the picture here is another side of the family who has no basic income but sits there with a comfortable bank account that you cannot touch. And on the boy's side of the family are working parents and you feel you have a perfect right to attach their salaries.

Something is very lax. Something is very wrong in the division of thoughts on attaching people.

In this particular situation there are several brothers and sisters whom most of you do not feel should be penalized and I would go along with it to a great extent excepting there are also other delinquent members of this family who have completely liquidated the children's mother's family resources to such an extent that they feel that they have no responsibility. But is one group of grandparents to sit with a bank account and the others, who because at their age are still working, to take care of the responsibility they have assumed, are they still to be attached a little bit further?

I feel that in this particular setup these parents have done their share of the job. I don't feel that the community is responsible for other people's children. However, I am also in a situation to see these welfare checks come out and see these five and seven hundred dollar checks

misused.

No, the children do not benefit by them.

My immediate neighbor runs a store where she cashes these welfare checks and you never saw such going-on, for the period of time that these people can hold on to this money, that takes place in these neighborhoods when these welfare checks come out.

SENATOR GROSSI: You have read the list of recommendations made by this Committee?

MRS. PADDERATZ: Yes, I have, and I am afraid I would go along with every single one of them and very likely add a few more.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. Thank you, Mrs. Padderatz.

RAYMOND A. DOUGHERTY: My name is Raymond A. Dougherty.

SENATOR GROSSI: You have appeared before this Committee before, haven't you?

MR. DOUGHERTY: Yes.

SENATOR GROSSI: Will you identify yourself again for the record, please, and proceed to tell us whatever is on your mind?

MR. DOUGHERTY: I am Director of Welfare, Mercer County Welfare Board, which is located in the Mercer County Court House, Trenton, New Jersey.

Before I make any remarks or comments, I would like to preface them with this introductory paragraph:

I think the only fair approach to an evaluation of the New Jersey public assistance program is to state that the procedures now being followed and established in good faith were established as the most efficient and constructive form of operation at that time, being centered on the humane approach to assist fellow citizens who suffered personal tragedy and were in need of material assistance. However, experience has brought out that in order to carry out these goals further adjustments and administrative controls should be introduced.

The recommendations made by the Welfare Investigating Committee point up the weak areas and the need for certain changes. Our observations and comments relative to these recommendations are as follows:

Regarding recommendation No. 1 - Residency requirements. I am of the opinion that a review of the statutes and regulations governing legal settlement and residency of applicants for and recipients of public assistance is in order, the objection being to establish a residency standard of one year within New Jersey as a requirement and establishing eligibility for public assistance administered by county welfare boards.

I think that we who are in the operating line are a little confused with the various standards regarding residency. We spoke here earlier today about the municipal residency, the state law regarding general assistance. There you have two years - one year within the municipality. In our own program for two categories - aid to dependent children and disability, we have one-year residency; ADC nothing.

Also, relative to certain municipal institutions, I think that the requirement is for 5 years within the municipality. I think it is in order that we review this, and I would support the one-year residency for ADC.

Recommendation No. 2 pertaining to statutory maximums: Well, of course, in my reading this, I don't have enough information. I think that this recommendation is open to discussion and that there are large families in New Jersey where the family budget exceeds \$300.

One of the questions arising would be where would a family in this situation - I am talking about a family who needs more than \$300 - where would the family in this situation obtain additional funds for their essential needs.

Now the average ADC grant in Mercer County I think is \$176 per family. Of course, you have your extremes and you have below.

Now, one of the other questions would be, Senator, regarding the general assistance program. As you well know from your investigating of the various operations, the local DPW is in counties where they have established Departments of Public Welfare - of course, my experience has been in Mercer County where Trenton is a large urban area and they have an established Department of Public Welfare - whereby they grant emergency assistance pending findings as to eligibility. Now, for example, if they found in their budget that this family, say of a mother and seven children, needed \$375 or \$400, when the family was transferred to our agency, would we have to drop it down to \$300?

These are some of the things I think are open for discussion, and I know that you have gathered a lot of information in connection with these various recommendations, but one of the thoughts I had was that maybe an operating committee would be a good thing. You know that we do have a Directors' Association and maybe representatives from the Directors' Association and members of the State Division of Welfare and your Committee would sort of look into this and the actual experience that the Directors have had on this might be helpful. Now, this is my feeling on the subject.

Recommendations 3 and 4 pertaining to responsible relatives: Well, I think the present setup regarding

responsible relatives other than the parents of the children is fair. I would leave well enough alone. My experience has been regarding situations where we are paying off the mortgage in lieu of rent. I think there should be a lien on real property in those instances.

Recommendation No. 5 - Voluntary agreements for support of children should be eliminated: I think it should be made by a Judge of a court of competent jurisdiction and a record made and that this would be in the interest of the child.

No. 6 - A referee should be appointed by the Assignment Judge in each county: I would support this and I think there is need for such a plan as this recommendation would establish.

No. 7 - A separate staff should be established in each prosecutor's office whose principal purpose would be locating fathers and putative fathers: This I would support wholeheartedly. I would say it's long overdue, because we in the administrative phase of this welfare program cannot have law enforcement authority. According to federal participation, this is eliminated because I have looked into it with my Prosecutor. He says he doesn't have the funds, and if I could get the money he said he would go along with me with special investigators. However, in checking it out we found that federal funds could not be used for that purpose. I think it would help us a lot to run down some of these abuses that we have. Now, of course, we hear of abuses, Senator, and I think from your investigation you

know that they are not as widespread as the press would lead us to believe and these situations that we hear about and know about are in the minority. Actually the program itself is a humane one. However, there are certain people in any segment of the population who try to circumvent the law and fail to cooperate, and this is why we need more stringent controls.

No. 8 - Each recipient should be required to furnish, at the commencement of payment and at each six-month interval thereafter, a statement setting forth all income, earned or received, and the source thereof:

Well, we have that procedure here except that it doesn't have the force of law; that is, you would recommend that it become a misdemeanor. However, these are the investigative procedures that we follow in verification at certain periods in order to re-establish and re-affirm eligibility. I think we are practicing the thinking behind this legislation today.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, we find, of course, that Welfare Directors do so except that, as you say, they don't have the force of law and there are some who are so undermanned and understaffed that they are unable to perform this function; whereas, if we made it a matter of legislation those requirements would have to be met. Perhaps the penalty for not doing so might be a little severe by making it a misdemeanor, but still everyone says that they try to do it, which indicates they are not able to do it in every instance, and some people have been able to hide

their income by virtue of the inability of the various agencies to get these six-month statements under oath.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, you know, Senator, this is mandatory under a recent federal amendment.

SENATOR GROSSI: Yes, I know.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Of course, as you bring out, we don't have the personnel to do the job we would like to do. Now, I think we are headed in the right direction, but some of the negative press releases and the negative image you get in the press - some of these young people who we feel might want to come with us, maybe they don't want to get into such a situation.

All right. Now, No. 9 pertains to the issuance of food orders. Now, if we are going to use it as a deterrent where conduct indicates neglect of children, I think if a family deteriorates to such a state that we would have to do something of that nature in order to control it - and there are situations like this - that we should take the children away from the mother, because the environmental situation would still be the same. And I know from my own experience because I 've worked on this program back in the depression days when food orders were granted, that food orders can be discounted and they can get money and they can sell the food orders and use it for other purposes than to feed the children.

I would say that we would like to have a better approach in order to remove these children from these mothers, because the environmental situation, I repeat, is

still the same and the children are growing up and know of no other way of life than what they find in their immediate home. Now, there has been some thinking and some expression by people who have been studying this problem as to the use of a properly staffed institution for these children. Of course, we don't have that today. We don't have sufficient foster homes today, especially for the Negro children. You know that; I mean, from the State Board of Child Welfare. This is a real problem. It is not confined to the welfare administrators alone; this is a community problem, and I think that everybody in the community should be coordinated and try to help in this situation. Now, if there are situations existing such as I hear today, I am wondering if the people who have this information will come down and talk to the welfare authorities and tell us what is happening which could strengthen us to go in there and make a decision as to whether or not these people should receive assistance. I mean, we do get people who work with us, but many times people like to talk about it rather than to come down and try to help the community out.

I would say further regarding this illegitimacy, this is a let-down in the social barriers in our society in the last 10 or 15 years since World War II. Sure, there is; everybody is talking about the moral let-down. But we as welfare administrators and social caseworkers know what to do but we would like to have more personnel in order to counsel and guide these women who are in these situations, but we can

only go that far; the community must set up certain programs of which we can avail ourselves after we have talked to these people and guided and counseled them. And I would say in situations where there is not a true family setup - this is what the ADC is based on - give the child the same opportunity as any other child in the neighborhood to go to school and grow up. If conditions are not conducive to a well-integrated healthy family so these kids can grow up to be good citizens, I would favor a plan whereby they are taken out of that environment.

No. 10 - "Whenever the atmosphere of a recipient's home or place of residence has deteriorated morally as evidenced by the birth of illegitimate children to either the recipient or any member of her household, then the child or children of such recipient should" - well, I think I've answered that already to a certain extent. When men are coming to the house, and so forth and so on, we should take the children away from the mother and let her live her own live if she wants to.

Now, here is one thing - I know you know about this: In every case we have of illegitimacy, a bastardy complaint, a conciliation complaint, is filed with the local court, magistrate's court. Nothing is done about it except that the father, where it is established that the man is the father of the child, is ordered to pay \$10 a week. Now, in many situations this may be a deterrent, but I think it should be treated under the criminal code. These people are committing a prima facie criminal act. The criminal code

covers fornication and adultery. Nothing has been done about that. We feel we are doing the best we can by bringing this situation to the court's knowledge.

I had another thought on that but have forgotten it.

No. 11 - Landlord's responsibility. Well, of course, I support this recommendation that there should be no money paid to a landlord other than what is determined by the welfare agency. Now, as far as the housing code is concerned, I think here now in Mercer County, specially in Trenton - of course, Trenton is where we have most of our cases, 75 per cent of our cases - they have been trying to do something about the standards under which people are living. However, there is a great scarcity of housing, the housing conditions are overcrowded, and we feel that we are being exploited by the landlords, because we have to have these people and we have to pay the rent they request.

No. 12. I would support this recommendation regarding the child's rights so that they could inherit and be eligible for social security, and so forth and so on.

No. 13. I would support this recommendation to expedite the processing of cases where incompetency is involved. We are tied down with red tape in too many cases, and I think if something could be set up under the law that would be acceptable it would help us expedite supervision of these types of cases.

SENATOR GROSSI: Thank you, Mr. Dougherty. I have no questions. You seem to have covered the ground thoroughly enough. I think we developed some of the more controversial elements with the previous witnesses.

Do you have any questions, Mr. Richman or Mr. Coyle?

MR. COYLE: Just one thing, Mr. Dougherty. Our investigations have shown that the majority of social workers are women and of necessity many times they might have to go back to a client's house because of the fact they can't find them in the daytime. The family may be out shopping or some other place. On many occasions these women caseworkers don't want to go out at night alone to make investigations when they normally could find these people at home. It came into our mind also as to why we should have a separate staff in the Prosecutor's Office where there are cases of fraud or what not suspected, that we would have men who would be trained in this type of work and who would go out at nighttime when this work can be done if necessary.

One other thing that I wanted to point out in regard to illegitimacy. If you will turn to page 74 of our report, I think you will agree that illegitimacy, so far as population is concerned, is not in the majority, but we have found that after mothers go on ADC the rate of illegitimacy climbs very high. Do you feel that there is any relationship between mothers who have illegitimate children after they get on ADC and the fact that they are getting ADC payments?

MR. DOUGHERTY: You mean, as a financial gain, that it would be financially to their benefit?

MR. COYLE: Well, either that or the circumstances of the whole program might contribute -

MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, I don't know whether there is sufficient income in that to warrant that decision. I think it is due more to the fact that we are dealing with a sub-cultural pattern of morals here, and I think this illegitimacy in many instances is something that is just taken for granted.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, from your experience, Mr. Dougherty, does that finding seem to be true with respect to the incidence of illegitimacy increasing after a person is on the ADC program?

MR. DOUGHERTY: Well, this is what I have generally found and my interpretation is that these certain type of people who are under ADC feel that they are a deprived group with certain deprivations, and sometimes in many cases they are exploited because of the fact - well, let's be honest about it - they are low grade mentally, and so forth and so on, and they can't cope with the situation and they have no qualms about the conventions because society itself they feel is not interested in them, so I think all of these factors have to be considered in talking about this problem.

I just want to add to that about the Prosecutor's Office - we find that in instances where our caseworkers go in the home - they have suspicions and they go in and find the father who is supposed to be absent; they find him in

there, and they go out and bring back the police officer with a warrant, and so forth and so on, and the guy's gone. If you have somebody who goes in there with a warrant and the man is in the home, he can apprehend him right there on the spot, otherwise you have to start all over again.

SENATOR GROSSI: Well, thank you, Mr. Dougherty.

Is there anyone else who would like to appear before this Committee and submit a statement or views?

C A R M I N E A R M E N T I: I would like to make a short statement, Senator.

SENATOR GROSSI: All right. Now I have to go to the Governor's office right away and these gentlemen can take care of you I'm sure. Will you identify yourself, please.

MR. ARMENTI: I am Carmine Armenti and am a Councilman of the City of Trenton. I wasn't sure I was going to make a statement this morning, but I do want to say that I for one am in complete accord with the Committee's recommendations and hope that the implementation of these recommendations will be forthcoming soon. There is no doubt in my mind, not only in the aid to dependent children program but in the over-all public assistance program throughout our state, a complete overhauling is needed.

I wish, when you are through with this particular phase of the public assistance program, you would continue your efforts in all areas of public assistance.

SENATOR GROSSI: Now, who's next?

R O B E R T R I C E: I am Robert Rice, Executive Secretary of the Family Counseling Service in Middlesex County. I am also Chairman of the Central Jersey National Association of Social Workers Unit, but I am speaking in neither capacity today. I am not a technician in relation to welfare; I am a practicing social worker concerned with families and families showing a certain degree of pathology.

It seems to me that perhaps there is nothing I can say that has not already been said. But we have been talking this morning about what purpose - I think around the question of what purpose ADC has, and maybe that's not so obvious. These recommendations, many of them, are attempts to limit pathological behavior of families by means of lowering their rate of income or in some other way limit them through the law. And it has been occurring to me that perhaps this is too much to ask from the ADC program itself to accomplish this particular purpose. I would assume that if these recommendations were to become law that there would continue to be abuses within the ADC load and there would certainly continue to be abuses of family among families that were not receiving welfare.

What we are dealing with then is a very complex social problem. Many of the things we have been talking about today seem to me to involve the Bureau of Child Welfare and the newly-established Protective Services Division of that department. If we had effective protective services

which were backed by professional personnel to evaluate what was going on, we would have a means of dealing with some of these people who certainly are a problem to the citizenry.

This is all I really wanted to say. I should mention one other thing as a person involved in working with families, and that was the exchange with Mr. Huddleston earlier about the family being the center of the unit which establishes social behavior, the basic unit of society perhaps and, therefore, the need to make it necessary for other members of the family to support when there was a need for the State to come in to add support. It seems to me that if we are going back to the concept that these families are pathological, then we are also beginning to suggest that probably these people's earlier family experiences - that is, their experiences with the now grandparents of the children on ADC - have been less than good. These have been experiences which for the most part have not, in these pathological kinds of situations, have not aided the process of these people becoming good citizens. And very often a caseworker may see the need for separation of parents from grandparents because of this background of trouble and, therefore, we can say that the family may be the core of social behavior, of learning how to be a citizen. At the same time we may have to say that that family experience with some people has been a very negative family experience which needs to be broken. I can think of situations in other states where I worked where the grandparents were asked to pay for children who were receiving ADC. I remember one experience very well where

there was really a strange situation between the mother and her living father who was the responsible relative. This woman had gone through a great deal to manage to break away from this father who was an alcoholic. She had moved; she had tried to make her whereabouts unknown and, from my point of view, this was a very healthy thing to do. But in this particular situation, going on ADC brought her back into this real trap of a very negative kind of family experience.

I think we have to bear in mind that these people are troubled, are showing not what we ourselves may have had on the way up but something else, and this means we have a wealth of services to consider, and I just wanted to underline the concept that ADC cannot be expected, whether it limits or whether it helps, to entirely undo all these things. We need a strong fabric of social services within the State and things that relate to each other. Limitation of grants is not by a long shot the only answer and there may even be something that helps along this process, because we are adding stress to people who are already unable to deal with the normal process of living.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, I don't think the Committee ever pretended in any sense of the word that they were going to be able to reform these types of people. It may have been their desire, but I think they very quickly and early realized that that could not be done through any legislation in this area in this field and probably not

by any legislation at all, criminal or otherwise, or anything else. But we do have this other conflicting area that I think has to be taken into account. The taxpayers in this country are hard put. Taxes are going up and up and up and these relief rolls are getting greater and greater and more and more money is being spent, and where do we stop? When a taxpayer is hit as hard as he is in present-day society and he sees an instance where someone literally, he believes, is living off of him and living a perfectly useless and worthless existence, then I think he begins to revolt, and I think that unless there are some reforms, there are some curbs, there are some limitations placed, the whole program could very well suffer by a complete taxpayers' revolt. I think that has to be considered.

MR. RICE: Well, I can't respond to how the taxpayer feels about this, of course. This, I'm not close to. I feel that we would save money if we could spend it on rehabilitative services. I can't prove this, although there are indications and various things that this sort of thing does save money, and I am wondering whether we end up spending more if we say about a family which is in conflict with the norm, "you're going to be limited in several ways; we're not going to let you do this." In my experience I have never seen such a family respond in any way but a negative one to any kind of limiting experience. These people are at odds with society anyway. They are used to being at odds with society.

MR. RICHMAN: That's true. I agree.

MR. RICE: New limitations then are just another one of a long string of experiences.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, you wouldn't suggest that because they are at odds with society and that, as you say, this is life as we expect it, that we should be happy and content and relaxed and try to do nothing about it?

MR. RICE: That's right.

MR. RICHMAN: You would do nothing about it?

MR. RICE: I'm not saying I would do nothing about it. I am saying that the need here may be in terms of the kind of staff situation which the Welfare Department can have and those services surrounding it. I'm speaking particularly here of the need for protective services within the Bureau of Children's Services and the need for emergency facilities to remove these kids, and the need for quick action, and the need for the welfare workers to know their families well enough to know even if this is happening. This is where I wish the emphasis were.

In the bulk of the Report, not the recommendations, the Committee mentioned many of these needs but none of the recommendations is geared to staff needs which to me are central to this problem.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, of course, there is a general recommendation as to the increase of staff and salary, but I take it you are suggesting more specific recommendations.

MR. RICE: Yes, I'm suggesting that the basic need for reform is within the structure of the department and what it's out to do rather than new laws to restrict, to put limits on these families. I don't think limits work in this sense.

MR. RICHMAN: Well, isn't the department out to support, maintain, and protect the children? Isn't that simply all the department really is supposed to do?

MR. RICE: Right. I think we are both agreeing on the purposes. I think we are disagreeing on the methods.

MR. RICHMAN: Right. I agree. All the way through this, and I think we may have given the impression too; if we did, it was wrong; that we thought we could reform anybody. Personally - I am not speaking for the Committee - I think that's a hope, but not a very realistic hope. Now, then turn the coin over and look at the statistics and look at the tremendous increase in expenditures, not for staff people, not for decent salaries, and so forth, but for these people, to go to these people directly, the actual funds. It would seem to us that somewhere along the line somebody has got to lay down some rules here. Now, if more money can become available for staff and for more adequate salaries, the Committee is certainly for that. But that isn't where this money is going. This money, or large parts of it, is going right down the drain, we felt. I don't think we are in disagreement. I think

it's just a question -

MR. RICE: - of where the emphasis should be.

MR. RICHMAN: That's right. Thank you very much, sir. Who's next?

M R S. E L S A A L S B E R G: I'm Mrs. Elsa Aisberg of Lebanon, New Jersey. I am now employed as a Social Worker in Middlesex County but up until February of this year I was a Supervisor at the Hunterdon County Welfare Board.

I didn't bring a prepared statement but I would say that by and large I support Mr. Huddleston's statement. I have a few remarks to make in relation to the discussion that ensued following Mr. Huddleston's statement. One is in regard to Recommendation No. 1. It was said that the residence requirement should be one year but that clients should be protected by way of the general assistance program until they would qualify for the ADC program. This, I think, might be a very good plan but I found in Hunterdon County in about 10 years' experience that the general assistance program does not work according to uniform standards, and I have, in my few years' experience in Middlesex County, come upon two cases where the general assistance program remains much to be desired, so I wonder, if the general assistance program is to be relied on to a greater extent, whether possibly another investigation of that program or an examination should be made and whether that program should be strengthened before more reliance is placed upon it.

No. 2. Comparison was made between the amount of the exemption for legally responsible relatives and the maximum grant - I believe it was to Recommendation No. 3. I just want to say that, so far as I know, the exemption of \$375, or whatever it was, was for a family size of three people, while those high grants applied to families of eight, nine, or ten people. So certainly there is a difference.

Relative to the high incidence of illegitimacy in the caseload of public assistance, I wonder whether this has more to do with the high incidence of weak people, of people who do have psychiatric problems, more so than the fact that these people receive a higher grant when they have one more illegitimate child.

By and large, I would feel that certainly we should have better controls. I think everybody agrees here but I wonder whether the solution lies more in a change in administrative functions rather than in a legislative change.

Thank you.

MR. RICHMAN: Thank you, Mrs. Alsberg. Now, is there anyone else?

I don't think we should close the meeting without the Senator. Suppose we have a recess for 10 or 15 minutes. I think he'll be back.

[R E C E S S]

SENATOR GROSSI: If there is nothing further, the hearing is adjourned.

[ADJOURNED]



FEDERATION OF JEWISH AGENCIES

of Atlantic County

OFFICERS

President
HENRY L. COHEN
1st Vice-President
ARTHUR PESKOE
2nd Vice-President
MORTON EPSTEIN
3rd Vice-President
DAVID M. PERSKIE
Treasurer
M. MILTON SINGER
Associate Treasurer
ARNOLD KRAMER
Secretary
HARRY NEUSTADTER
Asst. Secretary
MRS. JACK SOBLE
Financial Secretary
ISAAC C. GINSBURG
Asst. Financial Secretary
ISADORE FRISS
Honorary Presidents
HARRY CASSMAN
JOSEPH WAGENHEIM
Honorary Vice-Presidents
MORRIS BATZER
EDWARD R. KNIGHT, Ph. D.
BENJAMIN KRAMER
JULIUS WALDMAN
HARRY I. WAXMANN

5321 ATLANTIC AVENUE
VENTNOR CITY, N. J.
Tel. 822-7122

•
IRVING T. SPIVACK
Executive Director

September 10, 1963

Senator Anthony J. Grossi, Chairman
Welfare Investigating Committee
New Jersey Legislature
Trenton, New Jersey

Dear Senator Grossi:

As you will recall, you asked that I write to you regarding your continued investigations in regard to the aid to dependent children in this State. As you know, I am a member of the New Jersey State Board of Public Welfare, and I serve as Chairman of the Committee of Financial Assistance of that Board. I had presented to you a report of the "National A.F.D.C. Eligibility Review comparative statistics related to New Jersey". This report shows that the percentage of ineligibility of New Jersey was 2.0, or the lowest of the five contiguous states. Also, New Jersey had the lowest cost per inhabitant in the A.F.D.C. program for any state, except Texas. I think it would be well to preface any report and recommendation in this area with the above mentioned statistical information obtained by this national survey.

Having stated that, I now come to some of the recommendations being made by your Committee, upon which you are asking comments. I wish to acknowledge at the outset that your procedure is a very fine one, and you must be commended for having taken this approach. By and large, the information in the Atlantic City Press of September 10, 1963 indicates that you have separated to a large extent the judicial from the administrative functions, and properly so. There can be no question but that the payments of support agreed upon and necessary for the subsistence of dependents should be enforced. Perhaps this could be effectively done by the creation of Family Courts, recommended by a Supreme Court Committee in this State, and already in effect in the State of New York. I am quite familiar

FEDERATION OF JEWISH AGENCIES OF ATLANTIC COUNTY

Senator Anthony J. Grossi
September 10, 1963 page 2

with the problems of support, as I had been a Probation Officer in the Family Court in New York City for a number of years, and sought to obtain the compliance of delinquent fathers with court support orders.

I find myself in disagreement with some of your committee recommendations namely, that there should be a maximum of \$300. a month on any A.D.C. grant regardless of size of family. I believe, too, that voucher payments have been found to be very ineffective in the past; instead, recommendations have been made for a system of representative payees and there is provision for such a process in those cases where funds are not being utilized for the care of the dependents in a family. I also disagree with the recommendation that the County Welfare directors attach real property of legally responsible relatives, remove children from parents, or function as a rent control authority and housing authority as proposed. I question also whether there has been enough study and information to again require one year residence. There is a study being made at this time and should be available shortly, showing the results of a three year review of residence in A.D.C. cases, and the effect that the elimination of residence requirements have had upon the caseload. It would be well, it seems to me, to await the results of this study for guidance in this matter.

However, and I am very happy to state, there are many recommendations of your Committee that are clearly necessary and desirable, and would help in this very complicated matter. I concur in the need for a review of the current laws effecting settlement so that they should be brought up-to-date. I believe it would be desirable to have legally enforceable court orders rather than voluntary support agreements, and that there be follow-up to locate deserting fathers and putative fathers. As to the need for day-care centers for children, our Board has appointed a committee to look into this matter and to report back to us. There is obviously considerable evidence of the need for day-care centers and additional facilities for temporary care of dependent children. Your emphasis on the need to bring the caseload to sixty is certainly well taken. Your recommendation that salary levels for caseworkers be raised is again most important, particularly in view of the change in emphasis of this program.

FEDERATION OF JEWISH AGENCIES OF ATLANTIC COUNTY

Senator Anthony J. Grossi
September 10, 1963 page 3

I would like to touch on this last point in a little more detail. While the National Eligibility Review placed New Jersey in a very favorable light, it is important that we do even better in that regard, and at the same time provide for the very best care available in order to meet the objectives of the A.D.C. program. If this program is to help prevent family break-up, and is to serve as a rehabilitative service, then certainly the caliber of the staff must be a prime consideration. A six-month review of each case, and separate investigations, when fraud is suspected or uncovered are all necessary, and they are being made available at this time. In addition, if families can be kept together, if children can be given greater opportunities, if families can be helped toward greater "self-dependency" as you well put it, then this program will have served not alone the important economic ends, but also the underlying social purposes for which the A.D.C. program had been created.

May I commend you on your continued interest in this important work. I assure you that I will be happy to join with you and your Committee in helping to set up an even more effective and useful program in our State. It was a pleasure meeting you.

Sincerely yours,



Irving T. Spivack
Executive Director

ITS:aa

AUG 07 1991

