

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973, 10 A.M.

The following were present:

Marion Bennett - Chairman Assembly Health & Welfare

Robert Craddock  
Thomas Hickey  
Albert Wittenberg

Lee Walker, Chairman Senate Health  
and Welfare  
Joe Neal, State Senator

Betty Hile - Recorder  
Delia Gonzalez "

Rev. Bennett: The purpose of this hearing is to hear first-hand what the problems seem to be with reference to some bills. I think this is our role, to come to the people, rather than have the people come to Carson City. I am pleased to see all these fine people who serve on the Committee. They are taking their Saturday to come here.

We only need four people to do what we have to do. We appreciate this opportunity to serve you. These people are interested in 592. Please give your name when you come to talk.

Cora Williams: I am a member of the State Board of Cosmetology. We are concerned about AB-592. It comes under Section 1 of NRS 644240. It is hereby amended to read as follows: (read amendment). We would like the statute to read as follows:

The schools have not been practicing hot work, and while people pay approximately \$400 to go to school, the average person, when they go to school cannot do a black person's hair, they cannot make it in a black beauty shop. This is what I explained to the Board in November. The passed it last May, but nothing has been done so far in the school to practice hot work. They are required to do wet work for the Caucasian's hair, surely the Caucasian should be required to take the hot work to do the Negro, or a black's hair. You pay \$60 for that kit in beauty school, it does not include hot irons. If we can get hot work included in the schools and this is taught to the students, then these students from the schools can practice in the black shops. I have been a hairdresser for 20 years. There have been times when I have gotten off my stool to help another operator. They have never seen a marcel wave. Somebody tells me, well they are going back 25 years. History repeats itself, so why not go 25 years back, when this is what you'll be making money on?

Mr. Wittenburg: Can you describe to me what marcelling and hot waving are?

Ms. Williams: Hot work is done with marcel irons, which take the curl out, there is a wave which resembles the marcel wave. This they haven't been taught. If they are not taught this in school, then they lose a patron.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont..)

- Mr. Wittenburg: What are you saying is that when they are enrolled in Beauty school, they come out without the techniques to go to work in a black shop and do the kind of work that they want.
- Ms. Williams: Exactly.
- Mr. Wittenburg: This bill would not require that kind of training, it is simply saying that for certificates should include hot waving or marcelling, it wouldn't force the schools to teach it, except that if they don't teach it, they wouldn't be able to pass the exam.
- Ms. Williams: There are some schools that don't want the hot work and they'll do anything to keep from teaching it. The Board, in May, passed this bill.
- Mr. Wittenburg: In the law there is the work cutting, but if you say cutting, and cut the hair of any person, would that mean that you would then be examined on cutting men's hair? Or are you talking about styling?
- Ms. Williams: I am talking about any individual's hair that wants it cut.
- Mr. Wittenburg: There is a difference in terms. You cut the style, but could that also be interpreted to mean you cut the short hair? Give a man a short haircut?
- Ms. Williams: You cut the hair to style it. I can't send my patrons to the barbershop to cut their hair and then style it the way I like it to be. I like to do my own haircut and then I can do a perfect styling because I know where I want to leave the hair in inches, the length, and the barbershop doesn't know that.
- Rev. Bennett: Any additional questions?
- Mr. McCormack: I am Frank McCormack, Chairman for the Legislative Committee for the Hairdressers Committee for the Las Vegas area. I would like to direct a question to Rev. Bennett. In the Bill we drafted in conjunction with the State Board we included this hot iron work, and in as much as you are a sponsor, we wonder why this was set up as a separate bill. Bill 421 coming up before the senate has no mention of hot work, yet our original draft had. I see where; 4 644473 is hereby repealed. It says, (1), it is unlawful for any licensed cosmetologist establishment to engage primarily in cutting men's hair, or (2), to represent itself to the public as cutting men's hair. It seems to me that this might be a compromise. (We were very much in favor of this hot work to be in). With the barbers if you were to leave in cutting men's hair, then we will let you have hot work. I would suggest that that section be deleted, that's what we objected to.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973, (Cont..)

- Mr. Wittenburg: If we were to amend that section of the law, <sup>AB</sup> 282 and <sup>AB</sup> 287, the resolution-- I would strongly object to repealing that section of the law because that would put us back where we were, without any control.
- Mr. McCormack: Our concern is that Monday morning 592 is to come up for assembly, that means we repeal cutting men's hair, then our bill comes up before Senate which deletes women and children hair, is not one a contradiction of the other?
- Mr. Wittenburg: That will probably be amended too.
- Rev. Bennett: Any other speakers?
- Dorothy Feeney: I am Dorothy Feeney, State Board of Cosmetology. We are interested in getting 592 through. We have been working with it for over a year and a half. We had it put into the rules and regulations, but it seems that the school will fight us all the way because they say it is not a law and they can't enforce it. We said, alright, we will try to make it a law. We have this bill in to enforce teaching of hot work. When you go to school and pay your fees and work, what we call slave labor, it's like a cut-rate beauty salon, then they should come out of school prepared to go to work in any shop. The black would go to school and could not go to work in their own shops. They had no place to place these people. If we can force them to teach it, this is what we are looking for.
- Mr. Wittenburg: I would like to point out that Mrs. Feeney is a constituent of mine in Reno and we don't hardly agree on anything.
- My question is directed to the rules that are promulgated by your Board to the beauty schools. Do you say that the beauty schools ignore this?
- Ms. Feeney: Yes, they have.
- Mr. Wittenburg: What is the make up of your Board. How many beauty operators do you have on your Board?
- Ms. Feeney: There is five.
- Mr. Wittenburg: Anybody from the school?
- Ms. Feeney: No. We feel that school members would be partial in giving examinations.
- Senator Walker: Who sets the curriculum for the schools? You can't mandate the inclusion of certain courses?

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont..)

Ms. Feeney: Yes we can. Each one sets it's own. We have to approve it. We set the precedents. We try to work it out with them.

Mr. Wittenburg: Can't you tell them to include hot work?

Ms. Feeney: We bring the schools in for a hearing. We go over everything and work it out with them, we set the precedents for them.

Senator Walker: By and large, you have the right to say you must teach these classes.

Ms. Feeney: Yes.

Mr. Hickey: How do the schools get their licensing?

Ms. Feeney: They are licensed through the State Board.

Mr. Hickey: Can you pull their license?

Ms. Feeney: Yes, if they violate the laws.

Mr. Hickey: Why don't you pull their license if they don't do it?

Ms. Feeney: Without the law, there is nothing we can do about it. We have gone to the District Attorney's office and there is nothing we can do.

Mr. Hickey: Do you have trouble getting the D.A. to support you?

Ms. Feeney: Yes, we do.

Mr. Hickey: All this bill says is that the examination must include these things. Getting back to the problem of cutting. Is there anything that can be done to put the language in the bill that would allow you to cut the hair of the person without getting into the conflict with the kind of things that are taught in the barber's school?

Ms. Feeney: This is the problem right now. When it comes right down to it, cutting hair is cutting hair, it's done by a cosmetologist or a barber. There isn't that many men going to a beauty shop, or women going to a barber shop. It would be discrimination if you put that in. We serve the public. Everybody should be able to go where they want. It's not up to us, these people should be able to go where they want to get their hair cut.

Mr. Hickey: Even if they wanted to get it cut with a pair of clippers?

Ms. Feeney: That's right.

Legislative Hearings, March 24, 1973 (Cont..)

215

Mr. McCormack: It's the terminology that is used. A cosmetology establishment could not represent themselves as a barber shop, such as putting up a barber pole. To say they style men's hair, I think this is self-explanatory, if they wanted to advertise this way. It's false advertising to represent themselves as a barber shop, they are not qualified to shave.

Rev. Bennett: Are there any other questions, we want to stay on the track.

Dorothy Williams: My name is Dorothy Williams, representing Cosmetique Organization of Black Operators. I would like to add to the other speakers. We beg of you to consider passing of this bill. We are not asking just for the Black students, we are asking for all students. I am a trainee at a beauty school for instructor's licenses. It's not the students, it's the old generation of people. Kids go to school, they mix. My daughter, when she stayed on campus she was able to do her classmates hair, but they could not do her hair.

Rev. Bennett: That concludes all the testimony on 592.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont..)

Ruby Duncan:

I would like to speak on <sup>AB</sup> 596 and <sup>AB</sup> 645. 596 concerns stepfather responsibilities and 645 is relative to responsibilities to Welfare recipients.

I want to speak about a bill which is supposed to come out, which I hope doesn't, that Mr. McNeil wants, that I tried to talk him out of.

I am Ruby Duncan, President of the Clark County Welfare Rights Organization. What you might call a welfare activist, a welfare fighter. I. Mr. McNeil's work program, that I hope he has not submitted yet, I hope so. I am a constituent of his district. The bill is Work Program for Welfare Recipients of Nevada which forces welfare recipients into getting jobs, which forces welfare recipients to work for \$30 a month, which forces welfare recipients to be physically tied, mentally tied, and to leave their children, even though they go to work for nothing. Although I dispise welfare, because that is a stigma, if this bill is passed it would be one of the most detrimental bills that ever passed in the House of the Legislature of Nevada.

I would hope that you gentlemen do not support this bill. The Welfare Department has a problem with poor people, they live off the backs of the poor, they thrive on the poor. The poor have become a gold mine for the rich and especially people like the Welfare Department. When you walk into a home of a family and you are demanded to support that family, what man would like to walk in and take the responsibility of another man's problems, and then the Welfare Department doesn't make the father support them? Relatives, they said make them support the children. We do not see why any relative has to take care of another family.

We hope that; you do not support AB 645 making sure that the relative support the Welfare recipient, that is the State of Nevada's responsibility. We feel that AB 596, 645 is a detrimental bill and we hope that you will help kill Mr. McNeil's bill that he intends to introduce, if he does, I'll be working against him. I wonder how many of you gentlemen that were left in a home without a father with a mother who had to struggle to support herself? We are very concern about this legislature. No other topic is more unpopular. Those who are not against the poor are reluctant to speak up because of the unpopularity of the issue.

We wish you gentlemen would take a good long look at the Welfare Department and issues that the poor people throughout the State of Nevada are preaching to and preaching for. I won't disappear, I'll be there. I will stick by. We are in the legislative every day and we know. I will watch this session. I don't want any of you to say I didn't know, how come somebody didn't tell me, you people will be told and shown.

In 1961 the Social Security Act was amended to extend the Definition of AB 91 and SB 437. I won't go into details. There are Federal programs. We feel that children with fathers in the home get just as hungry as Welfare mother's children do.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont..)

Ruby Duncan:

The State of Nevada does not have a program when both parents are out of work. We do know that we have to provide for little ones, young ones, if we want a better tomorrow. We do know that the father has to leave the home in order for the children to get benefits. We would like legislators to bring a FDCA program into Nevada, we feel that keeping both parents in the home, especially men, children have a way of wanting men, especially boys. The Welfare Dept. is the cause of me and my husband not being together today, and I will forever hold it against them, and I'll forever fight them.

It says under Public Assistance, Social Services Rehabilitation 73-03-100, that these things can't happen if you have the human needs at heart. That's what we sent you to the legislature for, to work for us. I sometimes notice in the halls of the legislature that some of you would like me to go away, but I'll be there.

We want the food stamp program. The poor people, we gave the County people hell, we went to jail, to drum up the kind of support that we needed, for the nutrition that any child in the State of Nevada needs in order to get a good education, in order to get off Welfare, in order to have a good tomorrow. Let's get on to how the State of Nevada Welfare Department feels about the youth, the children, because if I didn't have children, I wouldn't be here before you.

Section 305.2 - A dog of a blind man. We all love dogs. At least a dog is fairly respected. Compared to the Welfare Department of the State of Nevada a dog gets 30 meals, and each meal costs \$0.75.

Under Section 205.3, a child, children, human beings, I have seven of my own. A family of four in the State of Nevada gets \$176, although the Welfare Dept. says that they need \$320. We only get 55% of that \$320; it comes to \$176. Let's say that a child gets 90 meals a month. The cost of 90 meals a month is \$.17 per meal. The dog gets \$.75 per meal, the child gets \$.17. The Welfare Dept feels that any child can do with only \$15 a month. He pays to the doctor out of that, he gets sewing materials out of that, he pays rent out of that, he eats with that. He lives completely out of \$15 per month. \$.17 per meal, and that's a nutritional meal. We have before you a bill for \$67 average grant. We wish you would support that bill. You should talk with some of us. we are experienced with Welfare. We are a product of Welfare.

No use of anyone turning their heads and wishing that Ruby Duncan would go away, or any of the rest of the Welfare mothers would go away. We aren't going any place. We will continually watch you and observe you. If this Legislature does not give us the support that we need for the people of Nevada, we are going to organize the State of Nevada to the best of our abilities. In addition, gentlemen, we are looking forward to you to support the FDCU program and the \$67 average grant and we are looking forward to seeing you more and more every day and seeing you work harder and harder.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont..)

Mr. Jack Anderson: It's a pleasure having two poverty chairmen here, because we are talking about poverty issues. As you all are aware, the war is over in Vietnam. We are so peace conscious that our President has surrendered to the war against poverty. The needs of the poor are still there. While the National Administration has surrendered, we find the local Welfare administration is still waging a very heavy war against the poor. We are speaking about particular things that go on within the Welfare division that adversely affect a great segment of the population in Nevada and when it affects the poor people, it adversely affects the entire State. With your permission, I would like to go to the chalkboard and go over certain things. During the last legislative session, bill AD 319 was which removed the words health and decency from ADC. Everyone said it was pretty much of a housekeeping/type measure, but in fact what it allowed the Welfare Dept. to do was that they did in July 1971 was to make a drastic change in budgeting our ADC families. The Welfare Dept. determines the needs for various size families. A family of four was determined to need \$320. Formerly a family of four, whose comparable income was less than \$320, was eligible for some cash assistance. They changed this formula in July 1971 to what they called the 55% budget and the family's need was \$320, but they applied 55% to that which came to \$176, and that when your income exceeded \$176, you were no longer eligible for cash assistance. They lost Medicaid assistance. The question is, what is the capacity of a family of four, with income of \$182, what is their capacity to meet their annual medical bills. Under this system, this family does not get Welfare in the State of Nevada. How was this 55% reached? It was an administrative decision by the Welfare Division. It would not have been possible under former legislation. It is clear to everyone that when the Welfare Division said the terms health and decency were nebulous terms and could not be defined, but it is clear that we can define what health and decency is now. It is a family of four, with \$182, and no medical. They can't meet medical needs and emergencies. Medical needs don't go entirely unmet. They can go to Washoe Medical Center and Southern Nevada Memorial Hospital and their medical needs are met 100% by local dollars. Whereas when they had the medical cards, 50% of the medical costs were met by the Federal Government. In Nevada when income exceeds \$176, there is no grant. What we are advocating is the change back, using the need level that is not established by the poor people, it is established by the Welfare Division. AB 714 would require changing the budget procedure, there is also SB 366. The effect of this type of budget procedure is a work disincentive. You will find it means dollar by dollar reductions when you have income.



Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

Mr. Anderson: The Chief of Welfare says that a family of four could have \$700 income. Have you identified a Welfare family with that income? Ask again. The answer is "NO".

What is the average income of a working welfare mother. We are not concerned with the hypothetical. I don't think we should legislate for 1% of the population. The gross income of the Welfare mother is \$238 per month, and that is gross. Why are we using a sample like this? Under the current system, when I say this is a work disincentive, this mother is working for \$238, with the income disregards, she would possibly be entitled to a small grant of possibly \$20 and she would get medical benefits. In Nevada work is season. What happens when this mother is laid off? She could get unemployment, with a fixed income of \$220 a month, I'm saying unemployment benefits, social security benefits, there are no disregards there. At the \$220 level, because that is above the \$176, this family is terminated from aid. The children can't get medical coverage. The mother says I can't afford to go back to work, I can't put my children's health in hazard. The Welfare Division does not have the Welfare people in mind when they go into budgeting procedures.

When you go through the entire budgeting procedure, it goes against the poor, they are not getting more money out of this system. Our records show that 80% of the families were reduced or terminated under this system. You might say the Welfare Div. has the poor family at heart, but it clearly doesn't seem that way because when the employees of the Welfare Division testify, ask them what is going on with the budget right now. Without any legislative authority or guidance they have gone through another change in the budget. They have adjusted the standard of need. For a family of five, the standard of need is \$375.50. That's not payment need, Section 402 of the Social Security act says that the Welfare Division has to update the standard of need. Ask the Welfare Division that when they updated and increased the standard of need to \$375.50, \$207 was the standard of payment. For other families, the payment level has gone down. A family of six, whose total need under the former budgeting system was \$422.50 (that was their determined need), out of that comes rent and personal needs. Under the old system, they said the rent was \$115, personal needs were \$307.50. What they did was increased the shelter from \$115 to \$122 and at the same time decreased the personal needs. By increasing the rent, you would think the family would get more money. If were not paying more than \$115, you would not get an additional increase. Personal needs were decreased eighty percent of the Welfare population is currently facing a decrease in their already meager grant, what is happening is that 80% of the population is receiving a decrease of their grant.

When you have that type of a work disincentive, and you have a Welfare Administration that is not conscientious and is actively working against the needs of the people, we have a problem. Some of you have already signed a bill, the Community Work Project,

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

Mr. Anderson: I am wondering how such an anti-welfare, such an anti-union bill could find so many sponsors. In essence it says for your meager grants you are now going to have to work up to 80 hours per month to be entitled to this paltry sum. This work project is clearly evidence of a plantation mentality. What I mean is that someone has maligned the entire Welfare population, they sometimes take national news and apply it to Nevada. Let's look at what is happening to Nevada. We have the highest percentage of working mothers in the nation. We don't have to look to New York. The welfare grant in New York is twice what is given in Nevada. You are still asking someone to be placed in peonage under the Community work Project. The Program in California has just completed a survey of seven counties, 60,000 recipients. They have had the Work Program since July 1972, its a very expensive program, its a very oppressive program. Out of 60,000 people in California, how many people do they have in the Work Program? 118 in the month of December. Because we are all interest in looking out for the interests of the poor, they have just appropriated \$2 million to evaluate them. The question is, do we want to follow that kind of thing? This type of thinking is where Senator Talmadge comes from. Talk to the Painter's Union in San Francisco, ask them. They can tell you interesting stories. A father is a painter working for \$5.25 an hour. He fell off a ladder, hurt his back and could not paint. He applied for aid in September, was declared eligible and given aid. In October Welfare said there is a Community Work Project and there is a building which you can paint. The man said I can't work. They said you won't have to get up on a ladder, you can just paint the lower areas of the building. They said if you don't go, your family will be cut off from aid, and medical. He goes out to the job, the Union said, if you pick up the brush, we will terminate your membership in the Union. Welfare wanted him to work for \$.75 an hour and the Union has struggled for 50 years to get \$5.25. I ask, do we want to sponsor that type of legislation here? The man stuck with the Union and his family was terminated from aid.

Was he covered by NIC?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, he was, also the NIC was less than what he would be entitled to under AFDCU. This type of program is dangerous and oppressive. When they appear before your ----- Committee, you will probably be aware of a document that was presented to the Senate Finance Ways & Means Committee, that shot holes in the Welfare budget. It seems that whenever we destroy the Welfare Dept. credibility, they've fought back onto their fraud argument, the fact that they need these things to catch the cheaters. Two years ago, George Miller was the self-proclaimed Welfare fraud fighter in the nation and circulated the letter to every single senator and congressman in the United States, saying that 50% of the Nevada Welfare population cheats. That was fiction. Significant news is that the Department of Health, Welfare said they had better

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

Mr. Anderson: go over and investigate that. They did, they audited and you know what they found? Wide-spread fraud in Nevada on the part of the Welfare Division. Three times as many errors were made by the Welfare Division, as by the Welfare recipients. There were 50% errors, 3.8% were attributed to Welfare recipients, 46% to the Welfare Division. While we were appearing, we also heard their Chief of Eligibility state that he is now Vice President of the National Association against Welfare fraud. When you look at their figures on fraud in Clark County, they have not come up with one successful prosecution. The District Attorney found there wasn't enough information available to indicate fraud in any case that came to trial. In one case, a woman was found to have been overpaid \$1,200 over a 16-month period, over 2 years ago. It was very difficult to come up with the facts, but we did. We did the budget for every month. We presented it to the court, and the court was somewhat amazed in that after we did the budget correctly, the woman and the children were not overpaid \$1,200, they were underpaid \$232. There is Welfare fraud. We would like to get cheaters off the rolls and get George Miller off the Welfare.

Mr. Hickey: Would the head of a family of four, if they had no income at all, would they automatically get \$176?

Mr. Anderson: No, it would depend on their rent. If they paid \$106 for rent, personal needs would be \$114. If they were paying less than \$106 rent, they would not get \$176. If they were in low-income housing and paying \$80 rent, their need would be figured at \$214, plus \$80. They would get 55% of that. Less than 6% of the Welfare population is budgeted for full need; that means that 94% of the population is paying less rent than the maximum, and that means that with this new budgeting system, when there is an increase in the rent allowance, that it will only help 7% of the population and it would hurt.

Mr. Hickey: We dealt with averages of \$230 income. We haven't talked about subsidies in rent, in medical care. Do you have this information? I have never seen that. You started off with \$230, you said about \$20 comes from the Welfare as a cash grant. What I'm saying is, the head of the household is working, average income is \$230, let's say the rent is \$106, what's their subsidy on \$106, it would be added on to that?

Mr. Anderson: For a family of 5, with an income of \$222, Welfare would contribute \$182, rent subsidy would be \$20, medical subsidy would be \$50, for a total of \$474.

QUESTION ?  
somebody We had this big difference over commodities with the County. I know they ran out of funds.

Mr. Anderson: The commodity program is still working. Commodities for a family of four were worth \$88 a month, \$22 a person. As it turned out, the senators questioned that. They wanted the total amount of commodities at about \$4 of \$4.5 million. Page 452 of the Executive Budget is valued at \$2.1 million. That is 100 percent over the estimate. Of that amount, 65% was for people distribution, as opposed to institution and hospital distribution.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont..)

- Mr. Anderson: \$1.3 million value of food was available for distribution. To 15,000 people monthly. It would be worth about \$7.10 per person. The butter could be used up in a week. \$152 budget, \$60 left over a month for food.
- Rev. Bennet: AD 492
- Sister Mary: Franciscan Center, I would like to talk about SB 425, which deals with medical assistance to the needy. HEW defines the medically needy as a person who is financially eligible for medical assistance. If your accountable monthly income is up to one-third the ADC level you would not be eligible for a cash grant, you would be still eligible for some medical care of \$176 for a family of four. If the family has \$204, they won't be able to maintain either health care and pay medical assistance if this bill is passed by the legislature. About \$1.9 million is the total the State's share is half, the Federal Government pays the other half. This is an additional cost. Last year, the State of Nevada provided \$4 million in medical services. There is no way to avoid paying these medical costs. With an income of \$220, the family could not pay for medical expenses. Washoe County pays even more than Clark County. When a family who is not eligible for Welfare has large medical expenses, there is no way we can pay for it, the major portion of the people who would be using this money are children.
- Mr. Wittenburg: If the State were to take over the program and spend the \$1.9 million, the Counties would no longer have to spend their \$4 million. The counties would still have smaller medical expenses. \$2 million for the State; there is a large State surplus. \$2 million from State funds and for what the counties are paying, what do we say to the County, now that you have the \$4 million, let's have the County and other Welfare Programs?
- Sister Mary: The County would be able to give some kind of adequate assistance to people who are not eligible for State grants. An average County grant is about \$17.76 per month.

Frank Matthews: I am Frank Matthews, director of the State Office of Economic Opportunity.

AB 741 simply says pay more attention to the poor people, like providing them with counseling, training, etc. I think the legislature is saying one thing, the Welfare Department is saying another thing, and this is continuing getting worse.

AB 741, In the State of Nevada, asks for providing \$25.00 to the poor person. We are saying that in the last four years the Economic Opportunity Board has spent their money wisely and adequate. In the last four years the Concentrated Employment Program of the Economic Opportunity Board has provided people with jobs, I don't have the exact figures, I guess Leo Johnson= CEP Director can provide you with exact figures, but I'm saying that in the last four years, the Economic Opportunity Board has provided the most of services. We are saying that the Community Action will be placed under the direct authority of the State Legislature. Where it should be, and there it will continue to do it's very important work. I still think, I firmly believe, that we can make a most meaningful approach to the poor.

Rev. Bennett: Are there any questions?

Mr. Perkins:

I am Chairman of the Economic Opportunity Board, a board=made up of, County, City Government, private business, and poor people. We are attempting to direct the activities of the staff of the Economic Opportunity Board helping poor people pull themselves up, I think that this is the whole philosophy to help people to better themselves.

In the present we don't know what's happening, the way Nixon is cutting off the Federal programs. We are wondering how we are going to be able to help the 13,000 Senior Citizens, the way things are going with our NYC program we are wondering how we are going to provide counseling and job placements to all young men and women who dropped out from school. We are also in the process of wiping out Community Organization.

We were designated by the County Commissioners to administer poverty programs, and we found that we were not doing enough even with the amount of money and number of accomplishments they say we have. We have a number of programs that we are running in this agency, one is Alcoholism, Concentrated Employment, we can take an individual with an income of say \$1,700, give him a year training, and he can pay back in taxes over a three year period what he took in training. And there are the things that we are trying to do, alleviate some of the problems. We operate a Drug Counseling program, we operate a Foster Grandparent program, to get Senior Citizens more active, they can work with kids as Foster Grandparents. The Head Start Program, where we are trying to make youngsters able to go to school and succeed, and compete with other youngsters across the County. We have Health Services Programs, of course we have Legal Services, we have a Neighborhood Youth Corps to give youngsters some more education, send them to school and make them tax payers.

We had the Economic Opportunity Act to help individuals to increase their life chances. Now we are encouraging the State to commit themselves; It is time for the State to show its power, to support these programs, and I appreciate your full support, and your giving us a chance to show you that we are doing a good job. Thank you.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

Mr. Hickey: What programs are you trying to keep alive?

Mr. Perkins: We would like to maintain particularly in the summer time the Youth Programs. We would submit proposals, we would do whatever is necessary to keep our programs, see what our community needs are, and develop proposals to submit to the state.

Mr. Neal: Claude, you know that the EOB, Community Action agency, has been accused of spending money in getting people elected.

Mr. Perkins: Mr. Neal, I've been on this board, I've served on this board when you were chairman, I can't see any truth in those statements. The use of the staff is not political, but we cannot control the behavior of the board.

Rev. Bennet: Are there other questions?

Mr. Hoggard: I've been the Executive Director of the Economic Opportunity Board for four years, I would like to make a few comments in response to Senator Neal. The Economic Opportunity Board of Clark County, is a private, non profit organization. It has also been a Community Action Agency. We do not intend to become involved in politics. We have two former chairmen sitting here this morning, and have given a great deal of their time to these programs. We are requesting a million dollars over a period of two years for 47,000 poor people in the State of Nevada. The State of Connecticut this year appropriated \$5,500,090 for Community Action agencies which operate 40 Day CARE Centers. The State of Washington funded 13 Community Action Agencies. The State of Wisconsin gives \$660,000. The State of Hawaii \$1,097,296, and the list goes on. We are asking for just 1/2 million dollars a year.

Rev. Johnson: I've been the CEP Director since August 1969, and during all these years, we have been able to prove, that poor people can become meaningful citizens of this community or any other community, and that they can become tax payers, instead of tax receivers. A poor person doesn't have the money to buy the food that a person needs to keep himself in the best condition. So we have to recognize that this is a very crucial point in their lives. If you look at education as it is today I wonder if we should reevaluate the types of money that are being expended for education. Through this program we've been able to prove that the State should take analysis in the areas of education. An enrollee comes to the CEP program last year and is given the opportunity to go through certain kind of training. We are just asking the State to assist us in areas where there is a strong need of funding. We are trying to educate people how to use their money, so that they may be able to stretch the shrinking dollar.

Rev. Bennet: Are there any questions?

Fernando Romero: I am Fernando Romero, I represent the Nevada Spanish Speaking Coalition, and I support the philosophy of AB-741.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

225

- Mr. Fitzgerald: Mr. Chairman, Board Members, my name is S.P. Fitzgerald, Nev. State Employment Security Department, I've been in Nevada about 20 years, I heartily recommend passage of AB 741, something must be done to take care of the poor people.
- Mr. Wittenburg: How many people are employed by EOB?
- Mr. Hoggard: 137 people are presently employed by EOB.
- Dan Larson: I am Dan Larson, Training and Information Officer of the Economic Opportunity Board, and I would like to tell you about a case like thousands of them, that explains why the EOB and the CEP program are needed in our community. Take a young girl, in our dealer's class: four years ago her husband left the home, she has a little girl who has Epilepsy, and she was forced to go on Welfare. Few months ago she came to CEP, and she is now an enrollee in the dealer's class. She receives ADC for her child, but in three weeks she'll become a 21 dealer, and there is no need to say that her income will be pretty good. She'll be off Welfare. I asked her to come this morning, but she has only the one day with her child.
- Mr. Hickey: One thing has been put out, that a person can be moved from one program to another.
- Rev. Johnson: At no time can any individual re-enter the program. A person comes into the program, and is placed in a job training.
- Mr. Craddock: Do you have a good report with the Telephone Company?
- Rev. Johnson: Yes.
- Ms. Mattie Wormood: I came to EOB to get a job, and my husband was unemployed, he came to CEP as an enrollee, and now he is working. I also think that the Drug Program is helping lots of people in the community. I know a girl that received help from EOB Drug Program, and now she is off drugs, and she is also working.
- E. Lavonne Lewis: Chairman and members Senate and Assembly.
- I am E. Lavonne Lewis, 2nd. Vice President of League of Women Voters of Las Vegas Valley.
- I urge you to support the following bills on Welfare. These bills, individually or as a package, would expand the coverage of our Welfare system to help those in the greatest need. They would provide the most effective use of our Nevada tax dollars by securing federal matching funds to finance the expanded program. Passage of these bills would relieve the pressure on county welfare funds, which are secured totally from local taxes.
- SB 425 and AB 492 allowing marginal families to qualify for financial aid to medically indigent.
- SB 424 and AB 493 providing aid to eligible families in a crisis.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

Ms. Lewis:

SB 443 and AB 584 establishing a food stamp program

SB 426 aid to permanently and totally disabled.

SB 366 some cash assistance to children determined needy by the Welfare Division's own standard of need.

AB 754 exempting a child's earnings in determining grant level.

I urge you to defeat AB 569-596

AB 596 would require stepparents to support stepchildren. This bill should be killed. If passes it would be a strong factor in provoking family break-up. Many low income families can barely make ends meet because the stepchildren are eligible for the meager ADC grant. If the stepparent were required to provide their full support, they just couldn't make it. Aside from the impact on welfare families, this bill has many serious implications as regards the divorce laws of Nevada. Child support is difficult to enforce now, much less the additional requirement that a stepparent support his stepchildren. We return once again to the human factor that those who can and want to, will and do support stepchildren. Those who can't or will not, will continue to evade the law.

AB 645 provides additional criteria for determining relative responsibility for persons receiving welfare.

This bill should be killed. State and national figures show that it consistently costs more to enforce this law than they ever realize in roll reduction. Even more important than financial considerations, this is a costly harassing measure that ignores the human factor. To force relatives to contribute to the support of relatives is indeed a sad commentary.

I also urge you to defeat any bills that require work as a condition to receive a cash grant. Nevada has the highest percentage of working welfare recipients in the nation and would probably have more if we had adequate day care centers. Requiring welfare recipients to work at less than minimum wage would create an available pool of slave labor; it would eliminate jobs for people presently not on welfare but are lowly paid, and it would lower the standard of living achieved through minimum wage legislation and the efforts of organized labor.

I wish to recommend for your consideration the implementation of an Aid to Families with Dependent Children with Unemployed Fathers (AFDCU) program in the Nevada State Welfare system. The Nevada Legislative Commission subcommittee for the study of welfare laws chaired by Senator Walker, has ranked implementation of an AFDCU program secondly only to initiation of an Aid to Permanently and Totally Disabled Program in Nevada. Their report states: Presently, there is no state level program which provides assistance to the intact family. As a result, there is an incentive for family breakup to obtain state aid or the burden is shifted to the county where no federal matching is available. In 1961, the Social Security Act was amended to broaden the definition of dependent children to include children-deprived of parental support by reason of unemployment of the father. Funding for AFDCU is the same as for ADC.... presently, \$22 federal funds to \$10 state funds.

Who is eligible for AFDCU? families with a father who:

1. Has not been employed 30 days prior to application.
2. Has not refused a bona fide employment or training offer.
3. Has 6 or more quarters of work in any 13 quarter period ending within one year prior to application.



Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

Ms. Lewis: Aid will be denied if the father has not registered with Employment Security Department or if he is receiving unemployment compensation. These eligibility criteria are very rigid and hardly allow so-called "loafers" to abuse the program.

How much would the state rolls increase? National utilization experiences for AFDCU programs show a 7% increase over ADC rolls (based on national utilization figures as reported by U.S. Department of HEW, in Public Assistance Payments: #SRS 73-03-100, Oct. 3, 1972). Using this utilization figure of 7% the projected case load for 1974 would be 1,566 additional for 1975, 1,896, and for the biennium 3,462.

Using the Governor's recommended 10% increase in the average monthly grant, \$20 in state funds, \$22 in federal funds, this program is estimated to cost \$354,960 in 1974, \$372,720 in 1975 or \$727,680 for the biennium. If the Legislature goes with the level of Need grant, the cost would be \$621,336 in 1973-74. Compared to some of our programs, this is indeed a modest cost.

How would an AFDCU program benefit Nevada? It would provide relief from double taxation now suffered by county taxpayers who find that their county taxes are paying for an increasing case load for county general assistance, which is financed completely from their local tax dollars. Local taxpayers have already contributed their share to federal programs that can provide more aid by matching state funds with federal funds.

It would bring more of Nevada's tax money back home to circulate in our local economies and stimulate our economic growth. It has long been established that low income families spend all of their available income on consumer goods available in the local market. It would provide a tax credit for private employers. The Revenue Act of 1971 (P.L. 92-178-se. 601-26 USC, Sec. 40, 50A and 50B). Encourages the private sector to employ AFDCU fathers by extending them a 20% tax credit for each recipient employed. 20% of all wages paid to a recipient would be directly deducted, dollar for dollar from his income tax liability. Therefore, a recipient hired at the minimum wage of \$1.65 would actually cost the employer \$1.32 an hour. Available to any recipient.

Most important, an AFDCU program would mean that Nevada would begin to contribute to the maintenance of the intact family, in keeping with the recommendations of the Subcommittee to Study Welfare Laws and the intent of Congress in passage of the original legislation. Recognizing that from past acts of the 1973 Legislature, the maintenance of the family and not its destruction, is of primary importance to you, I urge your support of AFDCU.

Rev. Osman: My name is Herbert E. Osman, Vice President and Chairman, Human Needs Committee, Clark County Ministerial Association. The Clark County Ministerial Association has been a consistent supporter of an adequate program to meet the designated needs of the poverty community. We have deep convictions that all persons are deserving of having their basic needs assured in keeping with the level of need as determined by the Welfare Division. We have faithfully given our support in the past and will continue to do so to this position even to the extent of supporting those measures now before the Legislature requesting that all children designated as needy are deserving of cash assistance.

Rev. Osman:

We are very concerned about what this legislature will do in the area of Welfare. No other topic is more unpopular. Those who are not against the poor are reluctant to speak up because of the intense unpopularity of the issue. This, however, doesn't cause the needs of people to vanish nor does it put food in their stomachs, give them medical aid for their sicknesses, and a better life for themselves and their children.

This is the day of stepping on the poor to benefit the rich, of saving money for restoration of Vietnam by creating potential Vietnams in our own land. We need to think of our brothers in other lands, but we cannot afford to look over our brothers here to do so. This is a luxury we cannot afford.

We support a meaningful and compassionate reappraisal of the Welfare System both nationally and within the state. It is clear to us that the present level of assistance is inadequate. With living costs going up drastically, it is not possible for recipients to live on current levels.

It is our consensus that an adequate level of assistance must be found. Therefore, we would support the Welfare Division's request for a \$67 average grant level as being morally right. We urge you to support this request.

By resolution we are totally in support of the people in requesting Food Stamps rather than commodities if they must choose between the two. An overwhelming majority prefer Food Stamps if a dual program is not a possibility. We are pleased that the Clark County Board of Commissioners has voted to support the people's request for Food Stamps. We understand that the Governor has made provision in his budget for Food Stamps and for this we are pleased. We are extremely pleased over the vote of the Senate Finance Committee this week approving the funding for Food Stamps for Clark and Washoe County. We encourage you as legislators to support these actions and to insure a favorable vote in both the Assembly and Senate for Food Stamps for Nevada.

We are strongly in support of a program for Aid to the Permanently and totally Disabled including full medical coverage. Some very confusing information has been given concerning the new Social Security guidelines as they apply to APTD. Scare tactics have been used in an effort to cause you to think it is impossible to do this. We suggest you get the facts from those who have them and then make your own decisions. There are some political pitfalls as well as definite political opportunities in this program. Get the facts and do what is right and just. We suggest you have a good political out to do the right thing in this program and be on the right side as well.

Our consistent support of meaningful and compassionate reappraisal of the Welfare System referred to earlier would put us in the position of supporting efforts on behalf of the medically indigent, emergency assistance, and ADCU programs. These are all programs which would go much further at a meaningful reappraisal of the Welfare System and a creative solution to the problems of the citizens of the State of Nevada who fall under the designated level of need. We urge your support.

We are alarmed by the efforts to introduce repressive and backward legislation requiring work up to 80 hours per month, irregardless of pay, before a recipient could receive a grant.

Legislative Hearing, March 24, 1973 (Cont.)

Rev. Osman: How ridiculous can one be. Already we have the highest per cent of working welfare mothers in the United States. What is it that this effort is trying to accomplish. What provisions are made to enable persons to work? The WIN Program, I am told, now has more applications than they have jobs. Why should a mother working for the Welfare Division in Las Vegas be required out of need, to call my office asking us in our Day School to supply child care for her at a special rate? Not only is there no meaningful program for child care for all mothers in Nevada who now work and these who might be required to work under this proposal, but also it seems they do not even provide child care for the mothers who WORK FOR THE WELFARE DIVISION. They force them to call and beg for assistance from someone else. We are against any more repressive actions on the part of the Welfare Division and/or this legislature. This is a medieval approach to a twentieth century problem. We urge favorable action on the concept of the EOB-sponsored bill creating a Department of Economic Opportunity. There are many other concerns which we certainly have, but these are some specific ones. Above all, we want to urge you to make the right decision. There are thousands of children, aged, blind, retarded, disabled, mothers, and others who are depending upon you to do what is right. Don't let them down.

Gloria Ramy: My name is Gloria Ramu, Chairman of Tenants Pulling Together, Henderson: We are in favor of food stamps program, the food stamps would be better for the people's diet. We talk about the money on medical expenses. I came from the State of California I think the food stamps would be a great help. I have a family on nine, and when you run short on money if you have food stamps you can have food. Regarding tenants from Carver Park, they should try to relocate the tenants, so I am asking you to take us in great consideration. What do you do with 200 families, that do not make enough money to move some place else?

Clemencia Jabbs: I represent Citizens for Community Action: We have our office in Carver Park, we also found out that the state of Nevada has not adopted a resolution where they are responsible for the tenants in the state of Nevada. So we would advise you to try to pass some kind of resolution, so the same thing doesn't happen again. In Carver Park we have Senior Citizens, people that do not have enough income and can't move, so I feel that it should be something done.

Following conclusion of the testimony the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON HEALTH & WELFARE

Saturday

Date March 24, 1973 Time 10:00 a.m. Room 940 West Owens

Economic Opportunity Board  
Las Vegas, Nevada

Bills or Resolutions  
to be considered

Subject

Counsel  
requested\*

AB 492	Allows certain additional individuals to qualify for state aid to medically indigent.	
AB 754	Prohibits welfare division from decreasing aid to dependent child because of earnings of that child.	
AB 493	Requires welfare division to provide emergency assistance to dependent children in certain cases.	
AB 491	Enlarges eligibility for aid to dependent children.	
AB 592	Expands area of examinations for hairdressers and cosmeticians.	
AB 584	Provides food stamp program.	
AB 741	Creates department of economic opportunity.	