

Marshall University

Marshall Digital Scholar

League of Women Voters of the Huntington
Area Bulletin 1970-1979

League of Women Voters of the Huntington
Area Bulletin

12-1970

League of Women Voters of the Huntington Area Bulletin, December, 1970

League of Women Voters of the Huntington Area

Follow this and additional works at: https://mds.marshall.edu/lowv_newletter_1970_1979



HUNTINGTON AREA LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

DECEMBER, 1970 ** HAPPY HOLIDAYS

Mrs. Neil Gibbins, President
6128 Gideon Road -- 736-3287

Mrs. George Hartman, Editor
6224 Brenda Court--736-5790

CALENDAR

Dec. 22 9:30 a. m. Meeting with Senator McKown and Delegate
Dennis White, at Chloe Dunfee's, 818 - 13th Ave.

Jan. 5 9:30 a. m. "Let's Get Ready to Lobby", (see bulletin item
for details) Enslow Park Presbyterian Church,
Babysitter Provided.

THERE WILL BE NO NIGHT MEETING ON JANUARY
6.

Jan. 12 9:30 a. m. Board meeting at Sue Carlson's 2009 N. Englewood Rd.

Jan. 19 9:30 a. m. Air Pollution unit meeting, Enslow Park Presby-
terian Church. Babysitter provided.

Jan. 20 7:30 p. m. Air Pollution unit meeting at Chloe Dunfee's
818 - 13th Avenue.

Feb. 2 9:30 a. m. Air Pollution consensus meeting--Enslow Park Pres-
byterian Church--babysitter provided.

Feb. 3 7:30 p. m. Air Pollution consensus meeting--Florence Oxley's
1220 - 12th Street.

Feb. 16 LEAGUE DAY AT THE LEGISLATURE

NEED A RIDE? Call any of the following League members:

Kathleen Kowalski	525-9555
Sue Carlson	523-5838
Mary Lee Watts	523-0496
Beth Bauserman	522-3052
Fonetta Collett	522-3938
Pat Hartman	736-5790 (Pea Ridge area)

LOCAL PROGRAM

At the annual business meeting in March, the Huntington League will determine what its local studies will be. The procedure for this is as follows from our By-Laws:

"(a) The Board of Directors shall consider the recommendations sent in by the voting members two months prior to the Annual Meeting and shall formulate a Proposed Program.

(b) The Proposed Program shall be sent to all members one month before the Annual Meeting."

At the Annual Meeting the membership may still adopt a program for study not recommended by the board, if members had recommended this program to the board. Therefore, the Board is asking members to submit their recommendations to any Board member. The Board discussion will be in February.

Below is listed the present local Current Agenda as adopted for 1970-71 and the progress of the studies.

Study of Comprehensive Planning in Cabell County

The speaker at the March annual meeting will talk about planning, new trends and what the scope of planning might involve. Other than assembling materials, no other League work has been done due to a very heavy general program load.

Study of the Cabell County School System

The school survey is under way with 12 members involved in the first phase. The purpose is to give an overall picture of the organization, operation and program of the local school system. A guide book prepared by the National League of Women Voters is being used as a basis for study with adaptations by the local committee.

Because of the broad scope of the project, this year is being spent gathering data on organization and administration, to be followed by the study of curriculum and school program.

In the beginning the committee felt that if this study is to have any value it must be accurate and thorough. Working in teams of two, we are in the process of gathering information on organization and administration through research and interviews of school personnel. When the study is completed, the findings will be published and made available to the public as well as to the League membership. It may be that bases for League positions and action will result.

Helen Brown, Chairman

Study of the Cabell County Juvenile Court

The time has come "to think of many things" -- a new local program for League, for instance. Our program on the juvenile court has progressed to the stage where it may be called a continuing responsibility. This will leave an

LOCAL PROGRAM ... cont.

opening for the pursuit of new ideas. So-o-o, let me know of your wishes. This is the time to push your pet project.

The juvenile program will not fade into retirement by any means. Programs, using slide pictures, are being prepared to present to groups. One program will be suitable for P. T. A.'S civic groups, or other interested adult groups. This presentation will stress juvenile court procedure and laws. A second program will be offered to the classroom and will emphasize the consequences of a court record.

Please! Tell the program chairman of other clubs; find out if they are interested in programs of this type. The program will be ready by the end of January. Two groups have already made appointments.

Beta Bauserman, Chairman

LET'S GET READY TO LOBBY

This meeting, on January 5, will have three parts:

1. A brief review of legislative procedure--'How the legislature works.
2. How to lobby!
3. A briefing on all state League items.

This will be an important meeting for all Leaguers and especially for new members. It's not only important but it will be most interesting so do try to attend. The Legislature opens January 13, 1971.

A warm welcome to the following new members:

Mrs. Wayne George (Jean)	9 Crestridge Dr.	736-1325
Mrs. Alexander Thomas (June)	1676 - 9th Avenue	522-8835
Mrs. Wesley King (Pat)	4 Dickson Lane	726-3550
Mrs. Robert Csernica (Ann)	105 Woodland Dr.	525-1017
Mrs. David Crawford (Mildred)	120 Jefferson Park Drive	736-1584

NEW MEMBERS - ATTENTION

A slip of my slipshod memory, I, Mary Lee Watts, failed to tell you that our unit study meetings are always held on the 1st and 3rd Tuesday mornings and Wednesday nights of the month. All Tuesday morning meetings are at the Enslow Park Presbyterian Church with a babysitter (50¢ per mother) and the Wednesday night meetings in homes announced in the bulletin each month. The night meeting is a repeat of the Tuesday morning meeting each time, so select according to your convenience. There will be no unit studies the 3rd Tuesday and Wednesday of February or in March, because of the trip to the Legislature on February 16, and the annual luncheon meeting in March.

Unit Study meetings are a culmination of committee work and study so do call the chairman of your study interest soon - like now! (See chairmen listed in your kit officers sheet).

STUDY OF WELFARE - INCOME MAINTENANCE LOCAL CONSENSUS REPORT

The following is a summary made by combining the consensus of a morning meeting of eleven members and an evening meeting of nine.

1. All felt that government had a responsibility of providing the basic needs of every person by assuring training for jobs and providing income assistance when jobs are not available, earnings are inadequate, or persons not employable.
2. The groups felt that administration should be governed by a single agency to avoid wasteful duplication and provide more reasonable standards. Many felt if states administered or financed the program, more corruption would be involved, one person felt state financing would be more desirable to allow for local demands. Those who favored the federal financing and administration felt it would be less burdensome for the poorer states to provide an equitable income level. By providing a more equitable level, it would limit migration from one state to another in search of better benefits. The federal government would set a floor beneath which income assistance would not go. Although the administration should be a single administration, it was felt that decentralized offices in contact with the people would be a necessity. These offices would help develop guidelines for job opportunities and any variances indigenous to a region.

A minority felt that states should supplement the income level as they would then be more careful about how the money was spent. The majority felt that the states should have the option of supplementing the federal income maintenance program if they wished, but if the federal level was below present levels of income assistance, it should be required to continue at the established level. A minority felt that to maintain established levels should not be mandatory.

3. (a) Eligibility should be determined by need with consideration of income levels, regional cost of living and number of persons in the family.
(b) Most felt that ideally benefit levels should be 100% of need. Realistically a minimum standard believed financially feasible should be set by the federal government and states could supplement this.
(c) All felt the dignity of the recipient could best be maintained by a declarative system with spot checks similar to the Income Tax program. A substantial number suggested that visitation of inspectors should be by appointment only and suggested that the effectiveness of the program would be enhanced if high standards were maintained for all social workers.
(d) A minority felt that only cash should be given to protect the dignity of the individual. The majority felt that cash or kind could be given allowing for administrative flexibility to meet individual cases.

- (e) All felt that recipients should be required to work if able-bodied, and if work was available at minimum wage levels. All felt that assistance should be scaled to work incentive, i. e., payments should not drop 100% of every dollar earned, but should be scaled 50% reducing upwards till minimum is reached.
4. (a) All believed all the supportive services mentioned should be essential. A minority felt family planning assistance should be emphasized above all others, with family planning clinics set upon wide distribution levels.
- (b) The groups agreed that services should be provided for everyone, but offered on a sliding scale (free to those on income maintenance.)
- (c) All agreed that services should be integrated with all having the right to refuse services unless protective services are required; e. g., senile persons, child neglect, etc.
- (d) A minority felt that supportive services should be determined by the federal government with decentralized offices as suggested in part 2. The majority felt that they were not prepared to answer 4 (d) and would like to register a complaint that not enough time was given to study the issue in general, even though we meet twice a month. The following recommendation was made by a minority: that it would not be practical for the federal government to finance and administer legal services, as this might often result in the government suing itself with unfair consequences.

Joan Bassford, Chairman

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

Information on air pollution covers volumes. If you can become familiar with the following terms before January you will be more informed for the consensus.

Ambient air: the outdoor air

Ambient air quality standards: Concentration of a pollutant at ground level which is desirable to attain. Should be low enough in polluted areas to be below the concentration level at which adverse health effects are known to occur. Should also be attainable! A goal by itself does nothing to clean the air.

Emission Regulation: A regulation which limits emissions of air pollutants; the mechanism which gets the job done. All types of pollutant sources, open burning, power plants, chemical plants, etc., are restricted by these regulations.

Federal Air Quality Control Region: A geographical area encompassing a single air shed which, after consultation with state officials, the federal government calls an air quality control region. All regions named so far are interstate areas.

Criteria Documents: From time to time the federal government publishes a document which defines the problems caused by a certain pollutant. It relates adverse health effects, corrosion and soiling effects, and damage to vegetation to various concentrations of the pollutant. Such a document represents necessary background research upon which to set meaningful ambient air quality standards.

This material was compiled by the State Environmental Quality Chairman, Ann Rick, of Charleston.

Copies of the League publication "A Congregation of Vapors", which is a concise, informative booklet on air pollution, will be for sale at the January 5th meeting. Members are urged to read this prior to consensus.