

whereupon, I started by saying to confidential  
assistant to the court, **IRVING J. ENGELMAN**

called as a witness, duly sworn, and accompanied by  
Gertrude Lotwin, Thomas Riti, John A. Taylor and Ronald  
Craig, also sworn, testified as follows:

**EXAMINATION**

By Mr. Jaffe:

Q. Mr. Engelman, I wonder if you might give us your  
full name and position for the record, please.

A. My full name is Irving J. Engelman. I am director  
of the Division of Public Welfare within the Department of  
Institutions and Agencies. The Division of Public Welfare  
embraces major units that are concerned with child welfare  
services, services for the blind and the entire array of  
what are referred to as the public assistance programs,  
those administered at county and municipal levels but  
supervised in one fashion or another, in varying fashion  
actually by the Department of Institutions and Agencies  
through the Division of Public Welfare.

Q. I wonder if you could give us your background, how  
long you have been in this position and your primary  
background in this area.

A. I have been in the civil service of the State of  
New Jersey or its political subdivisions since 1930. I  
have been in one or another aspect of public welfare work



1 since 1932 when I started my service as confidential  
2 assistant to the county counsel and county adjuster of  
3 Union County. I subsequently became the first executive  
4 secretary of the Union County Welfare Board.

5 Since 1936 I have been in the State Department of  
6 Institutions and Agencies initially as an administrative  
7 assistant to the then commissioner of Institutions and  
8 Agencies, and subsequently in varying positions until for  
9 the past six years I have occupied the position of director  
10 of the Division of Public Welfare.

11 Q Mr. Engelmann, before we start is there a  
12 statement that you would like to make? I see you have  
13 brought some documents. Would you like to explain these  
14 and then we can subsequently get into the substance of  
15 your testimony.

16 A I have no formal statement I wish to make. I did  
17 assemble some pieces of material that were available and I  
18 thought might be of possible interest to the members of the  
19 Commission. I can distribute these. I would like to  
20 identify what these pieces are.

21 MR. JAFFE: We will introduce them into the  
22 record.

23 THE WITNESS: They include what might have  
24 been a statement. This is a transcript of remarks  
25 that I made recently at a meeting last month.

1 October 27, in Asbury Park, which was statewide  
2 meeting of the CAP organizations, Community Action  
3 Organizations throughout the state jointly with  
4 our 21 county welfare directors.

5 On that occasion I undertook to outline very  
6 briefly our concept, our consistent concept in  
7 New Jersey of the role and function of public  
8 welfare as a public service activity. So that is  
9 the first statement.

10 MR. DRISCOLL (presiding): Do you want to  
11 mark them as evidence?

12 (EXHIBIT NO. C-78 WAS RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)

13 THE WITNESS: Next there is a monthly  
14 statistical report on public assistance for the  
15 month of June 1967. I brought this because it  
16 includes a summary of total expenditures for the  
17 fiscal year that ended June, 1967.

18 (EXHIBIT NO. C-79 WAS RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)

19 THE WITNESS: I have also brought the monthly  
20 statistical report for the next month, July, 1967,  
21 because it is the most recent one that is  
22 available at the moment, the most up to date,  
23 complete statement.

24 (EXHIBIT NO. C-80 WAS RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)

25 MR. DRISCOLL: Does your division compile these?



1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 MR. DRISCOLL: And they get the figures from  
3 counties?

4 THE WITNESS: From counties and municipalities  
5 as the material is processed through our division.

6 Believing that this Commission has an interest  
7 and concern that focuses specially in many respects  
8 on municipalities and large municipalities, I also  
9 brought along two separate little tabulations  
10 that we made, one which identifies the eighteen  
11 largest municipalities in the state in terms of  
12 population and summarizes data about their  
13 expenditures for general assistance for the county  
14 in 1966 and compares the experience of those  
15 eighteen municipalities with the rest of the state,  
16 and another one which does somewhat the same sort  
17 of thing, not for the eighteen municipalities  
18 largest in terms of population, but for the  
19 municipalities which in December, 1966 had the  
20 largest case loads, and we arbitrarily selected  
21 those municipalities that had 74 or 5 or more  
22 persons receiving assistance in that month. There  
23 were 33 municipalities in the state that in the  
24 month of December had 75 or more persons receiving  
25 general assistance or municipal aid.

(EXHIBIT NOS. C-81 AND C-82 WERE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)

THE WITNESS: Finally there is a more detailed tabulation for the month of December, 1966 of every municipality in the state, all 367 of them.

(EXHIBIT NO. C-83 WAS RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)

THE WITNESS: That is the assembly of data.

We also have available, and I can distribute certain materials relating to day care because it was suggested to me in a telephone conversation with Mr. Goldman that possibly this Commission might have some special interest in what is happening about day care arrangements and day care facilities. So we have these materials. I will identify them.

A publication called "Recommended Basic Standards for Family Day Care". Another, "Facts About Family Day Care (For Parents Who Provide Day Care)"; another, "Facts About Family Day Care (For Parents Whose Children Use Family Day Care)"; and one which is for general public distribution entitled "Day Care."

(EXHIBITS NOS. C-84, C-85, C-86 AND C-87 WERE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)

THE WITNESS: I also brought those sections



1 of our Categorical Assistance Budget Manual which  
2 spell out the allowances that may be made to  
3 families receiving assistance to enable them to  
4 purchase day care or to secure day care. This is  
5 identified as Section No. 317 of the Categorical  
6 Assistance Budget Manual.

7 (EXHIBIT NO. C-88 WAS RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE.)

8 By Mr. Jaffe:

9 Q As I understand it, the other copies of those  
10 would be available to Commission members for their perusal.

11 I wonder if you could start by giving us the scope of  
12 your department and the way in which welfare is administered  
13 in the state, the difference between the categorical system-  
14 municipal welfare concept, what the state's role is, and the  
15 county role and the local level.

16 A I will try to abbreviate this as much as possible.

17 There is no single public welfare program in New  
18 Jersey. There is a package, a very complex package of  
19 programs, all of which come under the umbrella of the  
20 public welfare description. Principally they can be  
21 divided into the three main categories that I outlined  
22 before -- child welfare services, services for the blind  
23 and visually handicapped, and an array of public assistance  
24 programs, that is, programs which are designed to provide  
25 financial assistance and related services to individuals

1 and families in the community who, by some standard or  
2 other, are deemed to have insufficient income and  
3 resources to enjoy a standard of living described in the  
4 statute as "compatible with decency and health."

5 I emphasize that this represents a variety of programs  
6 because within the array we have programs that have almost  
7 every possible permutation and combination of structure  
8 for administration and structure for financing. We have  
9 programs that are state-administered. We have programs  
10 that are county-administered but state-supervised. We  
11 have programs that are municipally administered but  
12 state-supervised. We have programs that are municipally  
13 administered but not state-supervised. We have programs  
14 that are financed through a combination of federal-state  
15 and county funds. We have programs, and each of them is  
16 financed in different proportions of those funds. So it is  
17 a real ball of wax.

18 Q What is the greatest percentage in each area?

19 A In terms of number of dollars expended or in  
20 terms of number of persons involved in the programs, by  
21 far the largest group is what is known as the categorical  
22 assistance programs. The categorical assistance programs  
23 are those which are directly administered by county welfare  
24 boards which are financed in a major part by the federal  
25 government and which are required to be statewide in terms



1 of standards of operation, standards of service and so  
2 forth. These categorical programs I will tick off.

3 There is old age assistance, which is financial  
4 assistance and related services for individuals 65 years  
5 of age and over who are needy and who have lived in the  
6 State of New Jersey at least a year. Disability assistance,  
7 more accurately known as assistance for the permanently  
8 and totally disabled, which is a program of financial  
9 assistance and related services for individuals between the  
10 ages of 18 and 65 who are financially needy, who are  
11 evaluated as being permanently and totally disabled and who  
12 have lived in the State of New Jersey at least a year.

13 There is a blind assistance program, a program of  
14 financial assistance and related services to individuals  
15 18 years of age and over who are legally blind, who are  
16 needy, and who have lived in the State of New Jersey at  
17 least a year.

18 There is a medical assistance for the aged, otherwise  
19 known as Ferr-Hills, which is a program of selected medical  
20 services only for individuals 65 years of age and over who  
21 are not receiving old age assistance but who, upon evaluation,  
22 are determined to have insufficient income and resources to  
23 pay the cost of the particular kinds of expensive medical  
24 service that the program provides. These services at the  
25 present time are in-patient hospital care, nursing home care

1 and home health care, which is defined as medical and  
2 paramedical services required by an individual who is  
3 confined to his home by illness for a prolonged period of  
4 at least 30 days.

5 I have recited four of the programs. All four of those  
6 programs, I recall to your attention, are concerned with  
7 individuals.

8 The largest among the categorical programs in terms of  
9 dollars of expenditure, size of staff involved, numbers of  
10 persons in the community who are reached is the program  
11 known as AIC, or more correctly AFIC, assistance to families  
12 with dependent children. This is the only one of the  
13 categorical programs that is focused on a family rather  
14 than an individual. This is a program of financial  
15 assistance plus related services to certain kinds of  
16 families in which there are needy children. It must be a  
17 family in which there is a specified degree of relationship  
18 by blood or marriage between the child or children and the  
19 adult person or persons in the household.

20 Secondly, it must be a family which is needy.

21 Thirdly, it must be a family which is characterized  
22 by a deprivation of parental support or care resulting from  
23 the death, disability or continuous absence from the home  
24 of one of the parents. In other words, this program does  
25 not in its present structure in New Jersey reach families,



1 no matter how needy, that are intact and whole. My  
2 definition it has to be a family that is broken in some  
3 way by death, disability or continuous absence from the  
4 home before this program may be invoked to provide assistance  
5 to the family.

6 There is one other categorical assistance program that  
7 should be mentioned at this point because of its increasing  
8 dimensions, and that is the Cuban Refugee Program. This is  
9 a program that is financed 100 percent by the federal  
10 government, but the Division of Public Welfare and the  
11 county welfare boards are the administrative agents for  
12 the federal government in carrying on this program, and  
13 it is of certain significance in its dimensions at the  
14 moment, and you will find those in the statistical data  
15 that I have given you, because the phenomenon is that  
16 New Jersey currently has more resettled Cuban refugees than  
17 any other state in the United States except New York.

18 MR. MEYNER: More than Florida?

19 THE WITNESS: Resettled. There are more in  
20 Florida at the point of entry, but as they are  
21 dispersed from Florida, there are more who come  
22 to New Jersey, far more who come to New Jersey  
23 than any other state in the United States.

24 MR. MEYNER: You are a discriminating lot.

25 THE WITNESS: This is not by law. We have no

1 law, there is no statutory law in New Jersey  
2 covering this program. We are merely acting as  
3 agents for the federal government.

4 All needy persons and families who do not  
5 come within one of these categorical slots that  
6 I have identified or who have not applied for the  
7 categorical program or whose applications for the  
8 categorical program are in a pending status, all  
9 such needy persons and families are under the  
10 traditional and long-standing law of the state  
11 the responsibility of the municipal authorities in  
12 the particular incorporated municipality in which  
13 they happen to live. This totality we refer to  
14 as general assistance.

15 There are two distinct sets of statutory law  
16 governing the operations of municipal welfare  
17 officials and municipal welfare departments. One  
18 set is identified in the Revised Statutes as  
19 Chapter 1 of Title 44 of the Revised Statutes.  
20 This is the recodification and restatement of all  
21 of the traditional welfare laws of the State of  
22 New Jersey going all the way back to colonial  
23 times.

24 There is no state agency or state department  
25 that is vested any authority to supervise or



1 direct operations that occur under the aegis of  
2 Chapter 1 of Title 44, possible in a given family.

3 At the same time there are Chapter 8 and Chapter  
4 8A of Title 44. These are the so called state-aided  
5 general assistance laws. Under these statutes  
6 each municipality is afforded the opportunity  
7 annually to apply for state aid. This is an  
8 annual election by the municipality. If it  
9 applies for state aid and if it is found to be  
10 eligible for state aid, then by that act it comes  
11 within the jurisdiction of the Division of Public  
12 Welfare within the Department of Institutions and  
13 Agencies.

14 If it does not apply for state aid or if it  
15 fails to comply with the requirements for receiving  
16 state aid, then it is totally exempt from any  
17 advisory directory or supervisory jurisdiction of  
18 the Department of Institutions and Agencies.

19 MR. DRISCOLL: Mr. Director, based on your  
20 experience what would be the largest number of  
21 case workers who might visit any given family?  
22 Is this the worst situation you could think of  
23 and tell me how many different people are going  
24 who might be called in for communication. I don't  
25 to come knocking on the door.

THE WITNESS: I would have to try to figure

1 that out as I go along if you don't mind. It  
2 would be theoretically possible in a given family,

3 if the family were of sufficient size and had a  
4 sufficient variety of problems, that there might  
5 be visitation from a municipal case worker from  
6 the municipal Welfare Department; a case worker of  
7 a county Welfare Department; a case worker of the

8 that is Bureau of Children's Services; a case worker of  
9 whether the Commission for the Blind; a representative of  
10 the office of the County Adjuster in some cases;  
11 of my had a representative of the maternal and child health  
12 ment files programs; a representative of the crippled  
13 Bureau the children's program.

14 I am going to ask my staff members to  
15 supplement those if I can't think of them all.

16 A representative, a case worker of the  
17 Rehabilitation Commission.

18 MR. TAYLOR: A parole officer who is a case  
19 worker.

20 MISS LOTWIN: A school social worker.

21 THE WITNESS: A probation officer as distinct

22 from a parole officer. I am doing this now in

23 terms of generic case workers and not specialists

24 who might be called in for consultation. I don't

25 know that I have exhausted the list, but these are



1 all possible.

2 the budgets. MR. DRISCOLL: That is a very representative  
3 list. If they were visiting my home, I would be  
4 pretty hopelessly confused before I was finished, I  
5 am afraid.

6 By Mr. Jaffe:

7 Q Could you give us an approximate amount of money  
8 that is spent in a year in New Jersey on welfare totally,  
9 whether it comes from federal, state or municipal funds?

10 A I just got through with my budget, the third phase  
11 of my budget presentation before the Budget Bureau for the  
12 next fiscal year, and in that context I informed the Budget  
13 Bureau that a ball park estimate of the total number of  
14 dollars that would be spent in the next fiscal year for which  
15 the Division of Public Welfare would have an accountability  
16 would be in the neighborhood of \$300,000,000.

17 Q That does not take into account the municipal funds  
18 under Chapter 17

19 A Yes.

20 Q It does?

21 A There are very few municipal funds under Chapter 1  
22 that you would be able to find.

23 Q Around \$300,000,000?

24 A Around \$300,000,000, and roughly the breakdown of  
25 that would be \$114,500,000 federal funds, \$186,500,000 from

1 the State Treasury and \$91,000,000 in funds to be found in  
2 the budgets of the counties of municipalities.

3 MR. MEYNER: Is this the actual relief money,  
4 or is this administration plus money?

5 THE WITNESS: This is the whole business,  
6 Governor.

7 MR. MEYNER: What percentage would be the cost  
8 of administration and what percentage would be  
9 direct payments?

10 THE WITNESS: We get a little sticky here,  
11 you know. If we are operating, for example as we  
12 are in some areas, work training programs, there  
13 are expenses involved in operating a work training  
14 program that are for the benefit of the individuals  
15 and yet are not assistance in the strict sense of  
16 the word. But in terms of calling under the label  
17 Administration everything that is not a direct or  
18 indirect money payment to the individual or family,  
19 roughly for the whole business about 12 percent of  
20 that.

21 MR. MEYNER: For administration?

22 THE WITNESS: For administration. The  
23 administrative cost, for instance, in general  
24 assistance percentage wise far exceeds the  
25 administrative cost in the categorical programs.



1 but I am trying to make a ball park estimate of the  
2 or those whole business.

3 account, but MR. DRISCOLL: But your administrative costs,  
4 amount do they include the administrative costs at the  
5 county and municipal levels?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes, what I am testifying now  
7 is in relation to totality.

8 By Mr. Jaffe:

9 Q I wonder if you could give us a rough estimate of  
10 what AFDC would be out of the \$300,000,000? Is that the  
11 largest one to begin with?

12 A That is the largest one.

13 Q Just roughly.

14 A Of that \$300,000,000, the estimated expenditures  
15 under the ADC program, not including administration, will  
16 be \$30,000,000. Now, I can't segregate the cost of  
17 administration and pinpoint it to that one program.

18 Q It is administered by the county along with the  
19 other programs?

20 A That's correct.

21 Q Out of that \$300,000,000, how much is for general  
22 municipal welfare administered by the municipalities in the  
23 general category?

24 A Twenty-two million dollars, again without  
25 administration. Roughly I would say that the 567 municipalities

1 or those that participate, what they actually spend for  
2 administration is something on which we have no real  
3 account, but I would estimate that percentage wise the  
4 amount expended for administration is somewhere between  
5 25 and 33 1/3 percent.

6 Q One other figure. I wonder if you could approximate  
7 for us the percentage number by families on welfare with an  
8 employable man. In other words, you have given us the  
9 AFDC figures and the general municipal figures. I wonder  
10 if you could break that down further so that we could have  
11 an estimate of the number of families on welfare with an  
12 employable man in the family.

13 A I can't give you figures; I can just make some  
14 observations.

15 Q Please do.

16 A Theoretically so far as the categorical programs  
17 are concerned there aren't any. I can't assert beyond  
18 contradiction.

19 Q Would there be some with permanently disabled?

20 A Permanently and totally disabled, but then they  
21 are not able to work. This is the very definition of total  
22 disability.

23 Similarly in the AIC program there are families where  
24 a father is home but presumably at least he is incapacitated  
25 and unable to work.



1 So in the categorical programs theoretically there are  
2 no able-bodied males represented in those programs. Needy  
3 families with able-bodied males, if they are receiving  
4 assistance at all, are presumably receiving it under the  
5egis of the general assistance program from municipal  
6 welfare departments.

7 I have no count to respond to your question, but we  
8 certainly have an impression and a series of impressions,  
9 and I will introduce the topic and then perhaps ask Mr.  
10 Taylor to supplement this, and that is that in our efforts  
11 to mount these so called Title V projects, these are the  
12 work experience and training projects that are being funded  
13 under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act and which are  
14 operated through the Department of Institutions and Agencies  
15 in New Jersey rather than through the Department of  
16 Community Affairs. In mounting those programs we were  
17 required to have a fixed percentage, a fixed minimum  
18 percentage of males as trainees, and we had great  
19 difficulties in recruiting even from the general assistance  
20 rates sufficient numbers of males to meet those quotas.

21 This has been true right here in the City of Newark where  
22 we have such a program operating.

23 Can you supplement that, Mr. Taylor?

24 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. I think it is important  
25 to know that a man and his wife with minor children

1 who is receiving assistance at the municipal level  
2 is not getting as much assistance as he would get  
3 at county level. Under the Title V programs we  
4 use the county scale.

5 MR. DRISCOLL: I couldn't hear the last part  
6 of that.

7 MR. TAYLOR: I said a man and wife with minor  
8 children who is a typical trainee for a Title V  
9 program -- you are talking about the males only  
10 now -- would not get as much on municipal  
11 assistance as he would get as a Title V trainee  
12 because we use the county scale of assistance for  
13 our Title V programs. In spite of this, we have  
14 had trouble in every project that we have ever  
15 had in reaching our quota of males.

16 They are bound in by definition. We can't  
17 take any able-bodied male and put him on our  
18 program. He has to be a head of a family containing  
19 minor children. Therefore, all your single men  
20 who are walking around the city are general  
21 assistance we can't touch. Childless couples who  
22 could profit from training and be made more  
23 employable we can't touch. There must be a man  
24 and wife and at least one minor child.

25 THE WITNESS: If I may pick up the thread,



1 broken up there are undoubtedly able-bodied males who  
2 received at one time or another general assistance,  
3 a rapid but my impression would be that such individuals  
4 relatively advanced age, for example, but they are not yet  
5 actually remain on the general assistance roles  
6 of, with only very short periods of time. They are in an  
and total outers.

7 It goes I might say to you the fact that the turnover  
8 rate in the general assistance program, and  
9 being proper turnover rate I construct for this purpose by  
10 easy means taking the number of cases closed during the  
11 course of the year and computing as a percentage  
12 families of the number of cases that were on the roles at  
13 the beginning of the year -- the turnover rate by  
14 year or base on that definition in general assistance statewide is  
15 350 percent. In other words, in the course of a  
16 twelve-month period the number of cases that have  
17 been closed is three and a half times as great as  
18 of the the number of cases that were on the roles at the  
19 the very beginning of the year.

20 A By Mr. Jaffe: The problem of the employable male

21 Q Let me ask you one other question on the figures.  
22 Out of the \$22,000,000 that then goes to the general  
23 assistance in welfare, what would you say the bulk of that  
24 is if it is not families with employable men? Or is that a  
25 difficult question to answer because of the way it is

1 broken up?

2 A It does go to families with employable men but on  
3 a rapid turnover basis. It does go to individuals who have  
4 relatively advanced age, for example, but they are not yet  
5 65, neither can they be medically evaluated as permanently  
6 and totally disabled.

7 It goes to a large group of people on a temporary basis  
8 while their applications for categorical assistance are  
9 being processed and which sometimes is a process of too  
10 many months.

11 It goes to a significant number of individuals and  
12 families who have not lived in the State of New Jersey a  
13 year or have not lived in the State of New Jersey two years  
14 as is required for purposes of municipal settlement.

15 So it goes to a wide variety, but there is a rapid  
16 turnover.

17 Q Would it be fair to say, then, that the problem  
18 of the employable man on welfare is not a major problem in  
19 the welfare structure?

20 A In my opinion the problem of the employable male  
21 on welfare is not a real problem because we have relatively  
22 few employable males who remain on any welfare program for  
23 more than a brief period.

24 MR. LEUCHTER: When you talk about real  
25 problem, what you really mean is in terms of



1 expenditure of funds to families with employable  
2 males, do you not? It may be a real problem, but  
3 it is not reflected in the amount of money that is  
4 disbursed under the general assistance categories  
5 throughout the state. When you say is this not a  
6 real problem? and Mr. Engelmann says no, it is not  
7 a real problem because they are only on a short  
8 period of time, that means it is not a real  
9 problem reflected in the financial outpourings,  
10 but it may well be a real problem in some other  
11 way?

12 THE WITNESS: You are correct. There is  
13 another facet that hasn't been mentioned that in  
14 my opinion is a real problem. That is the extent  
15 to which able-bodied males who are or should be  
16 heads of families are what we call underemployed.  
17 They may have employment and they may work full  
18 time, but the amount that they earn is not and  
19 cannot be sufficient to enable them to maintain  
20 the size of family that they have.

21 MR. BROWN: Does the department have any  
22 statistics on that?

23 THE WITNESS: I don't know what kind of  
24 statistics you mean, Mr. Brown.

25 MR. BROWN: Where you have supplementary

1 payments to families. You don't have anything  
2 that would actually pinpoint the underemployed?

3 THE WITNESS: We don't have any reliable  
4 statistics on that because such statistics could  
5 come from only one source and from the municipality.

6 MR. TAYLOR: I can tell you that in our male  
7 components here in Newark, which is solid male  
8 components, and little bits throughout the other  
9 five projects I am operating the size of the male  
10 head of the family is over six. This means that  
11 in a metropolitan area that person has to earn  
12 at least \$350 a month in order to get by. A lot  
13 of these people, even with some help, I don't  
14 think they are ever going to make that much.

15 MR. DRISCOLL: We listened to testimony where  
16 the implication was that for a woman with eight  
17 children it was better for her to stay without a  
18 legal husband than to acquire a legal husband  
19 because she would get a decrease in the payments  
20 she was receiving. Does your experience report  
21 that philosophy?

22 THE WITNESS: Well, this is not a philosophy;  
23 this is either a fact or it isn't a fact.

24 MR. DRISCOLL: It was a philosophy with her.

25 THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. It is entirely



1 conceivable that the amount required in the  
2 New Jersey community on a minimum basis to support  
3 a family of eight persons is an amount which is  
4 beyond the earning capacity of the head of that  
5 household. Governor, this is another way of  
6 stating the problem that I was trying to lay on  
7 the table here.

8 We have an enunciated standard of what the  
9 minimum cost is to maintain a family of eight  
10 persons in our New Jersey community.

11 MISS LOTWIN: Approximately \$360. Without  
12 shelter cost it would be at least \$125 to \$150 in  
13 New Jersey for a shelter cost so you have close to  
14 \$485 -- \$500 a month net without medical to take  
15 care of this many people at New Jersey's cost in  
16 1967.

17 THE WITNESS: Stating it another way, by the  
18 standards that we have developed in New Jersey  
19 after a careful study over a period of many years  
20 we consider that the minimum spendable money that  
21 a family of a person requires just to get by,  
22 barring medical care, is in the neighborhood of  
23 \$500 a month.

24 MR. MEYER: In other words, she better get  
25 a husband who is earning \$150 a week?

1 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

2 MR. DRISCOLL: May it be said that our welfare  
3 and relief programs are promoting illegitimacy?

4 THE WITNESS: In my opinion our welfare  
5 programs don't promote illegitimacy anymore than  
6 an umbrella promotes the rain.

7 MR. DRISCOLL: You are more likely to go out  
8 in the rain if you have an umbrella though.

9 THE WITNESS: That may be, but the rain doesn't  
10 come or go because you do or do not go out in it.

11 MR. DRISCOLL: You make a very good point. I  
12 understand.

13 THE WITNESS: No, illegitimacy, the growth in  
14 illegitimacy, I submit, Governor, is affecting all  
15 income segments of our population. It has a  
16 particularly visible impact in terms of the  
17 individuals and families who are at the lower end  
18 of the economic scale because (1) there it can't  
19 be hidden; (2) there it has dire economic  
20 consequences which the whole community can see.  
21 It affects the community's pocketbook.

22 MR. BROWN: I think what has been inferred by  
23 people who want to give the impression primarily  
24 that Negroes are living off welfare and having  
25 more children because they can get \$500 a month is



1 really what is being said here. That is a broad  
2 and very general impression held by many public  
3 officials who apparently have that point of view.

4 Nothing that you have experienced shows that this  
5 is so?

6 THE WITNESS: I will respond to that this way.

7 Mr. Brown: It is certainly a fact that the Negro

8 community is proportionately overrepresented in  
9 any public assistance program that you can think of  
10 except possibly old age assistance. I am not sure

11 of that one. Certainly in terms of the program of  
12 assistance for dependent children or in terms of  
13 the general assistance program or in terms of  
14 child welfare services there is statistically

15 overrepresentation of that ethnic group just as  
16 there is an overrepresentation in other states of  
17 poor whites or an overrepresentation of French

18 Canadians up in New Hampshire, that sort of thing.

19 wonder if you. But it is also true, I believe -- well,

20 ought to statistically it is true that there is a greater,

21 much greater incidence, much higher rate of

22 illegitimacy in the non-white population that there

23 is in the white population. This is a statistical

24 fact which can't be gainsaid.

25 But to say that the availability of public

1 assistance directly encourages and fosters  
2 illegitimacy to me doesn't make any sense because  
3 the woman doesn't get \$500 because she proliferates  
4 the number of illegitimate children. The \$500  
5 is the same figure whether the children are  
6 legitimate or illegitimate, Point No. 1.

7 Point No. 2, the addition of another child  
8 per se, assuming there already are a number of  
9 children, changes the monthly budget by about \$30.

10 If the opportunity to receive an additional \$30  
11 per month, or one dollar a day, is sufficient  
12 incentive, direct incentive to go through the  
13 labor of producing another child, I think this is  
14 extremely doubtful.

15 By Mr. Jaffe:

16 Q It has also been an issue here that the ADC  
17 requirement that the male not be in the home is the  
18 problem that leads to the break up of the family. I  
19 wonder if you would give us your views as to whether that  
20 ought to be changed.

21 A I emphasize it in my presentation earlier the  
22 fact that this ADC program as it is presently structured  
23 in New Jersey does direct itself to the broken family  
24 obligation, we have the statutory law, we have the  
25 rather than the intact family by definition.

MR. MEYER: But by the same token if you



1 enlarge the definition to take care of the  
2 situation where there is a man in the family, in  
3 you would then have to pick up the people who  
4 are not meeting your budget by earnings, so that  
5 you would have a tremendous additional expense  
6 there, would you not?

7 **THE WITNESS:** This is a speculation,

8 **Q** Governor, for this reason: That theoretically  
9 covered the families to which you are now alluding are  
10 already eligible for assistance. They are eligible  
11 for assistance from the municipal welfare  
12 department. It is not that they are ineligible  
13 for this for assistance, they do not have enough income

14 to support **MR. MEYNER:** But at lower rates?

15 **THE WITNESS:** Not according to the standards  
16 we promulgated. We could not promulgate --

17 **MR. MEYNER:** Didn't you say --

18 **THE WITNESS:** Mr. Taylor did. The standards  
19 we promulgate are the same for municipal welfare  
20 departments as they are for county welfare  
21 departments. However, in relation to the county  
22 programs which are federally matched we have an  
23 obligation, we have the statutory law, we have the  
24 machinery, we have the staff to do a reasonable  
25 enforcement job. We cannot do that kind of

1 are subject enforcement job, nor do we have the statutory  
2 extent, authority to do that kind of enforcement job in  
3 state, relation to municipal welfare departments.

4 There are some municipalities that substantially  
5 meet in their operations the standard that we  
6 promulgate for the county welfare departments.

7 Q By Mr. Jaffe:

8 Q Did you actually answer my question? Have you  
9 answered it fully?

10 A No. At the present time there is probably a  
11 motivation, an incentive which tends to encourage male  
12 heads of families to leave home or to pretend to leave home  
13 for this reason: That if they do not have enough income  
14 to support their families or if they see no prospect of  
15 acquiring enough income to support their families, they  
16 may apply for assistance at the municipal welfare department.  
17 But if they are working full time or even most of the time,  
18 regardless of the amount they are earning, most municipal  
19 welfare departments will say, "So long, Brother. You have  
20 got a job. You take care of your family."

21 On the other hand, if they leave home or pretend to  
22 leave home, this creates technical eligibility for the  
23 family to apply under the ADC program rather than under  
24 the general assistance program. In the ADC program there  
25 are uniform standards, there are prescribed standards which



1 are objectively identifiable and which, to the largest  
2 extent, are reasonably enforced uniformly throughout the  
3 state. So to that extent there is a motivation.

4 Q My question is: Do you think it ought to be  
5 changed?

6 A Oh, yes.

7 Q Do you think ADC ought not to have that requirement?

8 A I think so. The Board of Public Welfare officially  
9 thinks so. The Board of Control of the Department of  
10 Institutions and Agencies officially thinks so. All of those  
11 units have affirmatively recommended that action be taken  
12 by the legislature to take advantage of the opportunity  
13 that has been presented in federal legislation since 1961  
14 to enlarge the state's definition of ADC to include families  
15 with dependent children where the cause of the dependency  
16 results from the unemployment of the parent rather than  
17 from death, desertion or continuous absence.

18 The Board of Public Welfare and the Department of  
19 Institutions and Agencies have gone farther than that and  
20 have recommended that the scope of the program be expanded  
21 to include those families with children where the  
22 deprivation results from underemployment of the parent.

23 The first group, the unemployment of the parent, for  
24 that the opportunity exist to obtain federal matching.  
25 This is an opportunity which over the past years has not

1 been taken advantage of by our legislature.

2 For the second group, the underemployed, at the present  
3 time there is no federal matching for that group, although  
4 there has been one bill, for example, introduced in the  
5 Congress by Senator Case that would have provided for that  
6 group.

7 MR. LEUCHTER: The first category is a  
8 decision that can be made by the state legislature?

9 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

10 MR. LEUCHTER: The second category, unemployment,  
11 must be done on a federal level?

12 THE WITNESS: No. The state legislature can  
13 also deal with the second category, but there would  
14 be no matching for it.

15 MR. LEUCHTER: The point is theoretically  
16 that would have to be done at both Trenton and  
17 Washington if you are going to get matching funds?

18 THE WITNESS: Yes.

19 MR. MEYER: What is the percentage of  
20 contribution of the federal government to the  
21 Aid To Dependent Children roughly? I know it is  
22 an ascending and descending thing.

23 THE WITNESS: In the State of New Jersey it  
24 isn't given on a percentage basis. Currently the  
25 federal share of the ADC program is amounting to



1 about 40 percent.  
2 MR. MOYNER: That's because we take a more  
3 objective standard as to what a person should have  
4 to live on rather than some other states?

5 THE WITNESS: Well, that's why our percentage  
6 is less than some other states. However, the  
7 federal matching on AIC is in terms of so many  
8 federal dollars of the first so many dollars on  
9 the average plus 50 percent of the next group of  
10 dollars up to thirty dollars and so forth. It  
11 amounts to an absolute maximum of federal dollars  
12 of \$22 per month per person.

13 Our current average per person, monthly  
14 average per person, in the AIC program is slightly  
15 under sixty. But for each sixty dollars per  
16 person that we spend we get only twenty-two federal  
17 dollars. If we spend fifty-five dollars per  
18 person, we would still only get twenty-two federal  
19 dollars. If we spend sixty-five dollars per  
20 person, we would still get only the twenty-two  
21 federal dollars.

22 MR. LUCHTER: If what you say about the  
23 pretended absence of the husband is true both in  
24 practice as well as in theory, if it actually  
25 happens as you imply it does, then would it not

1 also follow that some of the alleged illegitimacy  
2 is in fact quite legitimate; that those who may  
3 be classified as illegitimately born are in truth  
4 sired by their real fathers under conditions of  
5 wedlock and, therefore, are not illegitimate at  
6 all?

7 THE WITNESS: If a child sired, well, let me  
8 put it this way: Is born to a woman who is  
9 married and whose husband is present, is alive,  
10 and where no other sire is identifiable, that  
11 child is presumed to be legitimate under the law  
12 of the State of New Jersey and isn't even classed  
13 as illegitimate.

14 MR. LEONARD: What I am saying is this: That  
15 a woman in an AIC situation receiving aid for her  
16 dependent children, were she to admit that the  
17 father of the new arrival was indeed her husband,  
18 would she not be deprived of funds under our  
19 present law?

20 THE WITNESS: No. We have such admissions  
21 every day in the week. They say, "My husband came  
22 in to see the children" on such and such a day,  
23 "and this happened. But he doesn't live here. I  
24 don't know where he lives."

25 MR. DRISCOLL: I don't want your your staff



1 to think we are being facetious about this very  
2 important subject, but I think every member of the  
3 Commission is of the opinion that one of the great  
4 problems facing us is half families. This is one  
5 of our problems and if there is anything we can do  
6 as a Commission to help solve that problem, we will  
7 have rendered a service. That's why you receive  
8 these questions.

9 THE WITNESS: I recognize that, Governor,  
10 and I would certainly agree that one of the major  
11 problems affecting our society in our community,  
12 not merely in terms of the economics but in terms  
13 of the social implications, the social structure,  
14 is what you refer to as the half family.

15 MR. BROWN: It is a fact though that general  
16 assistance could accommodate many of these problems  
17 theoretically? Actually they have a tax structure  
18 problem?

19 THE WITNESS: That is true.

20 MR. BROWN: Would you recommend, then, that  
21 the general assistance program be removed from  
22 municipalities and be incorporated into the county  
23 program under the county unit?

24 THE WITNESS: I will respond to that this way,  
25 Mr. Brown, and I think I responded to it the same

1 way when you sat as a member of the Alexander  
2 Commission --

3 MR. BROWN: And nothing has happened since.

4 THE WITNESS: Well, a few things.

5 MR. MEYER: There have been rebuffs on a few  
6 occasions.

7 THE WITNESS: I respond this way: That I  
8 believe that all public assistance programs should  
9 be integrated and should be administered to a  
10 single administering agency, and that if there is a  
11 division of cost, the division of cost should be  
12 across the board and not vary from one program to  
13 the other.

14 I am not responding at this point to the  
15 question of whether that integration ought better  
16 to occur in the structure of a county welfare board  
17 or in the structure of a state-administered  
18 program or in the structure of some district  
19 allocation of administration of the public  
20 assistance programs. But I do say that they ought  
21 to be integrated and we should not have one  
22 package administered by county welfare boards, a  
23 second administered by municipal welfare departments  
24 and a third package administered by state agencies  
25 without any county or municipal involvement at all.



1           MR. BROWN: But as a result of some of the  
2 work done on this hasn't it been generally agreed  
3 that the county unit is the most readily available  
4 and most likely unit for incorporation of the  
5 municipal programs within the structure rather  
6 than within the state structure?

7           THE WITNESS: In terms of the fact that the  
8 county welfare board structure does exist, that it  
9 does now administer the overwhelming bulk of the  
10 public assistance programs in terms of dollars and  
11 persons, and that it is an ongoing and, I hope, a  
12 viable structure, yes, it would make sense  
13 certainly as the first step of integration, even  
14 if it is only a first step, to integrate at that  
15 level. Of course, if you have been following the  
16 newspapers recently, you are beginning to see a  
17 large overtone of dissatisfaction being expressed  
18 with the county welfare board system by the county  
19 welfare boards and the boards of freeholders.

20           MR. BROWN: Yet historically it was the  
21 freeholders who wanted to control this area and  
22 espoused the unit system.

23           THE WITNESS: Yes.

24           MR. LICHTER: Isn't that mostly because  
25 they don't want to share the onus in the public

1        ...died for a substantial tax increase? They don't  
2        really mind money being spent as long as it wouldn't  
3        be charged to them?

4        THE WITNESS: That's correct. They would love  
5        to have the authority for administering the programs  
6        at the county level and have the state pay  
7        100 percent of the tab.

8        MR. BRIDGES: But the very essence of the home  
9        rule and the unit rule idea was the freeholders  
10       wanted control of the dispensation, and when the  
11       thing was argued ten years ago they were not so  
12       inclined? It has been nearly that, 1933?

13       THE WITNESS: It was in 1939. I don't know  
14       which of the studies you are referring to really.

15       MR. BRIDGES: There were only two.

16       THE WITNESS: No, there were more than two.  
17       During Governor Driscoll's administration you will  
18       recall there was the Bain-My Report.

19       MR. MEYNER: To take this from municipalities  
20       and put it in the county, the relief directors  
21       came down into Trenton and said, "You can't do  
22       that."

23       THE WITNESS: At the outset of your  
24       administration, Governor Meyner, there was the  
25       Kidd Commission Report.



1           MR. BROWN: Then the Alexander Report.

2           THE WITNESS: Even before the Alexander  
3 Commission there was Mrs. Yaguda's Medical Care  
4 Study Commission. Then there was the Alexander  
5 Commission.

6           MR. BROWN: Is it your feeling now that the  
7 counties would be willing to relinquish the control  
8 in terms of standards and the supplemental income  
9 to the under-income families, that they would be  
10 willing to relinquish this kind of control in  
11 terms of the tax shield that Mr. Leuchter talks  
12 about? Would they be willing to say, "All right,  
13 this is the state's problem; they are the ones  
14 raising the taxes" and pay for it by letting the  
15 state control the standards and so forth?

16          THE WITNESS: How the votes are going to line  
17 up on that particular issue I don't know. We  
18 have some county units that are saying, "Let the  
19 state take over the whole thing." We have others  
20 that are saying, "Let the state take over the  
21 whole thing," but they mean, "Let the state pay for  
22 the whole thing and let us continue to run it."

23          There are still others, and we will say one,  
24 Burlington County -- there they are saying, "Give  
25 it all back to the municipalities."

1           MR. BROWN: Would you say the larger counties  
2           are the counties that want to retain control while  
3           the smaller ones are willing to give way for total  
4           administration, literally control taxes?

5           THE WITNESS: I don't have enough information  
6           to respond to that.

7           MR. MEYER: Could you tell us, and I do  
8           realize it is a difficult question, how much of  
9           the welfare services is brought about by the  
10          migration of people from one area of the country  
11          to another? It has been my thought that is  
12          basically a national problem in the sense that  
13          people come from other places and they arrive  
14          here, and some of the places they come from  
15          really make no effort to establish welfare  
16          services. The people may come here in good faith  
17          hoping to be employed, but find they don't have  
18          the talent and then we have to pay what is  
19          basically a national problem.

20          Is this a sound thesis? Are there any  
21          statistics that indicate what percentage of the  
22          total welfare budget is brought about by this  
23          type of individual?

24          THE WITNESS: There are no hard statistics  
25          that I can give you on this subject. This is an



1 area to which we tried to address ourselves  
2 recently at the request of the Budget Bureau, and  
3 we did provide a statement to the Budget Bureau.  
4 I am sorry I don't have it with me.

5 MR. MEYNER: Could we have that for part of  
6 the record?

7 THE WITNESS: I could get it and provide it  
8 for the record.

9 Certainly a significant incidence of our  
10 current welfare problem can be identified with  
11 individuals and families who are recent in-migrants  
12 from elsewhere in the country. No question about  
13 that. I say significant incidence -- the  
14 dimensions of that significance are a matter of  
15 speculation. There are no hard data.

16 I provided the Budget Bureau, for example,  
17 with a very sophisticated study of that very  
18 issue that the State of Maryland tried to make,  
19 using very sophisticated statisticians and  
20 statistical methods, and came up with no hard data  
21 but just impressions. It is my opinion that even  
22 if we didn't have this incidence of in-migration  
23 from the agricultural southern states, we would  
24 still be experiencing a visible growth of  
25 significant proportions in the AIC caseload and the

1 general assistance caseload.

2 MR. MEYNER: I have been rather surprised to  
3 hear some witnesses here, some of the Negroes in  
4 the community, making very affirmative statements  
5 that relief is a base of our existence and we  
6 ought to put restrictions on it.

7 Is there any method by which at least to  
8 respond to these people that you could take people  
9 who have been on relief or subject to welfare and  
10 give them an intensive program to see whether you  
11 could get them out of the areas?

12 THE WITNESS: Yes, certainly.

13 Q: Get them out of the areas?

14 A: MR. MEYNER: Get them out of the relief roles.

15 A: MR. BROWN: Economic areas.

16 THE WITNESS: This is the very sort of thing  
17 to which we have been addressing ourselves in terms  
18 of isolated projects that I refer to as Title V  
19 projects and to which Mr. Taylor was addressing  
20 certain remarks.

21 In the 1967 amendments to the Social Security  
22 Act, which are currently in Conference Committee  
23 as between the Senate and the House, both the  
24 Senate version and the House version will make it  
25 mandatory that every state as part of its state



1 plan for receiving federal aid for the AIC program  
2 create and finance a structure of work experience  
3 and training programs that will be available for  
4 all geographical areas of the state and not just  
5 on a selected project basis. However, I would like  
6 to point out that this sort of thing, such as  
7 mandate makes only limited kind of sense in a  
8 structure where our AIC program does not include  
9 the families that have the male head within the  
10 family because if we continue to exclude that  
11 group of families from the ambit of the AIC program,  
12 then our work experience and training programs  
13 that we may create, may be obliged to create in  
14 every county of this state will be directing their  
15 attention only to women. Unquestionably the  
16 emphasis of the public assistance programs, and  
17 this is an emphasis which, incidentally, you will  
18 find stated in the first document that I gave you  
19 -- the emphasis should not be on providing financial  
20 assistance to keep the family's head above water,  
21 but there should be an affirmative emphasis on all  
22 kinds of measures and structures and programs that  
23 would aid and abet the adjustment of the family to  
24 both the economy and the society of the total  
25 community.

1           MR. BROWN: Is that three and a half percent  
2 turnover in the general assistance?

3           THE WITNESS: Three hundred fifty.

4           MR. BROWN: Three and a half times. The  
5 350 percent turnover, does that reflect people  
6 who get off and try and come back on again?

7           THE WITNESS: To some extent.

8           MR. BROWN: Would that seem to indicate that?

9           THE WITNESS: I have no data at this point  
10 to refine that 350 percent and to identify the  
11 various components within it, but certainly it  
12 does include some incidence of people who go on  
13 and off several times within the same year.

14           MR. BROWN: Would that be reflected in the  
15 sections of the state where there would be migrant  
16 laborers, or is this equally so in a municipality  
17 like Newark, Jersey City, Passaic or Camden?

18           THE WITNESS: I am guessing now, but I would  
19 guess this is equally true in your urban municipality.  
20 In fact, it might even be greater in the urban  
21 municipality because what you will find in the  
22 rural municipality in the context of the migrants  
23 that you are talking about is that their attachment  
24 to the general assistance rolls is a semi-annual,  
25 seasonal affair; that is, they are attached to the  
which we focus so much attention upon, monthly, and



1 general assistance roles during the winter months,  
2 and they are attached to the seasonal labor market  
3 in the spring and summer and early fall months.

4 MR. DRISCOLL: There are studies on this.

5 THE WITNESS: But in the urban municipalities  
6 you find this phenomenon: That the family applies  
7 for general assistance because papa loses his job  
8 the first time, and then there is great pressure  
9 on papa to go out and take the first job that is  
10 available to him, quick like a bunny, whether it  
11 is going to pay the family enough or whether it  
12 is the kind of a job that will be permanent for him,  
13 and he goes out and the job doesn't pay enough or  
14 the job blows up and then the family is back again.  
15 This can occur several times during the course of  
16 a year.

17 MR. DRISCOLL: What part does unemployment  
18 compensation play in this whole cycle?

19 THE WITNESS: Unemployment compensation  
20 provides compensation in the first instance,

21 unemployment compensation which is limited, of course, only to an individual who has had a  
22 substantial attachment to the labor market.

23 Secondly, unemployment compensation does not  
24 or has not heretofore dealt with the problem on  
25 your bill of your department's position on the  
which we focus so much attention here, namely, the



1 problem of the large family where the amount of  
2 unemployment compensation doesn't maintain a level  
3 during the period of unemployment.

4 MR. DRESCOLL: In other words, are you saying  
5 that the problem with respect to unemployment  
6 compensation for the large family and the AEC  
7 program is the same, the end result is the same?

8 THE WITNESS: In those aspects, yes.

9 MR. DROWN: But I think the gauge is  
10 different because the unemployment compensation  
11 is the same regardless of your family. It is what  
12 you have in the pool and the length of the  
13 unemployment, so it isn't rated at all in terms  
14 of need.

15 THE WITNESS: I understood the Governor was  
16 directing attention to the fact that the problem  
17 that I call unemployment or inadequate income has  
18 somewhat the same aspects both with respect to the  
19 man who is totally employed but at insufficient  
20 wages and the man who is unemployed but receiving  
21 unemployment compensation which is insufficient.

22 MR. LEUCHTER: In the material which you have  
23 distributed at the beginning of the section today  
24 on day care centers or programs, does it indicate  
25 your belief or your department's opinions as to the



1           adequacy or inadequacy of day care programs  
2           throughout the state?

3           THE WITNESS: No. The material that I have  
4           distributed does not contain any statistical data  
5           at all about the incidence of the facilities or  
6           the extent to which they are being utilized. We  
7           take it for granted, we all know that there are  
8           inadequate and insufficient facilities to meet the  
9           incidence of utilization of day care that does  
10          exist.

11          MR. BROWN: Is it your belief that, therefore,  
12          particularly in the suburban centers an expansion  
13          of day care centers by one agency or another would  
14          permit a greater employment of adults?

15          THE WITNESS: It would permit a greater  
16          employment of adults, but even before that it would  
17          permit adults to engage in some training so that  
18          they can as a second step move into employment.

19          I would like Mr. Riti, if you will permit  
20          him, to make some comments on about where we stand  
21          in terms of the availability of day care facilities  
22          and what we are trying to do about it.

23          MR. BROWN: Could I ask one thing first? In  
24          terms of municipalities such as Jersey City and  
25          Hudson County there is very little utility of

1 day care. In Jersey City you have to search far  
2 and wide to find one center. When you do, this  
3 increases the employability of the female as well  
4 as the male? Do you find any response from the

5 THE WITNESS: That's correct. The very  
6 purpose of the day care facility, one of its  
7 primary purposes is to relieve woman of a certain  
8 part of what are otherwise household duties.

9 MR. BROWN: which doesn't come back to our  
10 basic problem, which is male employability,  
11 particularly Negro male employability, so, therefore,  
12 what you are doing is facilitating the matriarchy  
13 and enhancing her position as an earner to the  
14 detriment, in a sense, of this other idea if we  
15 feel that the momentum is going the other way.

16 THE WITNESS: On the other hand, I don't  
17 think we should overlook the fact that in the  
18 current economy of our white families the incidence  
19 of both parents being in the labor market is not  
20 uncommon.

21 MR. BROWN: Do you find in the response from  
22 the community the emphasis on white need and white  
23 participation, or is this great bugaboo of Negro-  
24 Puerto Rican utility of facilities obscure, or are  
25 whites in it or do you find a response from the



1 community that says, "Well, look, there are poor  
2 whites; there are others that need it"?

3 Much of what we here emphasize is the  
4 non-white need. Do you find any response from the  
5 community as to the white need, and there must be  
6 a great deal of it?

7 THE WITNESS: Again I think this is something  
8 to which Mr. Riti might be able to respond  
9 because he is more directly sensitive to this  
10 area. He is closer to it.

11 You, would you speak on day care?

12 MR. RITI: We for the past few years have  
13 had responsibility for trying to gather data  
14 with reference to the number of facilities  
15 available for day care throughout the state. This  
16 was a federal thing. We attempted to do this.  
17 The latest figures that I have show there are  
18 121 day care centers in the State of New Jersey,  
19 and they have a total capacity of 4,308 children.

20 Someone just mentioned, you, Mr. Brown,  
21 in Hudson County there are practically very  
22 limited facilities. Actually our report indicates  
23 there are five day care centers in all of Hudson  
24 County with only a capacity of 116 children.

25 MR. BROWN: That includes the eight or nine

1 municipalities we have?

2 MR. RITTI: The total of the county.

3 MR. BROWN: Do you have anything indicated  
4 in Jersey City?

5 MR. RITTI: No, I don't have any breakdown  
6 for Jersey City.

7 BISHOP DOUGHERTY: Does that indicate also  
8 the private?

9 MR. RITTI: Yes, this is also private.

10 In the City of Newark, I understand, my figure  
11 shows there are 14 day care centers with a capacity  
12 for 610 children. When you add these up, these  
13 are very, very limited with respect to the  
14 available spaces for these children.

15 The Bureau of Children Services -- you raised  
16 a question with respect to the whole question of  
17 non-white versus white utilization. I can't give  
18 you the exact figures in relation to white or  
19 non-white in the day care centers, but for instance  
20 in Newark with respect to our total caseload I can  
21 point out to you that the caseload is somewhere in  
22 the neighborhood of 1,800 children just for the  
23 Bureau of Children Services. Of that number,  
24 approximately 86 percent are non-white; whereas,  
25 the statewide percentage of non-white children is



1 42 percent.

2 So I think there is a significance in this.

3 My guess would be that with respect to those

4 children that are in the day care centers in the

5 City of Newark a good number, a very high percentage

6 would be non-white.

7 The Bureau of Children Services is trying to

8 do a couple of things. One, we know that the day

9 care is required. This is a necessity. There are

10 not enough facilities currently available. We have

11 proposed that we would hopefully be able to set up

12 day care centers to be scattered throughout the

13 state, probably one in an urban section like Newark,

14 one in the center part of the state, and one in

15 the southern part to provide a very minimal coverage.

16 Hopefully each center would take care of about

17 35 children. We know this is nowhere near enough,

18 but there has to be a start.

19 We have also attempted something else in the

20 past few years. We are trying to get what we refer

21 to as family day care homes. All these are

22 basically what most of us know as foster homes,

23 but would only provide care for part of a day for

24 a child rather than 24 hours a day. We haven't

25 been too successful with this up until now.

1 Throughout the state we have been able to  
2 develop only 58 such homes, and we have in those  
3 homes only 67 children, so you start making the  
4 percentages and we are coming out to one and a half  
5 child per home.

6 What is the problem? I wish I knew the  
7 answer, but one of the big problems is when you  
8 have a facility available, and I don't care whether  
9 it is a foster day care or a congregate day care  
10 center, one of the problems is it is located in  
11 such a spot that it is not available to the  
12 children who require the service. This is true  
13 right across the board. Of course, the mere fact  
14 that it becomes almost impossible to find people  
15 who would be willing to provide this kind of care  
16 is another issue altogether.

17 In addition to that, you are running into the  
18 problem of the costs for such a program. For  
19 instance, with day care we pay somewhere in the  
20 neighborhood of ten dollars per week per child.  
21 Most people who just want to open up their home  
22 to take a couple of kids in without any kind of  
23 standards can probably get more than the ten  
24 dollars a week, and they are not bothered with  
25 the Social Security Agency.



1           The cost of transportation for the families  
2           that would have to use it, as I indicated, you have  
3           to go too far to get the service. That cost alone  
4           is prohibitive for many families.

5           Then there is always the problem, too, and  
6           this is one we have been trying to lick for a long  
7           time; this is simply the idea there is a tradition  
8           relating to day care and that tradition says  
9           something like this is nothing but a glorified  
10          babysitting service and how are we going to be able  
11          to change this concept or this tradition, which is  
12          something we are working on. It is going to be a  
13          tough process. But this is not only true for the  
14          general community; this is also true for people that  
15          are in the field. I would venture that up until a  
16          year to two years ago very few of us that were in  
17          welfare really knew what day care could provide.  
18          As a matter of fact, my understanding is there was  
19          a study in New York City in which they asked  
20          people what is day care? And interestingly enough  
21          those who should have known did not know.

22          MR. BROWN: Well, the state concept includes  
23          a great deal more than babysitting. It includes  
24          everything from supervision to medical supervision.  
25          How do you account for the fact that this can't

1 be so? For example, I will take that one instance,  
2 and I am sure it is desperate in Newark, too, that  
3 in Hudson County and Newark the very people who  
4 are involved in foster care are not able to  
5 disseminate within the neighborhood the fact that  
6 the day care unit is more than a babysitting situation  
7 and it is useful. For example, in spite of the  
8 fact that the churches, and particularly the  
9 Catholic Church in Hudson give such services,  
10 they have not availed themselves of certain things  
11 they can have for day care.

12 There is it because people don't understand it, or  
13 is there a resistance to it?

14 MR. RITI: I think they don't understand it.

15 There is a whole problem of education of what is  
16 day care? than even when you run into situations  
17 where people are beginning to see and are  
18 interested in day care, for instance, you will  
19 find some agencies that are interested in setting  
20 up a program of day care, then they run into that  
21 rather interesting problem of where do they get  
22 the money to do this. Some of them have talked  
23 and gone to Washington or they have been in touch  
24 with Washington with respect to where money is  
25 available for day care, and they get some interesting



1 answers. Q: What is the typical way for  
2 day care monies can come through the  
3 Federal Children's Bureau, and then they are told  
4 to get in touch with the state agency because the  
5 state agency takes care of these funds, but what  
6 they fail to tell the people is that the amount  
7 of money that is allocated for day care is such a  
8 small figure that by the time, even if they were  
9 able to, and they are not permitted to do this,  
10 but to take the total allocation and give it to  
11 one or two people, the allocation would be gone.  
12 There wouldn't be that kind of money.

13 Q: As it is now there is no specially earmarked  
14 federal money for day care purposes. The only  
15 money that I know that is coming through is through  
16 OSO and how this is administered and how you get it  
17 I couldn't say.

18 Q: MR. BROWN: Generally in our state it is  
19 under Community Affairs, isn't that so?

20 THE WITNESS: The Department of Community  
21 Affairs now embraces within it the former State  
22 Office of Economic Opportunity, but the funds come  
23 from the federal OSO.

24 Q: Did you feel  
25 there is any overlapping in your activities?  
THE WITNESS: There is certainly a great deal

1 MR. MEYNOR: What is the typical day for  
2 day care, eight to six?

3 MR. RITI: It varies in the various areas,  
4 but most people, of course, try to get to work at  
5 eight o'clock so that most day centers would have  
6 to open between seven and seven-thirty and go on  
7 until five to five-thirty.

8 I was going to say for instance down in the  
9 farms a couple of years ago we ran a day care  
10 center for migrant children, and this came about  
11 through a grant from the New Jersey DEQ whereby  
12 we provided a program right on the farms for  
13 children of migrant laborers. We did this for  
14 only one year, and we took care of somewhere in  
15 the neighborhood of 100 children for the summer.  
16 But then the local community action programs  
17 assumed that exact program the following year,  
18 and I believe they ran it last year also. My  
19 guess is they are going to continue to run it, but  
20 these are for the migrants.

21 MR. DRISCOLL: I was going to ask how closely  
22 your department or your division works with the  
23 Department of Community Affairs. Did you feel  
24 there is any overlapping in your activities?

25 THE WITNESS: There is certainly a great deal



1 of common interest and common concern, and we  
2 are attempting to address ourselves in many areas  
3 to the same basic problems and the same group of  
4 people. ~~Addressing attention to the fact that if~~  
5 ~~we~~ At the present time there is a certain amount  
6 of feeling between the two departments. This is  
7 inevitable. If your question is do I regard it  
8 as inevitable that there should be inappropriate  
9 overlapping, no, I do not. I think it is con-  
10 ceivable that after enough shake-down cruise in  
11 the new department we will be able to identify  
12 those things which are Caesar's and those which  
13 are God's. ~~Address a question to Mr. Taylor?~~

14 There is a certain amount of obscurity at  
15 the present time in certain areas. I couldn't  
16 deny that. ~~At the present time, or is it is the~~

17 ~~through~~ MR. DRISCOLL: With the need being so great  
18 I am sure you must feel that it is important to  
19 get every dollar out into the field where it will  
20 do the most good. ~~Right now it is before the~~

21 ~~question~~ THE WITNESS: Well, the last phrase is  
22 important, "where it will do the most good."

23 ~~question~~ MR. BROWN: I think you were going to bring  
24 Mr. Taylor in on the Title V ideas which leads  
25 more to the question of employability to the male

1 than to any other program.

2 THE WITNESS: If you will recall, I think I  
3 had developed my remarks on that score to the  
4 point of directing attention to the fact that if  
5 we don't expand the ADC program in this state to  
6 embrace the families in which there is an employ-  
7 able male person, then our work experience in  
8 training programs is inevitably going to have as  
9 its primary target the female, and you had com-  
10 mented on that yourself.

11 MR. BROWN: Then that is a built-in defi-  
12 ciency there unless we can incorporate. Do you  
13 mind if I address a question to Mr. Taylor?

14 THE WITNESS: No.

15 MR. BROWN: Do you anticipate Title V will  
16 continue in its present form, or is it in the  
17 throes of change?

18 MR. TAYLOR: It is not a way of life. We  
19 know from the very beginning it would last a  
20 handful of years. Right now it is before the  
21 committees in the House and the Senate, and  
22 depending upon how they compromise and how much  
23 money they give us we will know where we are going  
24 this year. One school of thought is we will have  
25 as much money as last year. In that event we won't



1 have to cut any of our projects.

2 Another school of thought is that it is  
3 going to be reduced by about forty percent. In  
4 that case we will not have as many projects. This  
5 is as far as we know. It is still in Congress.

6 THE WITNESS: But I want to supplement that.  
7 While there is a certain amount of uncertainty  
8 about the life of the Title V program as such,  
9 there is at the same time apparent unanimity of  
10 both the House and the Senate on the concept that  
11 State welfare department will be required to  
12 maintain this kind of activity on a continuing  
13 mandatory basis as part of the public welfare  
14 program and not as a special project under  
15 Title V.

16 MR. BROWN: But that means, then, if you  
17 could reform the ADC to include the concept of  
18 the under-income family, then your Title V  
19 would naturally come in, but failing this we are  
20 going to be in the same bind we were in a matter  
21 of a couple of years ago, aren't we?

22 THE WITNESS: Unless the state does it or  
23 the municipality does it.

24 MR. TAYLOR: Unless the state does it or the  
25 municipality won't get the male component without

1 an ADC unemployed parent program.

2 MR. BROWN: Mr. Jaffe, do you think it is  
3 possible within the framework of time to get  
4 some material to work with Mr. Engelman, knowing  
5 his time is about one hundred fifty percent con-  
6 sumed, isn't it?

7 THE WITNESS: I am supposed to be starting  
8 off for Washington right now.

9 MR. BROWN: That we can get some data on  
10 this concept of the employability of the male  
11 which Governor Driscoll pointed out has been  
12 repeatedly emphasized as a very serious factor in  
13 the family continuity, family control, family  
14 development. This is probably as vital an area  
15 as we have had to deal with. What can we do in  
16 terms of some working paper on this?

17 MR. JAFFE: I think the question is what  
18 Mr. Engelman could help us with in that area.

19 THE WITNESS: I would like to make one comment  
20 in that connection, Mr. Brown, and that is this:  
21 in attempting to mount these Title V projects in  
22 the various places where they have been -- Newark,  
23 the Paterson-Passaic area, Trenton, Camden,  
24 Monmouth County and Union -- we went through such  
25 exercises as asking the municipal welfare directors



1 in those areas to identify in their case loads  
2 males of employable age and of apparent physical  
3 employability, to identify them as potential can-  
4 didates for these projects.

5 MR. BROWN: You got quite a response from  
6 Monmouth, didn't you?

7 THE WITNESS: I don't know what response we  
8 got from Monmouth, but I do know that from a com-  
9 munity like Paterson -- wasn't Paterson one where  
10 they said they didn't have a man on the general  
11 assistance roles who was employable?

12 MR. TAYLOR: We had trouble in every project  
13 in getting up to our male strength.

14 MR. BROWN: Is that conceivable, that they  
15 didn't have employable males?

16 MR. TAYLOR: With minor children.

17 MR. DRISCOLL: They put handcuffs on this.

18 BISHOP DOUGHERTY: That was discussed earlier  
19 by your division, what could be done at the state  
20 and national level.

21 MR. BROWN: My idea of what the Commission  
22 can fruitfully go into is some concept I think we  
23 have developed here to the effect that Title V and  
24 the ADC program has to have some sort of change if  
25 it is going to embrace the idea we are urging, and

1 we can only hope to project this if we can get the  
2 kind of valid presentation that would rely both  
3 upon your figures and experience upon our executive  
4 director's ability to use his staff to tie it in  
5 so that we come up with something that is viable  
6 as opposed to something visionary, because I have  
7 a fear of coming up with the broad recommendation,  
8 the broad ideas. It doesn't mean anything to  
9 anybody who reads it, particularly those who feel  
10 that nobody wants to work anyway. But is that  
11 practical at all?

12 THE WITNESS: I think we should have focus on  
13 the fact that projects that have similarity to  
14 Title V, that is, projects that are concerned with  
15 the training and movement into the labor market of  
16 unskilled or underskilled people do exist even for  
17 males who are not heads of families, but those are  
18 projects that are being mounted in various places  
19 and under various structures through OEO grants to  
20 community action organizations.

21 The only activity of that nature that is  
22 funded in which the traditional welfare department  
23 is afforded funding to do this kind of thing is  
24 Title V. Title V is restricted in the way that  
25 has been described here, but there is funding for



1 similar activity, under the aegis of the Welfare  
2 Department. It doesn't deal with one head of

3 CHAIRMAN LILLEY: Following through on  
4 Mr. Brown's request, could our Commission through  
5 Mr. Jaffe obtain any data that you might have that  
6 would help us in this employability area?

7 THE WITNESS: We have no available hard data.  
8 The only thing we could do that might have sig-  
9 nificance would be to send out a one-time census  
10 and ask everyone of the municipal welfare depart-  
11 ments to advise us as of the end of December, for  
12 example, on that date: "How many people do you  
13 have on your general assistance roles who in your  
14 opinion are employable?"

15 By Mr. Jaffe: you, within certain limits, have had  
16 Q would you mind just remaining for a few minutes?

17 We want to take up some quick Commission business before  
18 Governor Driscoll and Governor Meynor leave.

19 MR. BROWN: I would like to ask one question.

20 THE WITNESS: I have to get back to Trenton  
21 and have to go to Washington.

22 MR. BROWN: What about the effect of Title I?  
23 Title I has to some extent employed manpower  
24 situations. It doesn't deal with Title V.

25 MR. TAYLOR: It is a youth program.

1 MR. BROWN: Has that had any impact at all in  
2 this area? It doesn't deal with the heads of  
3 families.

4 MR. TAYLOR: No.

5 MR. BROWN: It deals with males in a sense  
6 of employable males. My next question is, which  
7 is Part A: Has there been any interchange of  
8 data so that we can understand some of the success  
9 of this program in dealing with the single man,  
10 the youth? He is generally sixteen to nineteen.  
11 Have you had any experience with that? One of  
12 the great myths is the fact the people on the  
13 relief roles won't work; that people from one area  
14 won't work. Title I appears to have had some  
15 success, and you, within certain limits, have had  
16 some success. Divorcing it temporarily from the  
17 head of family concept, are there any figures on  
18 that which can assist us in trying to evaluate  
19 this perpetual myth that people on relief won't work?  
20 I will boil it down to a very personal  
21 sense, that Negroes won't work, and I know you  
22 don't have that kind of available information.

23 MR. TAYLOR: The Community Affairs people are  
24 trying to build a data bank which is in the early  
25 stages, and they have some Ford Foundation money



1 to finance it. They have a professional outfit  
2 coming in to work up an IBM structure which  
3 everybody will report into. If you want to know  
4 about youth corps or job corps, then you have to  
5 go to the OEO people.

6 THE WITNESS: I would like to make an obser-  
7 vation.

8 CHAIRMAN LILLEY: Perhaps if you do have a  
9 few minutes, we would like to take a brief recess.  
10 We have urgent Commission business, and then you  
11 could come back.

12 THE WITNESS: Very well.

13 (whereupon, a short recess was taken.)

14 CHAIRMAN LILLEY: Thank you, Mr. Engelman.  
15 We will now try to finish with you because you  
16 want to get to Washington.

17 THE WITNESS: That is correct.

18 If I may, while I am thinking of it, I did  
19 have something that was burning my tongue that was  
20 evoked by something Mr. Brown said about the myth  
21 of large numbers of people receiving public  
22 assistance who are employable and who don't want  
23 to work. Mr. Brown was alluding to the possibility  
24 of various kinds of statistical demonstrations,  
25 that this is a myth. As far as I am concerned

1 that ghost was laid a long time ago by a very  
2 simple phenomenon that doesn't require a lot of  
3 statistical sophistication. We went through the  
4 experience that in the period of the great war  
5 and immediately preceding the great war all public  
6 assistance roles went down very drastically, and  
7 they didn't go down because the administration put  
8 on a lot of extra detectives and a lot of extra  
9 case workers and a lot of extra services and a lot  
10 of extra incentives and a lot of extra stimulation.  
11 They went down merely because jobs were available,  
12 and jobs were available to anybody who could  
13 breathe. When jobs are available and available at  
14 wages that people feel compensate them for their  
15 work so they can at least meet a reasonable  
16 standard of living, you don't need artificial  
17 incentives to move people into those jobs. They  
18 move themselves. This is my belief. There are  
19 always exceptions.

20 There is going to be a hard core no matter  
21 what the structure is. There is going to be a  
22 hard core of eccentric, disaffected, psycho-  
23 neurotic, psychopathic individuals who just don't  
24 believe in working or who believe that only saps  
25 work. But certainly the myth that the public



1 welfare roles at the present time are overpop-  
2 ulated with such people is to me just a myth.

3 MR. GOLDMAN: Isn't it also documented, isn't  
4 this myth also documented by the fact that the  
5 heavy percentage and the rising percentage in the  
6 case load is mothers with dependant children and  
7 not employable males?

8 THE WITNESS: Well, that's true, but, on the  
9 other hand, we have to deal with the speculation,  
10 and it is more than a speculation, that part of  
11 this mushrooming of the mothers with dependant  
12 children is a by-product of the fact that there is  
13 or should be a male in that household who is or  
14 should be working.

15 MR. GOLDMAN: Isn't beyond the Title V ex-  
16 periments the more realistic incentive what is now  
17 in the Senate bill and what is being tried in some  
18 other places, to make the retainable income without  
19 deductions from welfare when people get work more  
20 realistic and meaningful and attractive?

21 THE WITNESS: This introduces a very compli-  
22 cated subject which I would like to deal with, and  
23 unfortunately I haven't got the time. Certainly  
24 there should be an incentive, but in my opinion the  
25 kind of formula that is in both the Senate and House

1 bill is going to be disastrous for New Jersey, and  
2 I am about to go down to Washington to tell them  
3 so. Let me just give you one simple illustration.

4 ~~So~~ The formula that is in those bills at the  
5 present time is alright, it is fine for any state  
6 whose public assistance standard is way down here  
7 (indicating) so that it has got to be beefed up  
8 in tremendous proportions. But let me point out  
9 to you what will happen in New Jersey if the  
10 Senate version of the bill is adopted. The Senate  
11 version says that if a family is receiving public  
12 assistance and a member of that family secures  
13 employment, the public assistance agency shall  
14 count as income for purposes of the public  
15 assistance budget only that portion of the earnings  
16 which remain after deducting the first fifty  
17 dollars plus fifty percent of the remainder.

18 ~~Now~~ Right now in New Jersey our public assistance  
19 standard for a family of four persons is approxi-  
20 mately \$330 a month, \$3,960 a year. Under ADC the  
21 family of four, assuming that the oldest child is  
22 a teen-ager, has a budget of \$230 a month plus  
23 shelter cost, and you can figure on the average  
24 the shelter cost for such a family is at least  
25 \$100. That's \$330 a month, \$3,960 a year. If



1 that family applies for ADC and has no income, they  
2 get \$330 a month. If they have some income that's  
3 other than earned income, they get the difference  
4 between that income and \$330 a month.

5 If at this point one of the members of that  
6 family is already working, we allow an additional  
7 \$40 a month in that budget. So that family, when  
8 its combined income from whatever source, from  
9 earnings exceeds the \$330 a month level by \$40 a  
10 month, or \$480 a year -- we already have a four  
11 hundred eight dollar a year incentive built in --  
12 they are no longer eligible for supplementary  
13 assistance.

14 what happens under the Senate formula? That  
15 family under the Senate formula would not be  
16 removable at all from the rolls. That family would  
17 have to continue to receive some supplementary  
18 assistance until its net take-home income was two  
19 hundred percent plus \$50 of the \$330 that we  
20 started with. That is mathematics, and you can  
21 figure it out.

22 MR. BROWN: It doubles the budget.

23 THE WITNESS: It doubles the budget and adds  
24 \$50 to it, double plus \$50. Under this formula  
25 that family would have to have net take-home pay

1 of over \$8,000 before we could cease giving  
2 public assistance to that family, and up until  
3 that point that family would, over and above these  
4 dollars, receive full medical care besides. If  
5 you apply that same thing to a budget for a family  
6 of six that we talked about, we are getting up  
7 into the areas where the family will continue to  
8 be on public assistance for supplementation up  
9 until there is net take-home pay in the nine-ten  
10 thousand dollar area, which, of course, is  
11 equivalent to an income before taxes of \$12,000  
12 or better.

13 MR. GOLDMAN: Isn't there a graduated  
14 deduction after a certain amount from the welfare  
15 budget?

16 THE WITNESS: The welfare would have to con-  
17 tinue to supplement the earnings until the  
18 earnings reached a point that they were two hundred  
19 percent plus \$50 of what you started with. Yes,  
20 of course, there is delinquent welfare systems,  
21 but I am pointing out that some welfare would con-  
22 tinue to be provided to this family up until the  
23 point that I described. At the same time this  
24 same Senate provision says that we may not do the  
25 same thing for the family which at the point it



1 presents itself to us is already earning more than  
2 the \$3,960 a year.

3 MR. LEUCHTER: What, then, will be your recom-  
4 mendation to Washington?

5 THE WITNESS: My recommendation to our  
6 Senators will be that this exemption of income  
7 idea is fine, but you have got to have a ceiling  
8 on it. This is open-ended. There is no ceiling.

9 MR. BROWN: It will destroy the programs.

10 THE WITNESS: There is no ceiling there of  
11 any kind. They have just put a ceiling on the so-  
12 called Title XIV program on Medicaid. They have  
13 said you can't set a standard for Medicaid which  
14 is greater than 133 1/3 percent in the House  
15 version, or 150 percent in the Senate version, of  
16 your public assistance standard. But here in the  
17 same act they are saying that public assistance as  
18 such you can go all the way up to 200 percent plus  
19 \$50 of whatever --

20 MR. LEUCHTER: You approve of the general  
21 idea, but you want a realistic ceiling?

22 THE WITNESS: That's right. I would say the  
23 ceiling ought to be the same as the ceiling they  
24 are imposing for Medicaid, whatever that is going  
25 to be.

1 MR. LEUCHTER: One hundred thirty or one  
2 hundred fifty percent.

3 MR. GOLDMAN: What would you say would be a  
4 realistic minimum as a monthly incentive for a  
5 family of four, of retainable income without  
6 reduction as compared to your present \$40?

7 THE WITNESS: I would say there is nothing  
8 unrealistic or unviable about the formula of the  
9 first \$50 plus fifty percent of the remainder up  
10 to the point, however, where the total family  
11 income does not exceed 133 1/3 percent of whatever  
12 standard you started with.

13 CHAIRMAN LILLEY: How much time do you have  
14 and your own occupation?

15 THE WITNESS: I am already over my time. I  
16 have to go back to Trenton and then I am being  
17 picked up to drive to Washington.

18 CHAIRMAN LILLEY: I haven't been here all  
19 business during your testimony, but what I have been present  
20 for indicates you have done quite a job for us, and  
21 I notice you did that before and we thank you and  
22 your staff for coming here.

23 THE WITNESS: You are quite welcome. If there  
24 are any data that occur to your staff or to you  
25 that I might be able to provide, let us know.



1 published by MR. JAFFE: We appreciate your offer very  
2 all of which have been concerned essentially with urban  
3 problems. The first was the future of (Witness excused.)  
4 Department Store and more recently have been working in the  
5 whereupon, housing.

6 Q You have GEORGE STERNLIEB the monograph  
7 called as a witness, duly sworn, testified as follows:

8 A That CHAIRMAN LILLEY: Thank you for your  
9 patience, Mr. Sternlieb. We were getting some  
10 field of real fine data on an important area.

11 A There EXAMINATION subsequent studies, the  
12 first of By Mr. Jaffe: (at Seeds, Social Resources, Newark

13 Q Mr. Sternlieb, would you give us your full name  
14 and your present occupation?

15 A My full name is George Sternlieb. I am a pro-  
16 fessor at the Graduate School of Business Administration  
17 and teach city planning, and, in addition, am director of  
18 research of the Research Center of the Graduate School of  
19 Business at Rutgers.

20 Q I wonder if you very briefly would sketch your  
21 background, how long you have been there and your major  
22 areas of interest.

23 A I have an M.B.A. and a D.B.A. from the Harvard  
24 Business School. I was a fellow for two years at the Joint  
25 Center of Urban Studies of Harvard and MIT. I have