

90th Congress }  
1st Session }

CONFIDENTIAL COMMITTEE PRINT

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

PART IV—PUBLIC WELFARE AMENDMENTS

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
RUSSELL B. LONG, *Chairman*



OCTOBER 23, 1967

Printed for the use of the Committee on Finance

85-312

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1967

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE**

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana, *Chairman*  
 JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Delaware  
 GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida  
 FRANK CARLSON, Kansas  
 CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico  
 WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah  
 ALBERT GOBRE, Tennessee  
 CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska  
 HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia  
 THURSTON B. MORTON, Kentucky  
 EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota  
 EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois  
 VANCE HARTKE, Indiana  
 J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas  
 ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Connecticut  
 LEE METCALF, Montana  
 FRED R. HARRIS, Oklahoma

TOM VAIL, *Chief Counsel*  
 EVELYN R. THOMPSON, *Assistant Chief Clerk*

II

**CONTENTS**

I. Staff—HEW Suggestions.....	Page
A. Section 201—	1
Family Planning.....	1
Family Services.....	2
Single State Agency.....	3
B. Section 202—Earnings Exemption.....	10
C. Section 203—Unemployed Fathers.....	15
D. Section 204—Compulsory Work and Training.....	20
E. Section 206—Emergency Assistance.....	37
F. Section 207—Protective and Vendor Payments.....	38
G. Section 208—Initiation on AFDC Program.....	40
H. Section 209—Home Repairs.....	43
II. Printed Amendments.....	44
III. House-Passed Provision Not Discussed Previously.....	47
IV. Other Changes Suggested By Witnesses at Hearing on H. R. 12080.....	50

III

**I. Staff—HEW Suggestions**  
**SEC. 201.—FAMILY PLANNING**

PRESENT LAW

H. R. 12080

Family planning services are made available under grants to States for maternal and child health services and project grants for comprehensive maternity and infant care.

States would be required to offer family planning services to all appropriate AFDC recipients. Federal matching at the 75% rate would be provided. Authorizations for maternal and child health would be increased and, though funds are not earmarked for family planning, an estimated \$15,000,000 would be spent for this purpose under the 1969 authorization, with slight increases annually thereafter. State plans for maternal and child health services would have to provide for the development of demonstration services, with special attention to family planning services for mothers, in needy areas.

**SENATOR TYDINGS' AMENDMENTS**

1. Write into the law a guarantee that acceptance of family planning services is voluntary. (Such language appears in the House report.)
2. Increase maternal and child health authorizations and earmark funds for family planning as follows (in millions of dollars):

Year	Authorization in H. R. 12080	Increased author- ization	Earmarked for family planning
1969	\$250	+ \$30	\$15
1970	275	+ 60	45
1971	300	+ 60	75
1972	325	+ 60	75

**Suggestions**

1. The following language is suggested to insure that acceptance of family planning services is voluntary—on page 108, line 18, insert the following:

(C) that acceptance by any individual of family planning services provided under the plan shall be voluntary on the part of such individual and shall not be a prerequisite to eligibility for or receipt of any other service or financial or medical assistance.



2. To assure that some funds under the maternal and child health provisions are used for family planning even if the full authorizations are not appropriated, use percentage earmarking rather than dollar earmarking, as follows (in millions of dollars):

Year	Authoriza- tion in H. R. 12080	Increased authori- zation	New total authori- zation	Earmarked for family planning	
				Percent	Amount
1969	\$250		\$250	6	\$15.0
1970	275	+ \$30	305	15	46.5
1971	300	+ 60	360	20	72.0
1972	325	+ 60	385	20	77.0
1973 +	350	+ 60	410	20	82.0

**Positions of Witnesses on House Bill Provision**

*Favor family planning provisions*

ADC Association of Lane County, Inc., Oregon (after 1972)	Hearing page	1794
Arthritis Foundation, Inc., New York Chapter		A180
Curtis, Hon. Kenneth M., Governor of Maine		A175
Lindsay, Hon. John V., mayor, New York City		1123
Maine Department of Health and Welfare		A211
National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA		1727
National Council of Jewish Women		A227
Planned Parenthood—World Population (would include pro- visions to avoid coercion)		1495
Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School (on voluntary basis)		1761
Tydings, Hon. Joseph D., U.S. Senator (completely voluntary manner)		1799
Wyman, George K., commissioner, New York State Depart- ment of Social Services (favors proscribing any coercion in connection with offering family planning services)		1543

*Opposes family planning provisions*

National Conference of Catholic Charities----- 1356

**SEC. 201. PROVISION OF FAMILY SERVICES—  
STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT**

PRESENT LAW

H. R. 12080

Provide for the development and ap-  
plication of a program for such welfare  
and related services for each child as  
as may be necessary in the light of the  
particular home conditions and other  
needs of such child.

Same as present law.

**Suggestion**  
Make it clear that States must provide a program of services to  
relatives (as well as to children) toward the general objective of  
strengthening family life.

**SEC. 201. SINGLE STATE AGENCIES FOR  
CHILD WELFARE SERVICES**

PRESENT LAW

H. R. 12080

Coordination of the program of serv- ices to AFDC recipients under title IV with those available as child welfare services under title V is required.	Child welfare services will be pro- vided under title IV for AFDC children. Requires that by July 1, 1969, all such services shall be provided by a single State or local agency.
--	---

**Suggestion**

Exempt the States of Illinois and Kentucky (where the child  
welfare services and welfare department are separate) from the single  
State agency requirement.

**Positions of Witnesses on Other Aspects of Section 201**

*Generally favor section 201 in H. R. 12080*

Allred, Zella D., Salt Lake City, Utah (if qualified by words "if in the best interest of the child or family")	Hearings page	A15
American Parents Committee		958
American Public Welfare Association		999
Brooke, Hon. Edward W., U.S. Senator		826
Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii		A213
Cleveland Welfare Federation		A35
Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ		1736
Council of State Chambers of Commerce		1265
Family Service Association of Wyoming Valley		A105
Hoff, Hon. Philip H., Governor of Vermont		A107
National Association for Retarded Children		1934
National Association of Counties		1289
National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.		A279
Oregon chapter, National Association of Social Workers		A55
Puerto Rico Medical Association		1388
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare		A283
Texas State Department of Public Welfare		A200



*Oppose provision in H.R. 12080*

Arthuring Foundation, New York chapter	1736
Congressmen Bingham, Cobelan, Don Edwards, Fraser, Ottinger, Rosenthal, Ryan, Diggs, George Brown, Conyers, Farbstein, Hawkins, Kastenmeter, Resnick, Roybal, Dow, Scheuer, and Congresswoman Mink (forces mothers into labor market without adequate protection for them and for children)	2037
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York	1727
National PTA	1632
Wisconsin Welfare Council	

*Favor provisions of H.R. 5710*

Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ--Family Service Association of America (with mandatory un-employed parent program)	1736
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.	2037
YWCA	1727

*Oppose punitive aspects*

Hillcrest Children's Services, Dubuque, Iowa	A223
Lindsay, Hon. John V., mayor, New York City	1123
National Presbyterian Health & Welfare Association of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.	1739

*Generally favor Federal funds for increased services*

American Public Welfare Association (favors 75 percent matching Board of Directors, Health & Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis	999
Evans, Hon. Daniel J., Governor of Washington (favors Federal matching higher than 75 percent)	A220
Health & Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N.Y. (favors authorizing enough funds to meet the actual need)	A258
Illinois Public Aid Commission	A150
National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.	A279
National Urban League	A277
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare	A253
Physicians Forum (but "we question whether [the services] can be carried out under the shadow of coercion and punishment without destroying their effectiveness")	A241
YWCA (opposes combining services with coercive requirements)	1632

*Favor day care provisions of sec. 201 of H.R. 12080*

AFL-CIO (favors Federal standards for day care)	1415
American Federation of Government Employees	1415
American Public Welfare Association (favors provision for minimum standards by Secretary of HEW; recommends making facilities available in all situations where they are needed to safeguard children)	1428
Arthuris Foundation, Inc., New York chapter	999
Board of Directors, Health & Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis	A180
Chafee, Hon. John H., Governor of Rhode Island	A251
Child Welfare League of America (favors standards for day care services)	A283
Community Council of Greater New York	1321
Community Service Society of New York (with standards)	1617
Council of Jewish Federations & Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York	1517
Curtis, Hon. Kenneth M., Governor of Maine	1611
Health & Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N.Y.	A175
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator	A258
Illinois Public Aid Commission (Federal Government and States should consider eliminating fragmented programs of day care for children by making day care for children a regular function of all school systems)	775
Lindsay, Hon. John V., mayor, New York City	A149
Maine Department of Health & Welfare	1123
National Council of Jewish Women	A211
National Farmers Union (favors directing welfare departments to employ as many low-income welfare recipients as possible in such day care programs as regular employees)	A227
National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union	1108
National Urban League	1088
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare (favors funds for construction of facilities; favors facilities for non-AFDC children)	A277
Tydings, Hon. Joseph D., U.S. Senator (favors strict standards)	A283
Volpe, Hon. John A., Governor of Massachusetts	1799
	1153

*Services should be available to all employable or potentially employable adults—HEW should interpret "appropriate broadly"*

Evans, Hon. Daniel J., Governor of Washington	A220
---	------



*Oppose provisions for tracking down fathers*

Hearing  
page  
Community Council of Greater New York ..... 1617  
National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social  
Service Employees Union ..... 1088

*Opposes provision requiring cooperation with law enforce-  
ment agencies in determining paternity and locating  
absent fathers as a condition of assistance*

National Urban League ..... A277

*Favors, except provisions for getting support from absent  
fathers*

South Dakota chapter, National Association of Social Workers. A110

*Favors provision that support should be obtained from  
fathers, but would require States to provide services to  
these fathers*

American Public Welfare Association ..... 999

*Opposes regulations dealing with illegitimacy*

National Presbyterian Health & Welfare Association of the  
United Presbyterian Church in the USA ..... 1739

*Favors provision providing more adequate protection of  
children from abuse and neglect*

National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA ..... 1727

*"We would suggest that rather than enforce new rules and  
regulations, more stress should be placed on States being  
obliged to encourage education and the development of  
full potential by the mandatory adoption of keeping chil-  
dren on grants while attending any type of training pro-  
gram or school which will make them self-supporting  
and give them a chance for meaning!"*

ADC Association of Lane County, Inc., Oregon ..... 1794

*Opposes provisions whereby children could be removed  
from the home by court order on "terms that are highly  
questionable"*

National Urban League ..... A277

*Opposes measures designed to reduce illegitimacy as part  
of our income maintenance laws; opposes provisions for  
establishing court and police department reporting mecha-  
nism as invasion into confidentiality; opposes singling  
out a particular class for oppressive treatment in special  
enforcement of neglect laws*

Hearing  
page  
Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale  
Law School ..... 1761

*Favors amendment to provide that States may appoint the  
responsible agency to administer the services to children  
and their families contemplated in the act*

Harmon, Maurice A., commissioner, Kentucky Department of  
Child Welfare ..... 743

*Opposes "removal of children from their families  
indiscriminately"*

South Dakota chapter, National Association of Social Workers. A110

*Opposes requirement that State furnish child welfare  
services toward getting families off welfare rolls*

Hawaii, State of ..... A123

*Favors extension of child welfare services to families  
receiving AFDC*

Department of Health & Social Services, State of Wisconsin. A262

*Opposed to mandatory day care in that no mother should  
be forced to put her child in day care to go to work; safe-  
guard standards such as included in section 523(1)(b)  
of act should be included and HEW should be directed to  
establish guidelines for care; Federal matching might be  
increased to 90 percent like that in community action  
programs; funds for building and renovation are necessary*

National Committee for Day Care of Children ..... A178

*"We are fearful \* \* \* that the specifications for the re-  
quirement that all States establish programs to combat  
illegitimacy may lead to undesirable coercion."*

Council of Jewish Federations & Welfare Funds, Federation  
of Jewish Philanthropies of New York ..... 1611



*Favors statement of intent that children should be encouraged to stay in school*

Illinois Public Aid Commission.....  
Hearing page A148

*Favors increased Federal matching of 75 percent for services to AFDC children; favors comparable assistance for other children*

Council of Jewish Federations & Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.....  
1611

*Opposes emphasis on vendor payments, protective payments, and removing the child from the home*

National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union.....  
1088

*Favors effort to objectify the law rather than giving social workers increased discretion*

National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union.....  
1088

*Favors requiring "assurances that States will take administrative action best suited to meeting their individual problems toward helping families to be economically independent"*

Hawaii, State of.....  
A123

*Favors expanding State, city, and town sanitation employment and the postal services instead of restrictions on AFDC*

Goddard, Maj. Gladys, Salvation Army.....  
A127

*Opposes requirement to cooperate with law enforcement agencies in locating missing fathers*

Travelers Aid Society of Washington, D.C.....  
A275

*Favors, except for provisions related to securing parental support*

Community Service Society of New York.....  
1517

*Opposes requirement that welfare agencies cooperate with enforcement agencies in securing parental support and court referral of child neglect cases*

National Council on Illegitimacy.....  
Hearing page 1476

*Opposes "paternity determination support provision"*

National Council of Negro Women.....  
1501

*Favors legislation authorizing release of needed information for enforcement of child support, and making it a Federal crime to cross a State line to avoid child support*

Council for Home and Family, Madison, Wis.....  
A236

*Favors correlation of AFDC and child welfare under one organization unit; make mandatory either July 1, 1969, or within 90 days after the adjournment of first regular session of State legislature, whichever is later*

Texas State Department of Public Welfare.....  
A200

*Opposes provisions that "have the effect of punishing illegitimacy by punishing the guiltless child"*

National Urban League.....  
A227



SEC. 202.—EARNINGS EXEMPTION

PRESENT LAW

H. R. 12080

AFDC program:

The State agency in determining need, upon which eligibility for and the amount of assistance is based, must take into account any other income (including expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of income) and resources of any child or relative claiming assistance.

The States, at their option, may disregard not more than \$50 per month of earned income of each dependent child under age 18 but not more than \$150 per month in the same home. The States also have the option of disregarding up to \$5 of any income before disregarding child's earned income as noted above.

All earned income of each child recipient under age 16, and of each child age 16 to 21 if he is a full-time student attending school, is exempt. In the case of a child over 16 not in school and a relative the first \$30 of earned income of the group in a month plus 1/3 of the remainder of such income for the month would be exempt. The option of the States to disregard \$5 a month of any type of income is continued. The provision exempting \$50 a month of a child's income is superseded by these provisions.

The earnings exemption will not be available to persons whose income in the month of application was in excess of their need as determined by the State agency. The earnings exemption will not be available in any month for a person who voluntarily terminated his employment or reduced his earned income within such period preceding the month assistance is applied for as may be prescribed by the Secretary (but such period must not be less than 30 days), or to persons who refused without good cause to accept employment in which they were able to engage, offered by or through the public employment office or by a private employer, which is determined to be bona fide by the State or local agency.

*Effective date:* The earnings exemption must be in effect in the States by July 1, 1969, but will be optional with the States from October 1967 on.

No provision.

Old age assistance and aid to permanently and totally disabled:  
In determining need, a State may disregard the first \$20 of earnings plus 1/3 of the next \$60.

Suggestion

Modify the AFDC House provision by retaining the first \$30 exempt amount and exempting one-half rather than one-third of family earnings above \$30. Require (July 1, 1969) the same earnings exemption for the old-age assistance program and the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program. There would be one difference. Under the House bill the earnings exemption becomes applicable only after the total income of a family falls below the level of need, i.e., no family otherwise ineligible for assistance would qualify on the basis of the income exemption provided by the bill. (Without this provision the costs of the House bill would be \$160 million higher

because of the people who would be added to the welfare rolls.) For example, if the level of need for a family of four in a State is \$200, the earnings exemption would not be available until total income from earnings and all other sources falls below \$200. The result is that if a family gets on the AFDC rolls because the total family income falls to, say, \$125, \$30 in aid will still be payable if family earnings were to increase to \$230. However, a family whose total income is already at the \$230 level—including some earnings—would not be eligible for assistance. Under the suggestion, the earnings exemptions would continue to operate in this fashion in the AFDC program but would not in the other cash assistance programs.

The exemption of earnings would not be available to a child under age 16 unless he was attending school full time (just as it would not apply to a child age 16 to 21 unless he was attending school).

*Cost:*  
Aid to aged and permanently and totally disabled provision is negligible. AFDC provision would cost \$25 million for fiscal year 1969 (an additional \$5 million over the House bill.)

Positions of Witnesses on House-Passed Provisions

Favor earnings exemption in H.R. 12080

	Hearing page
American Nurses Association	951
American Parents Committee	951
Arthritis Foundation, Inc., New York chapter	958
Board of directors, Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis	A180
Bull, Mary I	A251
Chaltee, Hon. John H., Governor of Rhode Island (prefers \$50)	A135
Colorado State Department of Public Welfare	A283
Council of State Chambers of Commerce	A44
Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin	1256
Family Service Association of Wyoming Valley	A262
Health & Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N.Y.	A105
Iowa State Board of Social Welfare	A258
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator	A72
National Association of Counties	900
National Association of Manufacturers	1289
National Conference of Catholic Charities	A161
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.	1356
National Council of Jewish Women	1727
National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.	A227
National PTA	A279
National Urban League	A100
Oregon Chapter, National Association of Social Workers	A277
Puerto Rico Medical Association	A55
Scholarship, Education, and Defense Fund for Racial Equality	1388
Tydings, Hon. Joseph D., U.S. Senator	1799
Volpe, Hon. John A., Governor of Massachusetts	1153



*Opposes earnings exemption (keeps families in poverty in those States which offer low grants)*

Congressmen Bingham, Cohelan, Don Edwards, Fraser, Ottinger, Rosenthal, Ryan, Diggs, George Brown, Conyers, Farbstein, Hawkins, Kastenmeier, Resnick, Roybal, Dow, Scheuer, and Congresswoman Mink-----

Hearing page

A199

*Favor earnings exemption of \$50 a month plus 50 percent of additional earnings for AFDC, aid to the aged and aid to the permanently and totally disabled*

Administration-----  
Community Service Society of N.Y.  
Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area  
AFL-CIO-----

211  
1517  
1487  
1415

*Favor, but prefer \$30 and 50 percent*

Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado  
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York  
Council of Jewish Federation & Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York-----

A174  
2019  
1611

*Favor more liberal provision*

ADC Association of Lane County, Oregon-----  
American Public Welfare Association  
Cleveland Welfare Federation  
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator  
Brooke, Hon. Edward W., U.S. Senator-----

1794  
999  
A35  
775  
826

*Favor amending to provide that wages of children under 21 who are going to school part time are treated the same as the wages of children attending school full time*

Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii-----  
Docking, Hon. Robert, Governor of Kansas  
Hawaii, State of-----  
Hughes, Hon. Harold E., Governor of Iowa  
Maine Department of Health and Welfare  
National Governors' Conference ("In general, the Governors favor" such an amendment)  
Volpe, Hon. John A., Governor, of Massachusetts-----

A213  
A111  
A123  
A266  
-----  
-----  
1153

*Oppose application to part time students*

Evans, Hon. Daniel J., Governor of Washington (but reduction for earnings between \$30 a month and \$90 is too restrictive for part-time students)  
Rhodes, Hon. James A., Governor of Ohio-----

A220  
A14

*Favors scale of exemption to provide a progressively smaller exemption as earnings increase*

Wyman, George K., Commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services-----

Hearing page

1543

*"I support the administration proposal in the House version with reference to permitting AFDC families to retain a portion of their income"*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----

1537

*Favors provision for work incentive, but prefers New York policy of \$85 a month plus 30 percent*

Lindsay, Hon. John V., mayor, New York City-----

1123

*Favors income exemption with the following exceptions: Should be made applicable to applicant as well as recipient families, should be uniform for all categorical programs, should be mandatory as to first \$30 with exemption above that permissive but not to exceed 10 percent of total earnings*

Illinois Public Aid Commission-----

A152

*Opposes; if financed adequately no need for provision*

Alabama Department of Pensions and Security-----

A7

*Favors higher earnings exemption*

National Committee for Day Care of Children  
National Federation of Social Service Employees and Social Service Employees Union-----

A178  
1088

*Favors allowing exemption of all income up to Federal poverty level and apply to all public assistance programs*

Arthritis Foundation, Inc., New York Chapter-----

A180

*Favors permitting AFDC recipients to keep all earnings above grant to OEO poverty line*

Northeast Neighborhood Counseling Center, Kansas City, Kans-----

A33



*Favors reducing amount of earnings exemption*

Hawaii, State of-----  
Hearing page A123

*Favors OEO approach, \$85 plus one-half of remainder*

Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator-----  
National Association of Social Workers-----  
1397  
930

*Favors higher work incentive; favors applying it also to benefit nonwelfare recipients who are presently at or slightly above the welfare line, but who, under the incentive program, would actually be making less than welfare recipients*

Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School-----  
1761

*Opposes possibility that section 202(b) would allow states to reduce or refuse assistance on the basis of assumed support which is not actually available*

Marlin, David H., Deputy Director, Law Reform, Neighborhood Legal Services Project, Washington, D.C.-----  
Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School-----  
A268  
1761

*Favors earnings exemption in H.R. 5710*

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights-----  
A183

*Favors earnings exemption at least equal to that provided in title I or title II of the Economic Opportunity Act*

Marlin, David H., Deputy Director, Law Reform, Neighborhood Legal Services Project, Washington, D.C.-----  
A268

*Favors amending section 202 to require States to establish a "poverty standard" and to disregard earned income, prior support payments and contributions until these have amounted during the 12-month period following application, together with what the State would pay in assistance, to an income equal to the "poverty standard"*

American Public Welfare Association-----  
A272

*Favors higher earnings exemption; believes excluding persons already employed at the same earnings level as assistance recipients is inequitable*

Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare-----  
Hearing page A253

**SEC. 203.—UNEMPLOYED FATHERS**

PRESENT LAW

H.R. 12950

For period ending June 30, 1968, Federal participation is authorized in payments to children who are deprived of parental support or care "by reason of the unemployment of a parent" as defined by a State. Program optional with the States, and 22 have such programs.

Permanent provisions of law limit Federal matching to needy dependent children under 18 (and specified relative with whom they are living) who have been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent. (Specified relatives include grandmother, grandfather, brother, sister, stepfather, stepmother, stepbrother, stepsister, uncle, aunt, first cousin, nephew or niece.)

Limits the program to children who need support on the basis of the unemployment of the father. Unemployment will be defined by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Program made permanent but still optional with the States.

Adds new plan requirement relating to when aid to dependent children will be paid on the basis of an unemployed father:

Payment of aid with respect to a child can be made only if his father has been unemployed for a minimum period of 30 days before receipt of aid, has not without good cause within such period refused a bona fide offer of employment or training, and has at least six quarters of work in a 13-calendar-quarter period ending within 1 year before the application for aid or, within such 1-year period, received unemployment compensation under any State or Federal program, or was "qualified for unemployment compensation."

The bill provides that persons who have fulfilled the requirements at any time after April 1961 (related to the date of enactment of the original unemployed parent legislation) will be considered to be eligible with respect to the quarters-of-work provision for up to 6 months after a State plan under these provisions becomes operative.

(5) Receipt of unemployment compensation bars assistance.

(5) Any State, at its option, to provide for the denial of all (or any part) of aid under the plan to which any child or relative might be entitled for any month, if the unemployed parent receives compensation under an unemployment compensation law of a State or of the United States for any week, any part of which is included in such month.



**Suggestion**

Same as H.R. 12080 except: (1) remove requirement that father have six calendar quarters of work or have been entitled to unemployment compensation; (2) allow, as does present law, rather than require States to withhold aid in a month during which unemployment compensation is received.

**Cost:**

Elimination of work attachment provision would cost \$2 to \$3 million a year over House bill. Elimination of complete bar because of receipt of unemployment compensation would cost \$1.4 million a year over House bill.

**Positions of Witnesses on House-Passed Provisions**

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----  
 Council of State Chambers of Commerce-----  
 Puerto Rico Medical Association-----  
 1537  
 1256  
 1388

*Oppose provisions in H.R. 12080*

Citizens' Committee for Children of New York-----  
 Colorado State Department of Public Welfare-----  
 Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Federation  
 of Jewish Philanthropies of New York-----  
 Delaware Department of Public Welfare-----  
 Hoff, Hon. Phillip H., Governor of Vermont-----  
 Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago-----  
 Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors-----  
 Oregon Chapter, National Association of Social Workers-----  
 Rhodes, Hon. James A., Governor of Ohio-----  
 2019  
 A44  
 1611  
 A68  
 A107  
 A104  
 A24  
 A55  
 A14

*Favor making program mandatory on the States*

American Public Welfare Association-----  
 Evans, Hon. Daniel J., Governor of Washington-----  
 Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator-----  
 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights-----  
 YWCA-----  
 999  
 A220  
 1397  
 1388  
 1632

*Oppose changes in present law, would then make existing program mandatory on the States*

AFL-CIO-----  
 Arthritis Foundation, New York Chapter-----  
 Brooke, Hon. Edward W., U.S. Senator-----  
 Child Welfare League of America-----  
 Community Service Society of New York-----  
 Maine Department of Health and Welfare-----  
 National Social Welfare Assembly-----  
 United Auto Workers-----  
 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights-----  
 1415  
 A180  
 826  
 1321  
 1517  
 A211  
 1938  
 1637  
 A183

*Expresses "concern" about provision that requires recent attachment to labor market*

Texas State Department of Public Welfare-----

Hearing  
 Page  
 A200

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080 except that work requirements should be removed and States should be permitted, not required, to withhold benefits when any unemployment compensation is paid*

Administration-----  
 Curtis, Hon. Kenneth M., Governor of Maine-----  
 Hawaii, State of-----  
 Lindsay, Hon. John V., Mayor, New York City-----  
 Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator-----  
 National Association of Social Workers-----  
 National Federation of Social Service Employees and Social  
 Service Employees Union-----  
 Oregon Social Welfare Association, Inc.-----  
 Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare-----  
 U.S. Commission on Civil Rights-----  
 Wyman, George K., Commissioner, New York State Department  
 of Social Services-----  
 211  
 A175  
 A124  
 1123  
 775  
 930  
 1088  
 1793  
 A283  
 1388  
 1543

*Opposes restrictions in definition of unemployment*

Elman, Richard M., author, "The Poorhouse State: The  
 American Way of Life on Public Assistance"-----

A244

*Opposes definition of unemployment which requires a recent employment history or exhaustion of unemployment compensation benefits*

Rockefeller, Hon. Nelson A., Governor, State of New York---

A240

*Opposes work attachment and unemployment compensation bars from eligibility*

Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado---

A174

*Opposes restrictions in definition of unemployment: substantial connection with the work force, used up unemployment compensation, limiting program only to fathers*

Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare-----

A253



*Favors removal of provision not allowing payment if father is eligible for unemployment compensation*

Hearing  
page

826

Brooke, Hon. Edward W., U.S. Senator  
California Rural Legal Assistance

1926

National Social Welfare Assembly

1938

Wyman, George K., Commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services

1543

*Favors expansion of unemployed parent program*

Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator

775

*Favors making UP mandatory; favors Federal definition of unemployment, but opposes restrictions in definition of H.R. 12080*

Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School

1761

*Opposes requiring a substantial connection with the labor force*

National Urban League

A277

*Favors making AFDC-UP mandatory upon the States (if this is done emergency care (sec. 206) not needed, except possibly for migrants)*

Illinois Public Aid Commission

A154

*Opposes attachment to labor force requirement, 30 day requirement, and bar of father receiving unemployment compensation*

Kerner, Hon. Otto, Governor of Illinois

A224

*Opposes limiting UP provisions to those who have had recent employment*

Health and Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N.Y.

A258

*Opposes tying definition of unemployment to an attachment to the labor force*

Board of Directors, Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis

A251

*Favors making provision permanent, but would leave definition of employment up to the States*

Hearing  
page

1289

National Association of Counties

*Favors making permanent, but opposes other changes*

National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers

*Favors making clear that work attachment requirements will not prevent States from covering such fathers with unmatched funds*

Illinois Public Aid Commission

A153

*Believes aid should not be denied to whole family because of father's refusal to register, train, or work. (Should be like Sec. 204 where only individual who refuses to work or train is denied, and assistance can be provided children through protective or vendor payments)*

Illinois Public Aid Commission

A155

*Favors more favorable matching for the programs*

Docking, Hon. Robert, Governor of Kansas

A111

*Favors including fathers who are unable to supply a sufficient livelihood because of unemployment, underemployment, or low earnings from full employment; also there should be no blanket prohibition because of receipts of unemployment compensation*

Illinois Public Aid Commission

A147

*Opposes forbidding assistance to a family with a resident unemployed father*

McKenna, Rev. Horace B., S.J., St. Aloysius Church, Washington, D.C.

A276

*Favors own standard for unemployed parents program which does not require an exact amount of work experience and allows for supplementation of unemployment compensation benefits:*

Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin

A262



*"The Governors favor enhancement and encouragement of the AFDC for Unemployed Parents program. Some suggest higher matching, extension to every State by requirement or bonuses \* \* \* Opposition was expressed to new requirements in the bill"*

National Governors' Conference

Hearing  
page  
A261

## SEC. 204.—COMMUNITY WORK AND TRAINING

### PRESENT LAW

Under present law there is no compulsory work program for welfare recipients. In 1962 the Congress authorized the States to require that AFDC adult recipients work off assistance payments through community work and training programs. Twelve States<sup>1</sup> have acted to provide such programs, but even in these States it is not required that the program be in effect throughout the State (it may cover only a single, or a few, communities). Moreover, no Federal matching was authorized for the cost of training, materials, and supervision.

The Federal authorizing statute requires that services under a community work and training program must be performed for the State public assistance agency or another public agency under a program administered or supervised by the public assistance agency. It also requires that the work serve a useful public purpose; that it not displace regular workers or be a substitute for work that would otherwise be performed by employees of public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations; and that it be of a type not normally undertaken by the State or community in the past.

In addition, the Federal law requires that "payments for such work are at rates not less than the minimum rate (if any) provided by or under State law for the same type of work and not less than the rates prevailing in similar work in the community." It also makes provision for the protection of the health and safety of the workers; requires that child care arrangements be made for dependent children while the parent or other relative is working, and provides time for them to seek regular employment; and makes job placement services of State employment offices available to them.

Finally the Federal statute prohibits a State from denying aid either to a worker or a dependent child for a worker's refusal to perform any such work if he has good cause for such refusal.

Authority for Federal matching under community work and training programs is scheduled to expire June 30, 1968.

<sup>1</sup> California, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

### HOUSE BILL

Expressing concern for the sharp rise in the number of recipients under the welfare program for aid to families with dependent children (from 646,000 families that include 2.4 million recipients to 1.2 million families and nearly 5 million recipients in only 10 years) the House seeks to reverse this trend by requiring all States to establish community work and training programs by July 1, 1969, and by requiring that the State deny aid with respect to an appropriate relative or dependent child age 16 to 21 (or "essential person") if he refuses without good cause to work or undergo training.

The work and training program at the Federal level would be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and at the State level by the State welfare agency.

As described to this point, the House bill tightens existing law by (1) making work and training programs compulsory both on the States and on the AFDC welfare recipients who are found to be "appropriate" for work or training; (2) establishing the age of dependent children required to participate in work or training at 16, rather than 18 (if they are not in school); (3) requiring "essential persons" to accept work or training; and (4) requiring (rather than permitting) the States to deny aid with respect to any of these persons who refuse without good cause to accept work or undergo training. In addition, the House bill requires that a work and training program must be set up in every political jurisdiction of a State where a significant number of AFDC families reside.

No objective criteria are included in the House bill for determining who is "appropriate" for work or training. The House committee report does attempt to give some guidance by indicating that "in some instances—where there are several small children, for example—the best plan for a family may be for the mother to stay at home." Despite this, the House bill has been criticized as attempting to put mothers to work contrary to the best interest of the dependent children.

Where a dependent child or a relative or "essential person" who has been found appropriate for work or training refuses to accept a job or undertake training and his welfare benefit is terminated for such refusal vendor and protective payments are authorized to be made on behalf of other dependent children in the family group. The States would not have to pay the children in such cases, but if they did, only the protective or vendor payment method could be used. These payments are designed to assure that children do not suffer because of the fault of someone else. (See chart below for more detailed description of provisions of present law and H.R. 12080.)



## PRESENT LAW

Federal matching is authorized, for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1968, for grants to people engaged in work and training projects. Twelve States make such payments. Federal participation in these payments may be made only under conditions designed to assure protection of the health and welfare of the children and their relatives:

- (1) The work must be performed for the State public assistance agency or another public agency under a program (which need not be in effect throughout the State) administered by or under the supervision of the State public assistance agency.
- (2) There must be State financial participation in these expenditures.
- (3) The State plan must include provisions which give reasonable assurance that—
  - (a) appropriate health, safety, and other conditions of work will be maintained;
  - (b) the rates of pay will be not less than the applicable minimum rate under State law for the same type of work, if there is any such rate, and not less than the prevailing wage rates on similar work in the community;
  - (c) the work projects will serve a useful public purpose; will not displace regular workers or be a substitute for work that would otherwise be performed by employees of public or private agencies, institutions, or organizations; and (except in the case of emergency or nonrecurring projects) will be of a type not normally undertaken by the State or community in the past;
  - (d) the additional expenses of going to work or training will be considered in determining the worker's needs;
  - (e) the worker will have reasonable opportunities to seek regular employment and secure appropriate training or retraining and will be provided with protection under the State workmen's compensation law or similar protection; and
  - (f) aid will not be denied because of a relative's refusal with good cause to perform work under the program.

## H.R. 12080

Makes such community work and training programs mandatory on the States effective with July 1, 1969. Age 18 is changed to age 16. Also includes dependent children over 16 and "essential person."

- (1) Same except that community work and training programs must be established in every political jurisdiction where a significant number of AFDC families reside. In addition, States could contract with private agencies.
  - (2) No change.
  - (3)
    - (a) No change.
    - (b) Federal minimum wage legislation would also apply, except that payments for work by individuals who are learners or handicapped workers may be at special lesser rates that are in accord with such State and Federal laws.
    - (c) Removes requirement that project will not be of a type normally undertaken by the State or community in the past.

- (d) No change.
- (e) No change.

(f) Bill also provides that (1) all appropriate recipients of AFDC to register and periodically reregister at the State employment office, and (2) requires that if any child or relative refuses without good cause (a) to register or reregister, (b) to accept bona fide offers of employment, or (c) to accept training,

## PRESENT LAW

(4) The State plan must also include provision for—

- (a) Cooperative arrangements with the public employment offices and with the State vocational education and adult education agency or agencies looking toward employment and occupational training of the relatives and maximum use of public vocational or adult education services and facilities in their training or retraining.

(b) Assuring appropriate arrangements for the care and protection of the child during the relative's absence from the home in order to perform the work under the program.

(c) Such other provisions as the Secretary finds necessary to assure that the operation of the program will not interfere with the objectives of the aid to dependent children program.

(5) A State participating in such a program must also provide (in its State plan) that there will be no adjustment or recovery by the State or any locality on account of any payments which are correctly made for the work.

The cost of administration of a State plan for which Federal funds are paid may not include the cost of making or acquiring materials or equipment in connection with work under a community work and training program or the cost of supervision of that work, and may only include those other costs attributable to the programs which are permitted by the Secretary.

## H.R. 12080

adult relative, essential person or child who so refuses shall not have his needs taken into account, and in the case where the caretaker relative so refuses, his needs cannot be taken into account and the payments can be made to the children only if by a protective payment, vendor payment, or to a foster parent. (However, the usual determination that the caretaker cannot handle the funds would not have to be made.)

(4) Services and facilities under the MDTA and other work programs shall be utilized.

(a) Provides also that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare enter into cooperative arrangements with the Secretary of Labor for the provision of the services offered by State employment offices to recipients and applicants for AFDC. The expenses of furnishing to recipients or applicants for testing, counseling, and other individual employment services would be reimbursed by the welfare agency at the 75-percent rate (85 percent until July 1, 1969).

- (b) No change.
- (c) Essentially the same.
- (5) No change.

Provides for Federal matching of the costs of materials, training, and supervision at the rate of 75 percent on July 1, 1969, and 85 percent from Oct. 1, 1967, to July 1, 1969, if the program meets the new conditions.



### Staff—HEW—Labor Suggestions

The basic thrust of the House bill—to provide for a compulsory work and training program—would be retained, but it would be administered completely by the Department of Labor rather than by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Welfare agencies would be responsible for maintenance payments, medical care, child care, and supportive social services for individuals participating in the program.

Under this suggestion, State welfare agencies would make determinations and refer all "appropriate" AFDC welfare recipients to the employment office managing the work and training program under the Department of Labor.

Appropriate persons would not include (1) any person with illness, incapacity, advanced age, or remoteness from a project that precludes effective participation in a work and training project, (2) a child who is attending school full time, (3) persons whose substantially continuous presence in the home is required because of the illness or incapacity of another member of the household, (4) a mother who is caring for a child under the age of 3, or (5) a mother who is caring for two or more children, one or more of whom is of preschool age, if such mother's presence in the home is in the best interest of the children. Notwithstanding these and such other criteria as the Secretary may establish, any individual receiving aid under this part who desires to participate in work training shall be considered for assignment and, unless the State welfare agency specifically disapproves her request, she would be referred to the program.

A refusal to accept work or undertake training without good cause by a person who has been referred would be reported back to the State agency by the Labor Department; and unless such person returns to the program within 60 days (during which he would receive counseling), his welfare payment would be terminated. Protective and vendor payments would be provided to protect dependent children from the faults of others. Under the House bill, such payments would be optional with the States but under the suggested proposal the child would be given this protection.

Work and training programs under this suggestion must be established in each State and in each political subdivision in which the Secretary of Labor determines that there is a significant number of AFDC recipients age 16 or over. While this is similar to a requirement in the House bill, the suggestion goes further by requiring that appropriate individuals who live in an area where there is no program in operation be transported to a neighboring area where there is a program.

Persons referred to the employment office are to be counseled and their capabilities and experience are to be determined. Based on the results of these steps the recipients would be moved into work or training or both. Those for whom jobs can be found will be moved directly into regular work. Some counseling may be involved but these people will be under the regular earnings exemption for people in private employment. For people in this category the earnings exemption (\$30 plus one-third of the excess over \$30 in the House bill) would apply.

Some people will be suitable for institutional training and the Labor Department and HEW would like to provide up to a \$20 per week training incentive payment. They feel their experience with other training programs demonstrates that training can be achieved both more quickly and more thoroughly at less total cost if such an incentive is provided. Other people, who have insufficient work experience or capability to enable them to go to work immediately, would undergo work training in work training projects to equip them with good work habits and experience. They also will receive their grants plus up to \$20 a week as a training incentive.

Welfare recipients who are found to be unsuitable either for regular employment training or work experience training would be given jobs with employers, public or private, under agreements made with the Secretary of Labor. Work under such agreements could not result in the displacement of regular employed workers and would have to be of a type which under the circumstances in the local situation would not be performed by regular employees.

It would be required that these workers receive at least the Federal minimum wage (if such work would ordinarily be covered under minimum wage legislation), or the prevailing wage, if higher, for their services. In measuring whether they are paid the minimum wage, amounts paid by the Secretary to the employer with respect to their employment would be taken into account. Only that part of the total wages which are not subsidized by the welfare payment would be subject to social security, unemployment compensation, or other Federal taxes.

The plan would work like this: The State welfare agency would pay into a special pool for each project on behalf of each person it refers who is in the project an amount equal to:

- (1) The welfare benefit he would be entitled to if he were not in this program, or, if smaller;
- (2) Eighty percent of the wages (including the subsidy) paid to the worker by the employer in the project.

The Secretary of Labor would contract for work for the participants in the project on the best terms he can negotiate and the amount of the funds paid by him to an employer would depend on these negotiations.

The extent to which the State welfare payment might be reduced depends largely upon the negotiating efforts of the Secretary of Labor. If he is successful in placing these workers in job slots where the pay is relatively good, the contribution the State must make into the employment pool would be less.

Employees who work under these agreements would have their situations constantly reevaluated by the employment office at regular intervals (at least every 6 months) for the purpose of moving as many such employees as possible into regular employment.

An important facet of this suggested work program is that in most instances the recipient would no longer receive a welfare check. Instead, he would receive a payment from an employer for services performed by him. In those cases where an employee receives wages (including the subsidy) which are insufficient to raise his income to a level equal to his grant plus 20 percent of his wages, a welfare check equal to the difference would be paid. In these instances the supplemental check would be issued by the welfare agency and sent to the worker. The earnings exemption would not apply to this employment.



## ILLUSTRATION OF HOW SUGGESTIONS WOULD WORK

A local public welfare agency screens all of its AFDC cases and finds after furnishing various social and medical services that 45 women are appropriate for referral to the local employment office for work or training. The welfare agency works out child-care arrangements for the mothers, using relatives in some cases and purchasing the care in others.

The local employment office provides employment testing, interviewing, and counseling to the women. The office determines that seven of the women have skills that are wanted in the locality and finds regular jobs for them. (In several cases it was the lack of day-care facilities which kept the women from taking regular work.) The earnings of some of these women is enough that they need no more assistance and go off the welfare rolls. In some other cases they earn enough to reduce their assistance payments, in varying degrees, in accordance with the earnings exemption.

The employment office finds that 20 of the women show manual dexterity skills which offer good promise that they can be trained for jobs in knitting mills in the area. The office enrolls the women in a training course funded under the manpower development and training program and pays them \$20 a week as a training incentive. This \$20 is in addition to their grant. Eighteen of these women complete the training and get jobs, two of them did not complete the training because of changes in their home situations which required their presence. Eight of the women were placed in a work-training project because it was determined that they needed several weeks of actual work experience to get accustomed to the situation and to gain self-confidence. Several of these were later trained in a specific skill and placed in regular employment. These women also were given \$20 a week as a training incentive. The employment office found that 10 of the 45 women have very limited educational ability and show very little aptitude or potential for developing any work skills. As to them, the employment office enters into an agreement with the Ajax Co. under which the company agrees to have the 10 women work as attendants in the women's restrooms in an office building. Since this is not a service which the company would provide if it had to pay the full minimum wage, this is work that does not replace any other workers and which would otherwise go unperformed.

The agreement further specifies that the women will work for 35 hours each week at \$1.40 an hour—the applicable minimum wage—and that the \$1.40 will be evenly divided between what the Ajax Co. will contribute and what the employment office will contribute—\$0.70 an hour for each. Thus, each woman—working 35 hours a week at \$1.40 an hour—will receive a monthly "wage" of \$270. Half of the wage will come from the employer and one-half from the employment office. In this case, the welfare office would send to the employment office the following amounts on behalf of the 10 women:

2 women, grant of \$100	\$200
5 women, grant of \$150	750
2 women, grant of \$210	420
1 woman, grant of \$300	1216

Total

1,386

1.80 percent of wage is less than total grant.

Since the amount which the employment office owes the Ajax Co. is \$1,350, the employment office can return \$236 to the welfare agency as a saving to the AFDC program—to be shared by the State and Federal Government in proportion to the matching formula applicable to the States.

The two women whose family grant would otherwise have been \$100 will be \$170 a month better off; the women at \$150 will be \$120 better off, and the two women at \$210 will be \$60 better off. The woman whose grant would otherwise be \$300 would get her wages of \$270 plus the amount of her welfare payment which was not sent to the employment office—\$84—for a total income of \$354. The latter computation is made under the provision which guarantees that a woman will receive at least 20 percent of wages plus her grant rather than her AFDC grant alone.

The employment office keeps in close touch with the Ajax Co. about the performance and work habits of the women and furnishes counseling where needed. In one case, the employment office arranges for the welfare agency to furnish social services to remove a family problem which is influencing behavior at work. After several weeks the employment office receives a request from a restaurant for a ladies room attendant and one of the women, whose work habits are good, is referred to and gets the job.

## COSTS

The table below indicates the relative costs and savings of the House bill and the staff suggestion. While the net costs to the program are somewhat less under the suggestions, it should be noted that many more AFDC adults would be working and off the rolls.

Increased taxes these people would pay are not reflected in the table. Neither, of course, are the intangible benefits to society, such as the fact that the children in these homes will have the example of a working parent to emulate, and the fact that the working parent will have a more positive attitude toward society in general.

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Work training expenses		Day care		AFDC reduction due to training		Net	
	House bill	Pro-posal	House bill	Pro-posal	House bill	Pro-posal	House bill	Pro-posal
1968	—	\$130	—	—	—	(?)	\$120	\$130
1969	\$45	182	\$7.5	\$7.5	—\$41	—\$41	216	216
1970	90	195	155	155	—115	—115	235	235
1971	135	247	250	250	—55	—214	330	283
1972	225	364	470	470	—130	—340	565	494

1 Only \$28,000,000 is attributable to work and training costs during this year.

2 State-local costs will be reduced as follows: Fiscal year 1969, \$31,900,000; fiscal year 1970, \$90,200,000; fiscal year 1971, \$168,300,000; fiscal year 1972, \$207,800,000.



WORK-TRAINING IMPACT UNDER HOUSE BILL AND PROPOSAL

[In thousands]

Fiscal year	Trainees		Full-time job placements		AFDC recipient reduction	
	House	Proposal	House	Proposal	House	Proposal
1968	50	100		50		155
1969	100	140	110	70	40	282
1970	150	150	20	75	80	300
1971	150	190	30	95	120	380
1972	250	280				

<sup>1</sup> Based on 20-percent placement assumption used by HEW in preparing figures.

Positions of Witnesses on House-Passed Provision

*Favor provisions in H.R. 12080*

American Parents Committee	Hearing page 958
Charlee, Hon. John H., Governor of Rhode Island	A283
Council of State Chambers of Commerce	1256
Department of Health & Social Services, State of Wisconsin	A262
Evans, Hon. Daniel J., Governor of Washington	A220
Illinois Department of Public Aid	A147
Iowa State Board of Social Welfare	A72
Kerner, Hon. Otto, Governor, State of Illinois	A224
Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado	A174
Maine Department of Health & Welfare	A211
Moss, Hon. Frank E., U.S. Senator (favors concept)	891
National Association of Counties	1289
National Association Manufacturers	A161
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.	1727
National Farmers Union	1108
National Federation of Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.	A279
Oregon chapter, National Association of Social Workers	A65
Puerto Rico Medical Association	1388
Rhodes, Hon. James A., Governor of Ohio (would apply to all AFDC mothers, with 90-percent matching)	A14
Winter Park, Fla., Chamber of Commerce	A43

*Oppose provisions in H.R. 12080*

Family Service Association of Wyoming Valley	A105
Northeast Neighborhood Counseling Center, Kansas City, Kans.	A33
Wisconsin Welfare Council	A105

*Oppose provisions in H.R. 12080 and generally favor provisions in H.R. 5710*

AFL-CIO Administration	Hearing page 1415
Citizen's Committee for Children of New York	211
Community Service Society of New York	2019
Employment Security Commission of Arizona	1517
Garrett, H. Fred, Boise, Idaho	A195
Hearnes, Hon. Warren E., Governor of Missouri	A76
Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies	A86
Kehl, E. M., Wisconsin	A102
Maine Employment Security Commission	A89
National Association of Social Workers	A83
Volpe, Hon. John A., Governor of Massachusetts	930
Williamson, Alan, commissioner, South Dakota Employment Security Department	1153
	A79

*Favors clarification that 85 percent matching will be available to States that have already implemented such program, not just States starting out*

Illinois Public Aid Commission	A149
--------------------------------	------

*Favor having programs run by other than public welfare agency*

Alabama Department of Pensions and Security	A7
Arthritis Foundation, New York chapter (Department of Labor)	A180
Caldwell, Hon. Sam, commissioner of labor, Georgia (Department of Labor)	835
Cleveland Welfare Federation	A35
Episcopal Action Group on Poverty	1733
Flint, Mich., chapter of National Association of Social Workers (Department of Labor)	A228
Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator (Department of Labor)	1397
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator (Department of Labor)	775
Lindsay, Hon. John V., mayor, New York City (Department of Labor)	1123
Moss, Hon. Frank E., U.S. Senator (Department of Labor)	891
National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA	1727
National Council of Senior Citizens (Department of Labor)	1069
National Farmers Union (Department of Labor)	1108
National Federation of Government Employees (Department of Labor)	A128
Physicians Forum (Department of Labor)	A241



*Favor removing compulsory work features*

	Hearing page
Administration-----	211
Allred, Zella D., Salt Lake City, Utah-----	A15
American Civil Liberties Union-----	1226
American Nurses Association-----	951
American Public Welfare Association-----	999
Arthritis Foundation, New York chapter-----	A180
Association of State Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Directors-----	A90
Board of directors, Health & Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis-----	A251
Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii-----	A213
Central Iowa chapter, National Association of Social Workers-----	A78
Child Welfare League of America (favors language of present law for assuring appropriate child care services)-----	1321
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York-----	2019
Cleveland Welfare Federation-----	A35
Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ-----	1736
Council of Jewish Federations & Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York-----	1611
Curris, Hon. Kenneth M., Governor of Maine-----	A175
Docking, Hon. Robert, Governor of Kansas-----	A111
Eliot, Dr. Martha M., chairman, Massachusetts Committee on Children & Youth-----	763
Episcopal Action Group on Poverty-----	1733
Family & Child Services of Washington, D.C.-----	A225
Family Service of Montgomery County, Pa.-----	A260
Flinn, Mich., Chapter of National Association of Social Workers-----	A228
Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement & Administra- tion of Justice Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency State of Massachusetts-----	A170
Hawaii, State of-----	A123
Health & Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N. Y.-----	A258
Health & Welfare Council of the National Capital Area-----	1487
Hughes, Hon. Harold E., Governor of Iowa (opposes blanket requirements that all AFDC mothers undergo work training or be required to work)-----	A266
Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator-----	1397
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago-----	A104
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator-----	900
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator-----	775
Landsay, Hon. John Y. Mayor, New York City-----	1123
Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado-----	A174
Lutheran Family & Children's Services of St. Louis, Mo.-----	A84
Maine Department of Health & Welfare-----	A211
Maine Department of Health & Welfare Advisory Committee, Citizen's Advisory Committee to the Bureau of Social Wel- fare, Executive Committee, Maine Conference on Social Welfare-----	A118
Medical Committee for Human Rights-----	1356
National Conference of Catholic Charities-----	1356

	Hearing page
National Consumers League-----	A121
National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA-----	1727
National Council on Illegitimacy-----	1476
National Council of Jewish Women-----	A227
National Council of Negro Women-----	1501
National Council of Senior Citizens-----	1069
National Farmers Union-----	1108
National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union-----	1088
National Welfare Rights Organization-----	1463
Oregon Social Welfare Association, Inc.-----	1793
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare-----	A253
Planned Parenthood-World Population-----	1495
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare-----	A283
Scholarship, Education, and Defense Fund for Racial Equality-----	1919
Shepard, Richard G.-----	A198
South Dakota chapter, National Association of Social Workers-----	A110
Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School-----	1761
Travelers Aid Society of Washington, D.C.-----	A275
Tydings, Hon. Joseph D., U.S. Senator-----	1799
United Auto Workers-----	1637
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights-----	A183
Utah Chapter, National Association of Social Workers-----	A188
Utah Division of Welfare-----	A106
Volpe, Hon. John A., Governor, State of Massachusetts-----	1153
<i>Opposes provision for mandatory work or training as a condition of assistance without regard for certain factors</i>	
National Urban League-----	A277
<i>Favors welfare agency administration</i>	
American Public Welfare Association-----	999
Maine Department of Health & Welfare-----	A211
National Rehabilitation Association-----	A131
<i>Favors provision for training</i>	
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator-----	775
<i>Opposes requirement that States establish work and training programs on a "crash" basis</i>	
National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union-----	1088



*Language should be clarified so that it is clear mother will not be denied benefits for nonacceptance of employment in case where child care arrangements are not appropriate*

Illinois Public Aid Commission.....  
Hearing page  
A148

*Favors provision for minimum wage under work and training programs*

National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union.....  
1088

*Favors Federal participation in work training programs*

Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare.....  
A283

*Favors increased Federal funds for nonmandatory community work and training programs*

National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union.....  
1088

*\*\*\* mothers should be offered employment opportunities only when the best interests of their children would be served in so doing"*

Wyman, George K., commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services.....  
1543

*Favor making counseling and day care services available to mothers who want to work*

National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA.....  
1727

*Opposes provision for 85 percent (later 75 percent) Federal matching for work and training*

National Association of Manufacturers.....  
A161

*Favors section 204(f), paying for employment services*

Illinois Public Aid Commission.....  
A151

*Opposes requirement of establishment of a project in every area where there are a substantial number of recipients:*

Hawaii, State of.....  
A123

*Favors requirement that appropriate arrangements be provided for the care and protection of a child while his parent is participating in a work and training program*

Administration.....  
Hearing page  
211

*Opposes omission of labor standards in work and training programs*

Episcopal Action Group on Poverty.....  
1733

*Use provision for adults and children over 16 "when use of such resource is appropriate"*

Hawaii, State of.....  
A123

*Favors authorization for project grants for needy persons not eligible for AFDC*

Administration.....  
211

*Favors training incentive payments for trainees in work and training projects of \$20 a week*

Administration.....  
211

*Favors removing "learner" exceptions to requirement to pay minimum wages and prevailing community rates*

Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School.....  
1761

*"There should be some specifics for job development and some aim toward technical and vocational training"*

ADC Association of Lane County, Inc., Oregon.....  
1794

*Favors requirement that the training offered should not be below individual's last regular occupation*

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.....  
A183

*Supports bill, but rejects Administration approach of devolving authority with Department of Labor. Federal law should not spell out the detailed administrative arrangements that a State should follow in carrying out programs*

Illinois Public Aid Commission.....  
A149



"A massive compulsory work program as provided in H.R. 12080 may very well seriously undermine labor standards"

National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA..... Hearing page 1727

*Favors greater emphasis on statewide planning for work and training programs*

Hughes, Hon. Harold E., Governor of Iowa..... A266

*Favors community work and training programs only under particular conditions; favors 90-percent Federal matching*

Hughes, Hon. Harold E., Governor of Iowa..... A266

*The Governors \* \* \* "have great praise for the self-help programs, particularly the idea of work training for mothers on AFDC. Most Governors do not think this should be compulsory across the board"*

National Governors' Conference..... A261

*Believes a federally supported work and training program equal in incentives and benefits to MDTA, title V of EOA, etc, would be more productive than work relief program under public welfare*

Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare..... A253

*Favors requirement that the agency must make a determination that the children will be adequately cared for before a mother is declared appropriate for training or employment*

American Public Welfare Association..... 999

*Oppose disregarding minimum wage in work and training programs*

Health and Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N. Y.----- A258  
Oregon Social Welfare Association, Inc.----- 1793  
Scholarship, Education, and Defense Fund for Racial Equality----- 1919  
Travelers Aid Society of Washington, D. C.----- A275

*Favors making certain these provisions would not violate National Labor Relations Act*

Scholarship, Education, and Defense Fund for Racial Equality..... Hearing page 1919

*Favors proposals which would increase the number of jobs and job training systems*

Lindsay, Hon. John V., mayor, city of New York..... 1123

*Favors safeguards for those assigned, including payment of prevailing wage and in no case less than minimum wage*

American Federation of Government Employees..... A128

*Favors directing Secretary of HEW to develop guidelines to protect the rights and interests of families and children under the work and training provisions*

American Public Welfare Association..... 999

*Opposes provision requiring the State agency administering AFDC to pay the Secretary of Labor for expenses involved for "testing and counseling services and other such services"*

Bonin, Garland L., commissioner, Louisiana Department of Public Welfare..... 1023

*Believes relocation of families is increasing problem in work and training programs for public assistance recipients—suggests consideration by the Congress*

Illinois Public Aid Commission..... A155

*Favors 90 percent Federal matching for work and training programs*

Administration (as in title V of EOA)----- 211  
Bonin, Garland L., commissioner, Louisiana Department of Public Welfare..... 1023

*"We question the advisability and even the constitutionality of compulsory requirements of work or training"*

Physicians Forum..... A241



*Favors use of private proprietary schools in work and training programs*

United Business Schools Association..... Hearing Page A231

*Recognizes "the importance of the expansion of the community work and training provisions of the bill"*

Flint, Mich., chapter of National Association of Social Work... A228

*Favors making program voluntary with States*

National Committee for Day Care of Children..... A178

*Favors making mandatory either July 1, 1969, or within 90 days after adjournment of first regular session of State legislature, whichever is later*

Texas State Department of Public Welfare..... A200

*Favors Federal funds for work and training*

National Urban League..... A277

*Favors 100-percent Federal share for education and training programs*

Maine Department of Health and Welfare..... A211

*Favors, but with amendment to require study by DHEW on how to avoid abuses under existing programs and reinstatement of specific language in present law*

California Rural Legal Assistance..... 1926

SEC. 206.—EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

PRESENT LAW	H. R. 12080
<p>No provision</p>	<p>Emergency assistance may be given for a period not in excess of 30 days in any 12-month period in the case of a needy child under age 21 who is (or, within a period specified by the Secretary, has been) living with any of the relatives specified in the Act in a place of residence maintained by such a relative as his home</p> <p>The Federal share will be 50 percent of the total expenditures under such plan for such assistance in the form of payments for items, services, and medical care and 75 percent of the total expenditures for such assistance in the form of welfare services. Effective upon enactment.</p>

**Suggestion**

Extend period from 30 to 60 days and include language allowing a State to set up projects to handle migratory labor emergency situations for the same length of time. (This provision could not be used in the case of a family where the mother or father had refused work or training without good cause.)

**Cost:**  
 Increase from 30 to 60 days together with optional extension to migratory labor will increase House bill cost \$10 million in fiscal 1969, \$20 million in fiscal 1970, and \$35 million annually thereafter.

**Positions of Witnesses on House Passed Provision**  
*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Administration (would make emergency assistance available for up to 120 days and would provide for 75 percent Federal share)	211	Hearing page
Alabama Department of Pensions and Security (favors same matching as AFDC program)	A7	
American Public Welfare Association (prefers time limit of 2 or 3 months; recommends that participating States be prohibited from refusing assistance because of any residence or settlement requirements)	999	
Board of Directors, Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis	A251	
Bonin, Garland L., Commissioner, Louisiana Department of Public Welfare	1023	
Colorado State Department of Public Welfare (would extend period to 90 days)	A174	
Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin	A44	
Hawaii, State of (opposes limit of 30 days)	A262	
Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado	A123	
	A174	



National Association of Counties-----	Hearing page
National Conference of Catholic Charities-----	1289
National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA-----	1356
National Federation of Social Service Employees and Social Service Employees Union-----	1727
Puerto Rico Medical Association-----	1088
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare-----	1388
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (favours, but extend to 60 days and increase Federal matching so it is competitive with other Federal aid programs)-----	A283
	A183

**SEC. 207.—PROTECTIVE AND VENDOR PAYMENTS**

PRESENT LAW

Authorizes protective payments to be made (limited in number to 5 percent of recipients) to a person who is interested in or concerned with the welfare of the dependent child and relative, under a State plan which provides for—

- (1) determination by the State agency that payments in this form are necessary because the relative is so unable to manage funds that it would be contrary to the child's welfare to make payments to such relative;
- (2) meeting all the need of individuals (in conjunction with other income and resources), with respect to whom they are made, under rules otherwise applicable under the State plan for determining need and the amount of assistance to be paid;
- (3) special efforts to improve the ability of the relative to manage funds, and periodic review of the situation to determine whether such payments to another interested person are still necessary—and with provision for judicial appointment of a guardian or legal representative if the need for payments to another interested person continues beyond a period specified by the Secretary;
- (4) opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency on the determination that payments to another interested person are necessary; and
- (5) aid in the form of foster family care, as provided for in the Social Security Act.

H. R. 12080

Deletes 5-percent limitation on number of recipients who can be under this method of payment. Adds authority for vendor payments under same conditions for protective payments as outlined below. (Vendor payments are made on behalf of family or child directly to a person furnishing food, living accommodations, or other goods, services, or items to or for such family.)

(1) In the case of an individual who refuses to take the steps leading to employment, vendor or protective payments may be provided without meeting the requirements.

(2) Deletes requirement of meeting full need.

(3) No change.

(4)  No change.

(5) No change.

Provision made permanent.

**Suggestion**

Would put 10-percent limitation on the number of recipients for whom the State can make vendor or protective payments but excludes from this overall limitation those recipients for whom such payments have been made because of the refusal without good cause of an individual to work, register for work, or to participate under a training or work program. In the case of an individual who makes such a refusal, the State must make his payment in the form of a vendor or protective payment but not for a period (during which he or she is undergoing counseling) of more than 60 days in any one year. At the end of the period such individual will be removed from the rolls but the rest of the family will continue to get vendor or protective payments based on their needs. (The emergency services provision would not be available for this type of AFDC family.)

*Cost:*

No cost for protective or vendor payments, but 60-day counseling provision will cost between \$1 and \$1½ million in first year increasing to \$4 million in 1972.

**Positions of Witnesses on House-Passed Provision**

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Administration (urges limiting the number of children who may be provided for in this way to 10 percent)-----	Hearing page
American Parents Committee-----	211
Illinois Public Aid Commission (favours additional language so that vendor payments might be combined with money payments "in such manner as may be appropriate in view of the nature and extent of the fund management problem presented, with the intent that payments to such suppliers be utilized only in cases of chronic and serious mismanagement of funds and in such a way that the needy individual can be returned at the earliest possible time to full control of his money payments")-----	958
Kerner, Hon. Otto, Governor of Illinois-----	A153
National Association of Counties-----	A224
National Association of Manufacturers-----	1289
National Council of Jewish Women-----	A161
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare (favours limit of 5 percent of caseload for vendor payments)-----	A227
Puerto Rico Medical Association-----	A253
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare (favours 10 percent of caseload limitation)-----	1388
	A283



*Oppose provision in H.R. 12080*

Alabama Department of Pensions and Security	-----	Hearing page
Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii	-----	A7
Child Welfare League of America	-----	A213
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York	-----	1321
Community Service Society of New York	-----	1517
Hawaii, State of	-----	1517
National Urban League	-----	A123
Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School	-----	A277
	-----	1761

*Opposes provisions for liberalized and increased use of protective payments as provided in sections 207, 201(a), and 204(a)*

Martin, David H., deputy director, law reform, Neighborhood Legal Services Project, Washington, D.C.	-----	A268
--	-------	------

*Opposes elimination of the 5-percent limitation on the number of AFDC children for whom protective payments may be made*

Board of Directors, Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis	-----	A251
--	-------	------

**SEC. 208.—LIMITATION ON NUMBERS OF FEDERALLY AIDED CHILDREN**

PRESENT LAW

H.R. 12080

There is no limit on Federal participation in expenditures other than the \$32 a month average maximum for all recipients of AFDC.

Provides that, for the purposes of Federal matching, the number of dependent children, deprived of parental support or care by reason of a parent's continued absence from the home, for any calendar quarter after 1967 shall not exceed the number bearing the same ratio to the total population of such State under age 21 on Jan. 1 of the year in which such quarter falls as the number of such dependent children with respect to whom such payments were made to such State for the calendar quarter beginning Jan. 1, 1967, bore to the total population of such State under age 21 on that date. No limit is imposed on Federal matching for children qualifying for AFDC based upon the death, incapacity, or unemployment of the parent.

**Suggestion**

Eliminate the "freeze" provision in H.R. 12080.

*Cost:*  
Savings in House bill of \$18 million in fiscal 1968 would be eliminated.

*Positions of Witnesses on House-Passed Provision*

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Council of State Chambers of Commerce	-----	Hearing page
Puerto Rico Medical Association	-----	1256
	-----	1388

*"Our first reaction is one of concern without being sure as to whether this provision should be opposed"*

Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin	-----	A262
--	-------	------

*Oppose provision in H.R. 12080*

ADC Association of Lane County, Inc., Oregon Administration	-----	1794
AFL-CIO	-----	211
Alabama Department of Pensions & Security	-----	415
Allred, Zella D., Salt Lake City, Utah	-----	A7
American Association of University Women, Michigan Division	-----	A15
American Civil Liberties Union	-----	A132
American Nurses Association	-----	1226
American Parents Committee	-----	951
American Public Welfare Association	-----	958
Arthritis Foundation, New York Chapter	-----	999
Association of State Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Directors	-----	A180
Board of Directors, Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis	-----	A90
Brooke, Hon. Edward W., U.S. Senator	-----	A251
Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii	-----	826
Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress	-----	A213
California Rural Legal Assistance (if retained, should be based on numbers of families in poverty)	-----	1537
Central Iowa Chapter, National Association of Social Workers	-----	1926
Chafee, Hon. John H., Governor of Rhode Island	-----	A78
Child Welfare League of America	-----	A283
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York	-----	1321
Cleveland Welfare Federation	-----	2019
Colorado State Department of Public Welfare	-----	A35
Community Service Society of Greater New York	-----	A44
Community Service Society of New York	-----	1617
Congressmen Bingham, Cobelan, Don Edwards, Fraser, Ottinger, Rosenthal, Ryan, Diggs, George Brown, Conyers, Farstein, Hawkins, Kastenmeter, Resnick, Roybal, Dow, Scheuer, and Congresswoman Mink	-----	1517
	-----	A199



Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ—	
Council of Jewish Federations & Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York	1611
Curtis, Hon. Kenneth M., Governor of Maine	A175
Delaware Department of Public Welfare	A68
Docking, Hon. Robert, Governor of Kansas	A111
Elman, Richard M., author, "The Poorhouse State: The American Way of Life on Public Assistance"	A244
Episcopal Action Group on Poverty	1733
Evans, Hon. Daniel J., Governor of Washington	A220
Family and Child Services of Washington, D.C.	
Family Service Association of Wyoming Valley	A105
Federation of Protestant Welfare Agencies	A38
Flint, Mich., Chapter of National Association of Social Work	
Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, State of Massachusetts	A170
Green, William S., member, New York State Assembly	1307
Hawaii, State of	A123
Health and Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N.Y.	A258
Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area	1487
Hearnes, Hon. Warren E., Governor of Missouri	A86
Hillcrest Children's Services, Dubuque, Iowa	A223
Hoff, Hon. Philip H., Governor of Vermont	A107
Hughes, Hon. Harold E., Governor of Iowa	A266
Illinois Public Aid Commission	A148
Iowa State Board of Social Welfare	A72
Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator	1397
Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago	A104
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator	900
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator	775
Kerner, Hon. Otto, Governor of Illinois	A224
Lindsey, Hon. John V., Mayor, New York City	1123
Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado	1123
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors	A174
Lutheran Family and Children's Services of St. Louis, Mo.	A24
Maine Department of Health and Welfare	A84
Maine Department of Health and Welfare Advisory Committee, Citizens' Advisory Committee to the Bureau of Social Welfare, Executive Committee, Maine Conference on Social Welfare	A211
Marlin, David H., Deputy Director, Law Reform, Neighborhood Legal Services Project, Washington, D.C.	A268
Massachusetts General Court	A67
Medical Committee for Human Rights	A118
Moore, Hon. Dan, Governor of North Carolina	A85
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People	1259
National Association of Manufacturers	A161
National Association of Social Workers	930
National Committee for Day Care of Children	A178
National Consumers League	A121

Hearing  
page

National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA		Hearing page
National Council on Illegitimacy		1727
National Council of Jewish Women		1476
National Council of Negro Women		A227
National Council of Senior Citizens		1501
National Council of Senior Citizens		1069
National Governors' Conference		A261
National Farmers Union		1108
National Federation of Settlements & Neighborhood Centers		
National Federation of Social Service Employees & Social Service Employees Union		1088
National PTA		A100
National Presbyterian Health and Welfare Association of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA		1739
National Urban League		A277
National Welfare Rights Organization		1463
Northeast Neighborhood Counseling Center, Kansas City, Kans.		A33
Oregon chapter, National Association of Social Workers		A55
Oregon Social Welfare Association, Inc.		1793
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare		A253
Physicians Forum		A241
Planned Parenthood—World Population		1495
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare		A283
Rhodes, Hon. James A., Governor of Ohio		A14
Rockefeller, Hon. Nelson A., Governor of New York		A240
Shepard, Richard G.		A198
Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School		1761
Texas State Department of Public Welfare		A200
Travelers Aid Society of Washington, D.C.		A275
United Auto Workers		1637
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights		A183
Utah chapter, National Association of Social Workers		A188
Utah Division of Welfare		A106
Volpe, Hon. John A., Governor of Massachusetts		1153
Wisconsin Welfare Council		A105
Wyman, George K., commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services		1543

## SEC. 209.—HOME REPAIRS

PRESENT LAW

H.R. 12060

No provision

Provides that States may, under all federally financed assistance except AFDC, make payments for home repair or capital improvements for an owned home up to a total of \$500 with 50 percent Federal matching upon a finding to do so would be more economical than paying rent in other quarters.



**Suggestion**

Extend provision to apply to AFDC program.

Cost: Negligible.

**Positions of witnesses on House-Passed Provision**

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Alabama Department of Pensions and Security (with more favorable Federal matching)	A7	Hearing page
Board of directors, Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis	A251	
Puerto Rico Medical Association	1388	
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare	A283	

*Favors provision, but recommend inclusion of AFDC family*

ADC Association of Lane County, Inc., Oregon	1794
Administration	211
Colorado State Department of Public Welfare	A44
Illinois Public Aid Commission	A155
Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School	1761

*Favors 70 percent matching payment for States to help meet the cost (up to \$1,000) for repairing homes of assistance recipients*

National Farmers' Union	1108
-------------------------	------

**II. PRINTED AMENDMENTS**

**Amendment 287 (Boggs)**

This amendment would provide an increase from \$5 to \$12 in the amount of income that a State may disregard in determining an individual's need for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

**Amendment 331 (Hartke)**

This amendment would make various changes in the aid-to-the-blind program relating to the standards of assistance, the needs test, relative responsibility, applicability of liens, social services, Federal matching formula and "pass along" provision, and the residence requirement.

**Amendment 332 (Hartke)**

This amendment would provide that in determining a person's eligibility for payments under the aid-to-the-blind programs, the ability of the blind person's family to support him shall be disregarded.

**Amendment 333 (Hartke)**

This amendment would prohibit the States from establishing any duration of residence requirement in any approved program established under titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act.

**Amendment 350 (Long of Louisiana)**

This amendment would establish a new title to the Social Security Act to authorize a Federal-State program of aid to needy children who are in foster care—in a foster home or a child-care institution—and who are not eligible for AFDC. Federal matching funds would be authorized to States operating approved programs of aid to foster children for care furnished to children in both child-care institutions and foster family homes.

**Alternative to Amendment 350 Suggested by HEW**

While the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not advocate greater financial participation in foster-care costs at this time than would be authorized by H.R. 12080, it believes that if such participation is to be provided it would be desirable for it to be part of a more unified and balanced child welfare program than would be assumed by the amendment. This could be achieved in a manner similar to the treatment of child health programs under H.R. 12080. A single, increased authorization would be provided in the part (title IV, pt. B of H.R. 12080) authorizing child welfare services, with percentages of the total designated for foster care, day care, other child welfare services, and training and special projects. A single set of plan requirements could be incorporated. This type of structure would tend to assure balance and coordination between various parts of the program and would avoid having one part of it, foster care, under an open-end appropriation, while the remainder was under a specified authorization.

**Amendment 372 (Hartke)**

This amendment would provide that State agencies may, up to January 19, 1969, and must, thereafter, disregard any increase in old-age, survivor, and disability insurance benefits (enacted into law January 1, 1967) as to public assistance recipients on the rolls at the time the benefit increases were enacted.

**Amendment 375 (Randolph)**

This amendment would provide that State agencies may up to July 1, 1969, and must, thereafter, disregard any increase in old-age, survivor, and disability insurance benefits resulting from the enactment of the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

**Amendment 394 (McCarthy)**

This amendment would remove the provisions of H.R. 12080 which would impose a ceiling on Federal financial participation in the AFDC program.



**Amendment 395 (McCarthy)**

This amendment would provide (1) that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no mother shall be denied assistance if she refuses to take work or training; and (2) that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall transmit a special report to the Congress by January 1, 1971, on the extent of voluntary participation in work and training programs by such mothers.

**Amendment 400 (Harris)**

This amendment would amend the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act to provide that State agencies use and train "community service aides," composed to the extent possible of recipients, to assist in the administration of the State public welfare programs.

**Amendment 401 (Harris)**

This amendment would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a study and submit recommendations on ways in which public welfare agencies could assist recipients in securing protection of various types of laws and the extent to which State public assistance programs could be used to enforce local laws helpful to recipients.

**Amendment 403 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would cover physical therapy services under medicare no matter where performed if necessity therefor is certified by a physician.

**Amendment 404 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would remove the limitation in H. R. 12080 (sec. 208) on the number of AFDC cases for which Federal matching would be available.

**Amendment 405 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would increase the authorizations in H. R. 12080 for child welfare services from \$100 million for fiscal year 1969 to \$125 million and from \$110 million for following fiscal years to \$160 million.

**Amendment 406 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would make clear that the child-care service which a State would have to make for a participant in a community work and training program would be for the purpose of assuring that the absence of the parent at work or training would not hurt the child.

**Amendment 407 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would require the States to meet the full need of its cash assistance recipients as established by the State.

**Amendment 408 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would amend H. R. 12080 to provide that where a father refuses to register at the employment office or to accept work or training without good cause, the payments for the family can be

made in the form of protective or vendor payments. The vendor or protective payments can include the father or other relative who refused work or training for 60 days only if he or she is receiving counseling and other services to persuade him to accept work or training.

**Amendment 409 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would change the earnings exemption for AFDC families by exempting the first \$50 of monthly earnings, rather than \$30 as under H. R. 12080, and one-half of the earnings above that amount, rather than one-third as under H. R. 12080. In addition, the amendment would extend the earnings exemption to the old-age assistance and aid to the permanently and totally disabled programs.

**Amendment 410 (Ribicoff)**

This amendment would consolidate into one new title XX, programs of public assistance now in title I—old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged—title IV—aid to families with dependent children—title X—aid to the blind—and title XIV—aid to the permanently and totally disabled. In addition the new title would make the following major substantive changes in these programs: (1) provides that income standards must not be less than two-thirds that established under the States' medicaid program; (2) provides an earnings exemption similar to that which amendment no. 409 would provide, as described above; (3) requires in the case of families with needy children that the State establish a program for each member of such a family to strengthen family life and for other purposes (similar to proposal of administration); (4) establishes a community work and training program similar to that which the administration recommended in H. R. 5710; (5) limits the proportion of AFDC families for which vendor or protective payments are made to 10 percent of the caseload; and (6) extends the emergency assistance provision in H. R. 12080 to 90 days, rather than 30, and provides 75 percent Federal matching for all services rather than 50 percent for certain services and 75 percent for the remainder as in H. R. 12080.

**III. HOUSE-PASSED PROVISION NOT DISCUSSED PREVIOUSLY**

**SECTION 205—FOSTER CARE FOR AFDC CHILDREN**

PRESENT LAW

H. R. 12080

Allows Federal payments with respect to any child otherwise not eligible who—

(1) is removed, after Apr. 30, 1961, from home of specified relative as a result of a judicial determination that continuation therein would be contrary to his welfare;

(1) No change.



(2) is placed in a foster family home (approved by the State), with payment to the child care agency permitted for the period through June 30, 1968 as a result of such determination; or (for the period through June 30, 1968) in a nonprofit private child-care institution, subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary to include within Federal participation only cost items which are included in foster family home care. Provision is made for payments by the State or local agency for foster care in a foster family home or a child-care institution either directly or through a public or nonprofit private child-placement or child-care agency, and

(3) was receiving aid to dependent children in the month when court proceedings were started, and for whose placement and care the State agency administering the program is responsible.

For the period through June 30, 1968, responsibility for the placement and care of dependent children placed in foster care homes may rest either with the State or local agency administering the program under title IV or with any other public agency with whom the administering agency has an agreement. Such agreement must include provision for assuring development of a plan for each child which is satisfactory to the State public assistance agency and such other provisions as may be necessary to assure that the objectives of the State plan approved under title IV are met.

The Federal share is 5% of the 1st \$18 per recipient per month with variable grant matching on the amount up to \$32 per recipient per month. Variable grant matching above 1st \$18 has a Federal share which varies from 50 to 65 percent depending on per capita income of State.

(2) Makes permanent the inclusion of child care institutions and permission for payment for care to an agency in foster family situations.

(3) Modifies provisions to cover children: (1) who were not receiving payments in the month court proceedings started but would have received such aid if they had applied for it, or (2) who had been living with one of the relatives specified in the law within 6 months of the start of the court proceedings and if in the month they were removed from home of the relative they would have been eligible for assistance if they had applied for it.

Makes provision permanent.

Provides an alternative Federal matching maximum of \$100 a month for children in foster care. Effective after September 1967.

*Favor provision in H.R. 12080*

Administration.....	1611
American Parents Committee.....	211
Arthritis Foundation, Inc., New York Chapter.....	958
Board of Directors, Health and Welfare Council of Metropolitan St. Louis.....	A180
Colorado State Department of Public Welfare (favors removing requirement that child be removed by court order).....	A251
Community Council of Greater New York.....	A44
Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.....	1617
Curtis, Hon. Kenneth M., Governor of Maine.....	1611
Health and Welfare Council of Nassau County, Inc., Garden City, N.Y.....	A175
Illinois Public Aid Commission (favors clarification of the HEW interpretation which requires finding that child will be ineligible if he cannot be returned to home of relative within reasonable period of time).....	A258
Las Animas County Department of Public Welfare, Colorado.....	A150
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors (favors Federal participation in all foster care situations).....	A174
Maine Department of Health and Welfare.....	A24
National Association of Counties (would provide Federal financial help for all foster children).....	1289
National Council of Jewish Women.....	
National Federation of Social Service Employees and Social Service Employees Union.....	1088
National Urban League.....	A277
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare (favors removing requirement that child be removed by court order).....	A253
Puerto Rico Medical Association.....	1388
Rhode Island Department of Social Welfare (favors matching for children in foster care without court action).....	A283
Wyman, George K., Commissioner, New York State Department of Social Services (would expand coverage to include all needy children in foster care).....	1543

*Oppose provision in H.R. 12080*

American Cyril Liberties Union.....	1226
Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii (favors Federal matching for foster care irrespective of whether child is needy or nonneedy).....	A213
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator.....	775
Lindsay, Hon. John V., Mayor, New York City.....	1123

*Favors 50 percent open-end matching for children under foster care*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress.....	1537
---	------



Should be clarified so that child will be eligible if he had lived with parent or relative prior to court placement but his parents lacked sufficient means to meet the needs of foster care costs

Illinois Public Aid Commission..... Hearing page A151

Favors more money for foster care, but opposes provisions of the bill

Sparer, Edward V., Teacher of Law of Public Assistance, Yale Law School..... 1761

Favors provision for Federal participation in foster home care, but would prefer a greater extension

Department of Health and Social Services, State of Wisconsin... A262

IV. OTHER CHANGES SUGGESTED BY WITNESSES AT HEARING ON H.R. 12080

Favor Federal standard of need

Arthritis Foundation, New York chapter (at least to the Federal low-income poverty line (\$4,000 for a family of 4))	Hearing page A180
Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii	A213
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York	2019
Congressmen Bingham, Cohelan, Don Edwards, Fraser, Ottinger, Rosenthal, Ryan, Diggs, George Brown, Conyers, Farbstein, Hawkins, Kastenmeier, Resnick, Roybal, Dow, Scheuer, and Congresswoman Mink	1617
Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ, of Jewish Philanthropies and Welfare Funds, Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York	A199
National Federation of Social Service Employees and Social Service Employees Union	1736
National Presbyterian Health and Welfare Association of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA	1611
National Social Welfare Assembly	1088
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare	1739
Travelers Aid Society of Washington, D.C.	1938
YWCA	A253
	A275
	1632

Favors a maximum and a minimum standard of need which will be set by the Federal Government. If a State falls below standard, no Federal matching. If it provides assistance above Federal standard, the excess will go unmatched. States within allowable range will receive Federal matching of from 50 to 83 percent depending upon per capita income of the State

Illinois Public Aid Commission..... Hearing page A159

Favors "universal system of federally aided assistance as recommended by the Advisory Council on Public Welfare"

National Social Welfare Assembly..... 1938

Favor provision to require benefit increases to be passed along to public assistance recipients:

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress	1537
Forbes, Sidney	A192
Hearnes, Hon. Warren E., Governor of Missouri	A86
Kennedy, Hon. Edward M., U.S. Senator	900
National Council of Senior Citizens	1069
National Farmers Union (and recipients under other public programs)	
National Federation of the Blind	1108
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers (and those receiving veterans benefits)	1049
National Retired Teachers Association, American Association of Retired Persons	1913
	1159

Favor simplifying administrative process of applying for public assistance

Citizens' Committee for Children of New York	2019
Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator	1397
Kennedy, Hon. Robert F., U.S. Senator	775
Lindsay, Hon. John V., Mayor, New York City	1123

Favor prohibiting residence requirements

American Foundation for the Blind, Inc	A167
National Association of Social Workers	930
National Social Welfare Assembly	1938
YWCA	1632

Favors separation of the two functions of social service and income maintenance

Lindsay, Hon. John V., Mayor, New York City	1123
---	------



*Favors amendment to permit the States to make money payments directly to the superintendents or their legally delegated representatives on behalf of individuals eligible for money grants who are patients in State hospitals for mental diseases and in institutions for the mentally retarded*

Texas State Department of Public Welfare-----  
Hearing page A200

*Favors bills based on the recommendations of the 1966 Report of the Adversory Council on Public Welfare*

Sparer, Edward V., teacher of law of public assistance, Yale Law School-----  
1761

*Favors removing handicapped persons from welfare rolls and placing them under Social Security*

Goddard, Major Gladys, Salvation Army-----  
A127

*Favors uniform matching for all public assistance programs*

Maine Department of Health and Welfare-----  
A211

*Favors improving public assistance payment*

American Federation of Government Employees-----  
A128

*Favors giving aged, blind, and disabled recipients the same increase in permitting earnings as would be given social security beneficiaries; favors making this mandatory on the States*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----  
1537

*Favors amending the act to extend indefinitely the 36-month period during which the earnings and resources of a blind or disabled recipient may be disregarded if he has a plan for achieving self-support*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----  
1537

*Favors permitting States to reduce the age for old-age assistance to 60, with Federal matching*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----  
1537

*Favors increasing the matching formula by \$5 to \$10 for all public assistance titles, primarily at the lower end of the scale; favors requirement to pass along this increase to recipients*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----  
Hearing page 1537

*If the courts sustain the recent decision against State residence requirements, favors increasing the Federal contribution in a declining rate so that at the fifth year it is at the current rate*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----  
1537

*Favors income guarantee geared to the minimum wage for those age 60 and over, the blind, and the totally handicapped*

Burton, Hon. Phillip, Member of Congress-----  
1537

*Favors increase in Federal matching above 50 percent for Puerto Rico*

Polanco-Abreu, Hon. Santiago, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico-----  
1888

*Favors greater consistency or simplification in amounts of matching formulas*

National Association of Manufacturers-----  
A16

*Favors requiring State to serve children with all types of potentially handicapping conditions*

American Foundation for the Blind, Inc-----  
A167

*Favors raising age 21 to age 22 under AFDC*

Gore, Arnold, Bronx, N. Y-----  
A31

*Favors national standards for AFDC set at OEO poverty line Northeast Neighborhood Counseling Center, Kansas City, Kans-----*

A33



*Favors a bonus to each welfare family with a male head of household; checks made payable to man and woman*

Holman, Yerby, Baltimore, Md.....  
Hearings  
page  
A70

*Favors "auxiliary services to help families with children"*

South Dakota chapter, National Association of Social Workers..... A110

*Favors provision to require administration of the crippled children's program "by a medically oriented bureau"*

Tennessee Department of Public Health..... A53

*Favors requiring advisory councils of welfare recipients for welfare departments*

Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator..... 1397

*Favors requiring the DHEW to hold hearings on the conformity of State public assistance plans on complaint of specified number of citizens*

National Office for the Rights of the Indigent and NAACP  
legal defense fund..... 1371

*Favors paying difference between earnings and standard of need in all cases*

Javits, Hon. Jacob K., U.S. Senator..... 1397

*Favors new program for financing of nonmedical homes, residences, or institutions for beneficiaries of programs for the aged who do not need constant medical or nursing care*

American Public Health Association..... 1529

*Favors provision requiring States to include all types of persons eligible under Federal law in their State plans for public assistance*

National Federation of Social Service Employees and Social  
Service Employees Union..... 1088

*Favors provision stating that relatives should not be required to support those needing public assistance beyond spouses and parents of minor children*

National Federal of Social Service Employees and Social  
Service Employees Union.....  
Hearings  
page  
1088

*Favors financial incentive to States related to the number of public assistance recipients who are helped out of dependency into self-sufficiency*

National Farmers Union..... 1108

*Opposes use of means test for cash payments; opposes determination of medical indigency*

Physicians Forum..... A241

*Favors Public Welfare Advisory Council's recommendation as to comprehensive programs based on Federal standards*

Arthritis Foundation, New York Chapter..... A180

*Favors eliminating residence requirements*

Travelers Aid Society of Washington, D.C..... A275

*Favors higher level of welfare payments*

McKenna, Rev. Horace B., S.J., St. Aloysius Church, Wash-  
ington, D.C..... A276

*Opposes sanction of a version of "man-in-the-house" rule*

National Urban League..... A277

*Favors some graduated percentage matching for APDC-UP in which Federal share would be higher for those States where availability of State and local resources are limited*

Burns, Hon. John A., Governor of Hawaii..... A213