

Minutes of Meeting - HEALTH AND WELFARE COMMITTEE - 56th
ASSEMBLY SESSION - March 3, 1971

Present: Glaser, Wilson, Smalley, Poggione, Valentine, Prince Swallow, and Homer.

Absent: White

Guests: Jean Ford, League of Women Voters; Faun Mortara, Legislative Intern; Keith W. MacDonald, Nevada State Welfare Board; Lucille Petty, Interested citizen & taxpayer; W.J. LaBadie, State Welfare Department; Carl Yamaslita, Welfare Department; Tosca Means, State Welfare Board; G.E. Miller, State Welfare Administrator; D.T. Tomlinson, State Welfare Department; Dorothy Moulton, Interested taxpayer; J. Holmes, Interested taxpayer; M. Sondereggen, Interested taxpayer; Jack Christner, Interested taxpayer; Orville Wahrenbrock, State Health, Welfare, and Rehabilitation Department.

Meeting was convened by Chairman Wilson at 3:00 P.M.

A.B. 232: Provides membership on welfare board to welfare recipients and for more board meetings in Clark County.

Jean Ford felt by having a recipient on the Board this would make the Board more responsive to the needs of the people that they are concerned about. She felt the more people involved, the better off these people are going to be. As far as getting someone on the Board that isn't intelligent enough, she felt the Governor wouldn't appoint anybody that wouldn't be right for the job.

Mr. Smalley said he found that there isn't enough communication with this Board. He felt it is time to open up to the people who feel they are so called "controlled by the Board."

Keith MacDonald, Member of the State Welfare Board, said he felt public participation is available whenever there is a meeting so why put a recipient on the Board. As far as the meetings go, he stated that 30% of all the Board meetings were in Clark County. The rest of the meetings are mostly in Reno, Carson City, and a few in the rural areas. He stated there are seven members on the Board. Two from Reno, two from Carson City, one from Jiggs and two from Las Vegas. Upon questioning from the Committee, he said he felt perhaps having a recipient on the Board would be helpful but also very frustrating to the recipient.

Mr. Wilson questioned the guests on the removal of a recipient if they were able to get off welfare during their term.

Tosca Means, Member of the Welfare Board stated there is no removal power to remove a member from the Board. When they are appointed, they are on for four years. She felt some of these recipients would distract the meetings rather than contribute to them. She felt this bill is unnecessary and uneffective. Usually when these people talk about their problems, there is nothing the Board can do about it. A member of the Board should be on the Board because they care not because they are one thing or another. She said she didn't care who they were - if they are not interested in caring about the people then they did not belong on the Board. If there is a recipient that is capable of looking at the policy or needs of the Welfare Board objectively, then let them on the Board but not just because they are a welfare recipient. We have to take abuse from these people because they are frustrated. If a recipient were on the Board, she didn't feel they could cope with their own problems plus the abuse of being on the Board. She felt people that are in this position of a recipient themselves could not be objective.

Mr. Wilson felt a person could really add to the Board if they were a recipient. He also felt they could be very objective. Some of these people are very intelligent.

Keith MacDonald explained that the Board had set up an advisory committee with a recipient as chairman. They had to discontinue the committee because of a lack of interest.

Bill LaBadie, Welfare Department, felt everyone was overlooking the position you will be putting this recipient in. When things do not go right, all the other recipients would be calling this person on the Board and complaining. This is putting too much of a burden on this person.

Guests were excused.

Mr. Glaser suggested reactivating the advisory committee and pay the members per deim expenses.

Mr. Poggione felt this bill would not help the present situation. The best thing to do would be to reactivate the advisory committee.

Mr. Poggione made a motion to indefinitely postpone A.B. 232; Mr. Valentine seconded; motion carried with a vote of 6-2 with Mr. Wilson and Mr. Smalley opposing.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

