Detailed proposals for both forms of income maintenance were many. One suggestion was that a children's allowance of $50 a month be paid universally only for preschool-age children.

A second was that an annual stipend of $500 be paid for the first child until he reaches 18 years of age and that payments for the support of succeeding children should decline with each additional child, but a minimum of $200 per child should be established.

There were almost as many specific proposals as there were economists testifying.

A Syracuse University economist testified the nation now has two kinds of welfare, one of which is acceptable, the other the object of scorn. The middle class, he said, gets public assistance in the form of unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and tax deductions for mortgage loan costs and for taxes on real property. These "hidden welfare measures" for the middle and upper classes are dignified and politically untouchable, while welfare for the poor is exposed and humiliating. "This dual welfare system is unjust and must be corrected," he said.

(9) Utilization of more welfare clients as case aides in welfare departments was urged in some of the regions. New York City Commissioner of Social Services, Jack R. Goldberg, testified that 1,200 such aides were now employed by his department; that they were working well; and that most had been unemployed for five or more years before being given these new jobs.

(10) Despite open invitations by State Board Chairman Hugh R. Jones for "irate taxpayers" to come forward, none appeared. Three individuals from rural upstate testified they felt the names of recipients in their counties should be made public, and one suggested that a farmer who was receiving supplemental assistance, as well as an allowance for fuel oil, should be made to cut his own firewood so that the oil allowance could be discontinued.

That was the extent of the "punitive" approach heard by the Board.

(11) Representatives of several chambers of commerce and counsel for the New York State Taxpayers Association all offered constructive suggestions for the improvement of welfare programs and administration.

Many speakers urged a total overhaul of the welfare system, with the Federal Government taking responsibility for providing the funds under some form of income maintenance and the State and local governments assuming the major responsibility for the social services that would be required under any federal system.

(12) Elimination of the various categories of public assistance was seen as a source of saving.

(13) Welfare recipients were frequently eloquent in their testimony which dealt with the minutiae of life on slim budgets. Several urged that personal allowances be paid to ease the transition from welfare to work. They pointed out that welfare subsistence was, at best, meager, and generally has with it a backlog of deprivation. Once a person is employed, the need for modest funds to "catch up" with that backlog is normally beyond the salary earned. A "transition allowance" which would continue welfare payments at some reduced scale for three to six months would not only help ease the shift but encourage many more people to try to obtain employment, they said.

Testimony was given that a sampling of persons living in poverty in various parts of the country showed:

"The poverty population is (a) highly motivated to work their way out of poverty, (b) shares conventional middle class standards, (c) wants self-help assistance to enable them to get out of poverty more than they want generalized services aimed at making their existing situation more bearable, (d) are more desirous of improving their neighborhoods than moving out of them, and, above all, (e) are deeply concerned about their children's education."

Other witnesses testified that the State should assume more of the cost of welfare and that no city be required to pay more than 25 percent of the total cost. At present, some localities, like New York City are saddled with a larger share of welfare costs than local officials believe is fair. One public welfare administrator said that salaries for welfare workers must be made more attractive if the turnover is to be reduced. In her community, she said, the annual staff turnover is close to 40 percent. She estimated it cost almost $5,000 to train a caseworker and that this price was even more costly to the welfare recipient because there was not sufficient continuity of services.

Many welfare recipients complained about the high staff turnover, pointing out that before they had an opportunity to establish a relationship with