

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
January 21, 1983

The meeting of the Human Services Committee was called to order by Chairman Marjorie Hart, January 21, 1983, 12:30 p.m., in Room 224A. All members were present except Rep. Fabrega who was absent and Rep. Brand who was excused.

HOUSE BILL 24.

QUESTIONS:

REP. WINSLOW asked if this was switched over to the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, would that mean that reimbursement, licensing, etc., would be done in one area. He also asked what are the areas that are split at the present time. As a youth care provider, what areas do they have to work with? NORMA VESTRE responded by saying that right now the placements are made by three separate state agencies--SRS, Institutions and Office of Public Instruction. While replacements are made locally, the question comes up who is going to pay for the placement. Oftentimes there is a conflict. The budget would be with SRS. REP. WINSLOW inquired if SRS would be doing all the placement. NORMA VESTRE replied no. The youth courts would continue to make placements as well as the Department of Institutions. REP. WINSLOW asked if OPI does the placement, do they have to pay for it. NORMA VESTRE said no. Very often we negotiate with SRS when we pay for their room and board and the school district will pay for their vocational cost. REP. WINSLOW asked if it is changed, would SRS pick up all the reimbursement for these youth. NORMA VESTRE replied that this bill relates to the Department of Institutions and SRS.

REP. SWIFT asked NORMA VESTRE in referring to page 28 which has to do with the original bill as it was before--words to the effect that the county would be responsible once the judge decided that the youth will be placed in the program--does SRS supplement the county. NORMA VESTRE said that the payment comes from county, state and federal funds. The county establishes the budget prior to the fiscal year.

REP. SWIFT asked NORMA VESTRE if she was aware of what we are experiencing in the problem area of indigency in counties where we have exceeded the budget by some five or ten times. We have a debt of about \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000. The county could be left holding the bag if they received 10% more cases this coming year. Is there any assurance they could get the funding for that level?

REP. KEYSER stated that Section 24 is now existing language. It is not a new section of the law nor a new section that we have added. REP. SWIFT said that is correct and he thought amendments may be in order.

NORMA VESTRE wanted to clarify that section. It deals with county-run shelter care facilities.

REP. JONES stated the bill specifically states such compensation and the maintaining of such facilities shall be paid out of the county treasury. NORMA VESTRE replied that it would, as it is under the section of shelter care detention. That allows counties to establish their own facilities. There are no counties who operate facilities with only county funds. They are paid for by county, state and federal funds.

There were a number of amendments that were submitted. CHAIRMAN HART said that the Committee was not going to consider the amendments. If anyone had any questions on the amendments, they could be directed to Dave Bohyer, our staff researcher.

REP. CONNELLY wanted to know why they want the change. What is their reason behind it? REP. KEYSER stated that, basically, there is fragmentation of services--who pays the money, etc. There are three different agencies that have different functions. What the bill is trying to do is coordinate one agency to have charge of record keeping and the different rules that go with it.

REP. HANSEN asked where does the real authority lie? REP. KEYSER replied with SRS except where a person is incarcerated, and the Department of Institutions would handle that. Everything would be centralized into one record-keeping area where figures and facts would be available.

REP. SEIFERT asked NORMA VESTRE if we changed the bill on page 18 where it says the youth court may establish procedures in finding, maintaining and administrating children's care in foster homes or other homes approved by the court for youth within the provisions of this chapter--does St. Ignatius fall under SRS's jurisdiction now? He also asked regarding Pinehaven. NORMA VESTRE said that currently Pinehaven is not licensed by the department. REP. SEIFERT inquired as to why they dropped their license. JEREMIAH JOHNSON stated that they voluntarily withdrew. REP. CONNELLY asked if the Kalispell home was licensed? JEREMIAH JOHNSON stated that the district youth guidance home is licensed by SRS.

CHAIRMAN HART closed the hearing on HOUSE BILL 24 and went into EXECUTIVE SESSION putting this bill into a subcommittee chaired by REP. BRAND with REP. KEYSER and REP. FARRIS participating as members.

HOUSE BILL 156. REP. PAVLOVICH, sponsor, stated that this bill is an act to increase monthly payment to victims of silicosis from \$200 to \$400 and to make uniform the payments to surviving spouses. We are incorporating REP. McBRIDE'S bill into this one. In 1981 there were only 442 recipients of this silicosis benefit. As of now, we have 395. The reason for bringing this up is the rising cost of inflation. These people are on a fixed income and have to qualify under the act to get this money.

PROPOSERS:

REP. McBRIDE appeared in support of HOUSE BILL 156. She drew the Committee's attention to page 3, section 4, that is, in fact, the identical bill that she presented to the Committee.

JIM MURRAY, representing Montana AFL-CIO, spoke in support of HOUSE BILL 156, (EXHIBIT 1).

OPPOSSERS: none

REP. PAVLOVICH closed saying that there is a fiscal note on this bill. If this bill does pass, it will have to go into Appropriations along with REP. McBRIDE'S bill.

QUESTIONS:

REP. KEYSER asked how many widows are on the program. REP. PAVLOVICH replied there are 185 widows and 210 men who qualify under it or 395 total as of 12-22-82.

REP. SEIFERT inquired if there has ever been any consideration to draft a bill for percentage increase rather than have a new bill every year. REP. PAVLOVICH responded that if we allow the \$400, we would not have to come back for an increase.

Silicosis report, dated 6-30-82, is attached (EXHIBIT 2).

The hearing closed on HOUSE BILL 156.

HOUSE BILL 181. REP. HART, sponsor, stated that this bill would simply change the name of the Eastmont Training Center to Eastmont Human Services Center. This would more accurately reflect the mission of the facility. In the late 60's, eastern Montana people who had mentally retarded children had to send them to Boulder River School or keep them in their own home. A group of people persuaded the Legislature to construct this facility for all eastern Montana people. It is located in Glendive, Montana. It began operation in 1969 as an alternative

special education program for children, ages 6 - 17. It was a five-day a week program that provided education to children in that vicinity, allowing them to go home on weekends. During the 70's, federal law mandated free appropriate education and institutionalization became known. The Department of Institutions began construction which increased the facilities at Eastmont to 40 beds. This was now a seven-day-a-week program providing broader human services to the majority of the population. This is why they changed the name to Eastmont Human Services Center.

PROPOONENTS:

CURTIS CHISHOLM, Deputy Director, Department of Institutions, stated that this bill was introduced at their request to assist them in more accurately reflecting what the center is.

REP. HART closed saying that the bill speaks for itself.

QUESTIONS:

REP. BROWN asked what is repealed that is referred to in the title. CURT CHISHOLM said that in 1977 the state committed itself to the building of two nursing home facilities, both of which would be 60-bed in size. One was to be located on the campus at Glendive--the Eastmont Training Center--and the other to be built at some other location in the state (Billings, Montana). The intent of those two nursing home facilities was to house a large geriatric senile population that was under the state's care. It was found out after construction had already begun on the Glendive facility, that that population did not exist. The plans for the Billings facility was scrapped but the state completed the Glendive facility. Two years later in 1979, it was determined that this nursing home would be a place where we could transfer Boulder River School patients that were in need of intermediate nursing care. That is what we did and that is when we expanded the concept of Eastmont. The repealer is the section that speaks to those two nursing homes--neither one of which really exists.

The hearing on HOUSE BILL 181 closed.

HOUSE BILL 123. REP. HART, sponsor, said that HOUSE BILL 123 was introduced at the request of the Department of Health and Environmental Sciences to clarify that a local health officer be appointed by a local health board. In one place the bill defines a local health officer as an individual appointed by the local Board of Health. In the same chapter, it requires local boards to appoint. It does not say local Board of Health. Even the title in that section speaks to appointment of a local health officer by the local board. It is a matter of inserting the right language and clearing it up.

PROPONENTS: None

OPPONENTS: None

REP. HART closed the hearing on HOUSE BILL 123.

QUESTIONS:

REP. KEYSER stated that it should read the local board of health.

The hearing closed on HOUSE BILL 123.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

HOUSE BILL 156. REP. DRISCOLL moved HOUSE BILL 156 DO PASS.

REP. SEIFERT moved an amendment striking \$400 and inserting \$215, or a 7% increase.

REP. MENAHAN stated that we should at least do for these people what the state does for their employees--a 12% + 12% or \$48. REP. SEIFERT withdrew his motion and made a substitute motion of \$220. The substitute motion failed.

There was discussion as to whether the bill was raising the benefit to \$400 or if some were getting the \$400 now. It was finalized that no one is getting the \$400 benefit now. REP. MENAHAN said that whatever we do, whether we leave it at \$200 or \$400, it will have to go to Appropriations Committee. The Human Services Committee can only submit a recommendation. But that does not mean the Appropriations Committee will accept the recommendation.

REP. HANSEN asked if this is all that the widows get or do they get social security also. It was felt that they also get additional benefits.

A roll call vote was taken on the original motion of DO PASS. The motion passed with eleven (REPS. FARRIS, BRAND, BROWN, CONNELLY, DARKO, DOZIER, DRISCOLL, HANSEN, KEYSER, MENAHAN and CHAIRMAN HART) voting yes and four (REPS. JONES, SEIFERT, SOLBERG, and SWIFT) voting no.

HOUSE BILL 181.

REP. SOLBERG moved HOUSE BILL 181 DO PASS. The motion passed unanimously.

HOUSE BILL 123.

REP. JONES moved that HOUSE BILL 123 DO PASS.

REP. KEYSER moved to amend lines 15, 17, 20 and 22 to read after "local" insert "health". The motion on the amendment passed with REP. BROWN voting no. The motion DO PASS AS AMENDED passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Marjorie Hart
Chairman Marjorie Hart

Jeri Bressot
Secretary



Box 1176, Helena, Montana

JAMES W. MURRY
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

ZIP CODE 59624
406/442-1708

EX 1
HB 156

TESTIMONY OF JIM MURRY ON HOUSE BILL 156, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON
HUMAN SERVICES -- JANUARY 21, 1983

I am Jim Murry, representing the Montana State AFL-CIO, in support of House Bill 156. This bill increases payments to silicosis victims and surviving spouses and eliminates the income limitation.

As you know, the silicosis law was enacted to provide benefits to silicosis victims who contracted the disease prior to the 1959 enactment of the Occupational Disease law.

Claimants who qualify had to have worked a specified number of hours where silicon dioxide was present, as in the Workers' Compensation Act. Claimants must have lived in Montana for at least ten years, be totally disabled and have earnings of less than \$150 per month. A physician on the Occupational Disease Act examining Board examines each claimant and submits a written report for qualification.

In December of 1982, there were only 210 active claimants, as compared to 771 when the program began in 1961. The number of claimants is decreasing each year, and will continue to do so because the claimants are slowly and painfully dying.

Among the current claimants are 87 widows, whose husbands died since July 1, 1974. At that date, widows became eligible to continue receiving the silicosis benefits after the death of the victim.

HOUSE BILL 156

-2-

January 21, 1983

Widows whose spouses died before July 1, 1974 are now eligible to receive only half of the benefit. There are 185 of these "second class" widows now. Part of this bill provides these widows with full benefits.

Silicosis is a painful, totally disabling, incurable disease that is contracted through no fault of the victims. These victims and their spouses should not be forgotten by Montanans. They are not welfare recipients, but disabled workers. This increase cannot change the suffering of the victims and spouses, but may help them survive financially. We urge your support on House Bill 156.

Thank you.

WITNESS STATEMENT

Name James W. Murry Committee On Human Service
Address P.O. Box 1176 Helena Date 1-21-83
Representing Mont. AFL-CIO Support X
Bill No. HB 156 Oppose _____
Amend _____

AFTER TESTIFYING, PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

1.

2.

3.

4.

Itemize the main argument or points of your testimony. This will assist the committee secretary with her minutes.

SILICOSIS REPORT
June 30, 1982

The Silicosis Law was enacted by the 1937 Session of the Montana Legislative Assembly and supervised by the Montana Department of Public Welfare until June 30, 1961, and at that time, Legislature transferred the administrative duties to the Division of Workers' Compensation.

The benefits received under this law from 1941 through 1980 varied from \$30 a month to the present payment of \$200 a month. The amount of the payment is set by the Legislature. Claimants have been receiving \$200 a month since October 1, 1981.

The law was enacted to provide benefits for claimants who had contracted Silicosis in their line of work prior to July 1 of 1959. In 1959, the Legislature passed the Occupational Disease Law, and the benefits paid under this law are the same as the amounts received under the Workers' Compensation Insurance Act. The employee had to have the specified number of hours worked in areas where silicon dioxide was present to qualify, and they have the same time frame to qualify as they do under the Workers' Compensation Act.

The applicants who do not qualify under the Occupational Disease Act may file under the Silicosis Program.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SILICOSIS PROGRAM:

1. The person is to have resided in and been an inhabitant of the state of Montana for ten years or more immediately preceding the date of the application.

The time qualification of ten or more years is verified by contacting the applicant's employer and requesting the work records to be filed with the application. If the work record is not available, we check with the clerk and recorders office in the county to see if he was a resident of that county for 10 or more years, and then we may also require that we have an affidavit from three persons stating they have known the applicant for more than ten years and that he has been the continuous resident of the state of Montana.

2. The claimant has silicosis as defined in the Montana Law, Section 39-73-101 which results in his total disability as to render it gainful occupation. The term "gainful occupation" is defined in Section 39-73-101 (subsection 4)

"The term 'gainful occupation', as used herein shall not be construed to mean occasional or intermittent light employment where the ability to do manual labor is not essential but shall mean any person having an income from any other source exceeding \$150 per month."

If the applicant is earning more than \$150 a month, then he is not eligible to file for the benefits.

Upon making the necessary verifications as listed above, we have the claimant examined by one of the physicians on the Occupational Disease Act Examining Board. Upon receipt of the written report by the examining doctor, a determination is made as to whether the applicant has been accepted or denied Silicosis Benefits.

If the claimant is approved for benefits, he will receive \$200 a month lifetime benefits. When the claimant is deceased, the surviving spouse would receive the benefits until such time as she is married. If for any reason the claimant, after being approved to receive benefits, is placed in a state institution, the benefits must be transferred to his beneficiary. (wife)

Each year, we mail questionnaires to the claimants to be completed and returned for review. The questionnaires request information as to whether the claimant is working full time or part time, the amount of wages received, the name of the employer, and any information concerning the amount of pensions they may be receiving, such as Social Security, company pensions, veterans pension, interest income, whether the spouse is still living or if divorced, and the spouse's birthdate.

Upon receipt of the questionnaire, we review and check (through the State Employment Security Office) the out-of-state claimants to see if they are gainfully employed. In-state claimants are checked through Employment Security and field investigators are used checking claimants. We refer inquiries through the Credit Bureau on files to see if they are employed.

We review paid warrants and check endorsements with application files and have field checks made on any that are questionable. We are requesting a power of attorney be filed if relatives are taking over depositing claimants' checks or transferring checks to rest homes.

At the time the claimant is deceased, we send an application to the widow requesting a copy of the death certificate and the marriage license before the payments are continued.

The following tables will show information we have compiled through the survey forms, which will enable us to project how long the program will continue by age factors, the number of single claimants, the number that are married, and the number of widows involved.

When the Division of Workers' Compensation received the records from the Department of Public Welfare and began to administer the Silicosis Program, we had 771 active claimants, and as of June 30, 1982, we had 219.

The number of claimants approved for payment prior to 1961, when the Division assumed the program, and are still receiving benefits total 32. (18 single; 14 married)

Age of claimants - ranges 71-94 years, 23 over 80 years old, spouse- 34-88 years old, 5 over 80 years old.

The table below will show a comparison for the past seven years as to the number of active claimants, single, married, and widows, that are presently receiving benefits under this program.

TABLE I

	June 30 1976	June 30 1977	June 30 1978	June 30 1979	June 30 1980	June 30 1981	June 30 1982
Single	95	90	90	78	70	59	53
Married	145	147	124	119	107	98	83
Widows	31	39	49	59	69	75	83
	271	276	263	256	246	232	219

At the present time, the youngest claimant is 58 years old and has been receiving benefits for 11 years. The oldest claimant is 94 years old and has been receiving benefits for 28 years.

The following table will show the rate and the number of claimants by fiscal year from 1941 through June 30, 1980, and when the rate changes.

TABLE II
SILICOSIS PAYMENTS AND NUMBER OF CLAIMANTS
as of June 30, each year

Department of Public Welfare

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>RATE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF CLAIMANTS</u>
1941-1942	30.00	286
1942-1943	30.00	300
1943-1944	30.00	348
1944-1945	30.00	415
1945-1946	30.00	494
1946-1947	30.00	570
1947-1948	40.00	663
1948-1949	40.00	750
1949-1950	50.00	644
1950-1951	50.00	622
1951-1952	50.00	601
1952-1953	50.00	617
1953-1954	75.00	621
1954-1955	75.00	628
1955-1956	75.00	610
1956-1957	75.00	600
1957-1958	75.00	588
1958-1959	75.00	643
1959-1960	75.00	767
1960-1961	75.00	779

(TABLE II Continued)

Division of Workers' Compensation

<u>Year</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>Number of Claimants</u>
1961-1962	75.00	765
1962-1963	75.00	713
1963-1964	75.00	657
1964-1965	75.00	602
1965-1966	90.00	547
1966-1967	90.00	508
1967-1968	125.00	455
1968-1969	125.00	412
1969-1970	140.00	391
1970-1971	158.50	361
1971-1972	158.50	321
1972-1973	158.50	311
1973-1974	175.00	303
1974-1975	175.00	271
1975-1976	175.00	271
1976-1977	175.00	276
1977-1978	175.00	263
1978-1979	175.00	256
1979-1980	175.00	246
1980-1981	175.00	232
1981-1982	200.00	219

TABLE III

Age of all claimants by year

<u>Age</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Spouse</u>	<u>Widowed</u>
94	1	1		
91	2			1
90	1			2
89	1	1		2
88	2		1	1
87		1		
86	5	2	1	2
85	1		2	4
84	3	2		4
83		1		2
82	2	4	1	1
81	4	3	2	2
80	6	7		5
79		3	4	1
78	2	5		5
77	2	5	3	2
76	5	7	5	5
75	2	7	2	6
74	1	7	6	1
73	3	2	1	2
72		5	6	4
71	2	1	7	2
70	3	2	4	3
69	2	2	3	3
68	1	4	5	5
67	2	1	5	5
66		1	1	4
65		3	1	1
64		1	5	1
63		4	1	
62			6	2
61			3	4
60				1
59				2
58		1		
57			1	
56			2	
55			1	1
52			1	
51			1	
46			1	
34			1	
Totals	53	83	83	83

RECAP TABLE III
Age of All Claimants

Listing of all claimants by age and breakdown:

<u>Age Group</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Widowed</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
55-60	-0-	1	4	5	2.28
61-65	-0-	8	8	16	7.30
66-70	8	10	17	35	15.98
71-75	8	22	15	45	20.55
76-80	15	27	18	60	27.40
81-85	10	10	13	33	15.07
86-over	<u>12</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>11.42</u>
	53	83	83	219	100%

TABLE IV
Number of Years Receiving Benefits

<u>Years</u>	<u>Claimants</u>	<u>Years</u>	<u>Claimants</u>
00	1	19	1
01	2	20	4
02	1	21	2
03	1	22	17
04	3	23	11
05	4	24	1
06	9	25	1
07	13	26	0
08	4	27	1
09	12	28	4
10	8	29	3
11	6	30	0
12	7	31	0
13	8	32	0
14	6	33	1
15	2	34	0
16	3	35	2
17	11	Sub Total	136
18	1	*Widows excluded	<u>-83</u>
			219

RECAP TABLE IV
Number of Years Claimants have Received benefits

<u>Age</u>	<u>Claimants</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
0-05	12	8.82
6-10	46	33.82
11-15	29	21.32
16-20	10	7.36
21-25	32	23.53
26-30	4	2.94
31-over	<u>3</u>	<u>2.21</u>
Subtotal	136	100%
*Widows Excluded	<u>-83</u>	
Total	219	

TABLE V
Review of Applications Received

July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1981

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Applications</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>Active 1980</u>
July 1, 1971-June 30, 1972	40	12	28	3
July 1, 1972-June 30, 1973	79	28	51	8
July 1, 1973-June 30, 1974	58	19	39	8
July 1, 1974-June 30, 1975	46	9	37	3
July 1, 1975-June 30, 1976	51	24	27	21
July 1, 1976-June 30, 1977	39	10	29	7
July 1, 1977-June 30, 1978	21	3	18	3
July 1, 1978-June 30, 1979	17	4	13	4
July 1, 1979-June 30, 1980	11	4	7	2
July 1, 1980-June 30, 1981	10	2	8	1
July 1, 1981-June 30, 1982	2	1	1	1
Total	374	116	258	61

A study of the number of applications received during the above listed period shows a total of 374 and we have approved 116--for an average of 31%.

From July 1, 1977 through June 30, 1982, we show a reduction in the number of applications and an average of 23% approved.

TABLE VI
Review of Claimants by Resident Towns

July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1980

Anaconda	8
Billings/Cook City	2
Boulder/Basin	1
Butte/Walkerville/Melrose	121
Deer Lodge/Elliston	3
Great Falls/Valier	4
Hamilton/Stevensville	3
Helena/Lincoln	9
Livingston	2
Dillon/Twin Bridges/Pony	5
Townsend	3
Missoula	4
Whitehall/Cardwell	9
Kalispell/Polson	2
Plains/Hot Springs/Noxon	3
Philipsburg	6
Roundup	1
Harlem	1
Out of State	<u>32</u>

TABLE VII
Benefits Reported Excluding \$200 Benefits

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Widow</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-100	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
101-150	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
151-200	4	3	1	8	3.74
201-250	1	1	1	3	1.40
251-300	5	1	3	9	4.20
301-350	4	1	6	11	5.14
351-400	6	6	10	22	10.28
401-450	4	7	34	45	21.03
451-500	5	3	8	16	7.48
501-550	3	4	3	10	4.67
551-600	1	9	1	11	5.14
601-650	5	10	3	18	8.41
651-700	5	11	2	18	8.41
701-750	1	9	1	11	5.14
751-800	1	4	2	7	3.27
801-850	3	5	1	9	4.21
851-900	2	2	1	5	2.34
901-950	-0-	2	3	5	2.34
950-over	1	5	-0-	6	2.80
Total	51	83	80	214	100%
N/A	2	-0-	3	5	
	53	83	83	219	

RECAP TABLE VII

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>	<u>Widow</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-250	5	4	2	11	5.14
251-500	24	18	61	103	48.13
501-750	15	43	10	68	31.78
751-over	7	18	7	32	14.95
Total	51	83	80	214	100%

Schedule III
Breakdown by Years

<u>Age</u>	<u>Claimants</u>	<u>Percent</u>
51-65	6	3.11
66-70	22	11.40
71-75	37	19.17
76-80	49	25.39
81-85	36	18.65
86-90	30	15.54
91-over	13	6.74
NA	<u>3</u>	
	<u>196</u>	100%

Schedule IV
Claimants by City

The majority of the claimants reside in Butte, Silver Bow, Deer Lodge, Powell, and Lewis & Clark County (70%) and 14% reside out of state.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Claimants</u>
Anaconda	3
Butte	121
Billings	2
Boulder	1
Chinook	1
Deer Lodge	2
Dillon/Sheridan	5
Great Falls	2
Harlem	1
Helena	10
Kalispell/Somers/Charlo	3
Missoula/Darby	7
Philipsburg	6
Roundup	1
Townsend/Three Forks	5
Out of State	<u>26</u>
Total	196

WIDOW BENEFITS

Montana Legislature enacted into law in 1974 legislation to provide: Benefits to widows who otherwise qualified to receive benefits but whose spouse died prior to March of 1974, to be eligible to receive one-half of those payments (100.00) provided that the taxable income does not exceed \$6,800 per year.

The Division mailed applications to 302 widows and approved payments for 251 as of July 1, 1974. We required marriage license, proof of death and taxable income before approval. We verified with the various county clerk and recorders, boards of health, or marriage licenses to see if the widow had remarried, and with a copy of income tax on claimants that might exceed \$6,800.

We send a questionnaire each year requesting information on full or part-time employment and adjusted gross income for a year. We request copy of income tax on claimants that exceed \$6,800. We have suspended claimants that exceed the \$6,800 amount, and they may reapply the following year if income decreased below \$6,800. We suspended five claimants after review of questionnaire for income in excess of \$6,800 this year.

From July 1, 1974 through June 30, 1982, the number of widowed claimants has been reduced by fifty-five. We have 196 widows receiving benefits as of June 30, 1982.

Schedule I Number of Widows by Age

<u>Age</u>	<u>Claimants</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Claimants</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Claimants</u>
53	1	75	3	90	4
56	1	76	12	91	3
58	1	77	8	92	2
61	1	78	7	93	3
62	1	79	11	94	2
65	1	80	11	95	1
66	1	81	11	96	1
67	1	82	8	98	1
68	3	83	4	NA	3
69	9	84	7		
70	8	85	6		196
71	5	86	14		
72	9	87	5		
73	9	88	3		
74	11	89	4		

Schedule II Comparison of Age Original filing date & June 30, 1982

<u>Age</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>1982</u>
45-54	3	1
55-64	32	4
65-74	106	57
75-84	90	82
85-94	19	46
95-over	1	3
NA		3
	<u>251</u>	<u>196</u>

WIDOWS
Benefits Received
(excluding \$100)

Payments received by widows who are receiving the \$100.00 a month benefits, include Social Security, P.E.R.S., Teachers' Retirement pensions, and rental property income or part-time employment.

Payments are -0- minimum to a maximum of \$1,076 per month. The payment is received by a claimant 82 years old. The payments average \$412 per month. The following table gives a breakdown of payments to the claimants.

Schedule V
WIDOW'S INCOME
\$100 Not Included

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Claimant</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-100	1	.52
101-150	1	.52
151-200	9	4.71
201-250	9	4.71
251-300	26	13.62
301-350	32	16.75
351-400	37	19.37
401-450	31	16.23
451-500	12	6.28
501-550	5	2.63
551-600	8	4.19
601-650	7	3.66
651-700	2	1.05
701-750	2	1.05
751-800	2	1.05
801-over	7	3.66
NA	5	
	196	100%

RECAP OF WIDOWS
\$100 Not Included

<u>Amount</u>	<u>Claimant</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0-250	20	10.47
251-500	138	72.25
501-750	24	12.57
751-over	9	4.71
NA	5	
	196	100%

SILICOSIS UPDATE

July 1, 1982 - December 31, 1982

	June 30, 1982	December 31, 1982
Single	53	46
Married	83	77
Widow	<u>83</u>	<u>87</u>
	219	210

18 claimants passed away from July 1 to December 31, 1982

7 Single

8 Married

3 Widow

1 new claimant added (married)

Age break down	Single	Married	Widow
51-60			1
61-70	1	2	1
71-80	3	2	1
81-90	3	3	1
New claimant age 65 spouse 53		1	
	7	7	3

We suspended payments on one claimant 84 years old unable to locate, checked last address Veterans Hospital and Soldiers home at Columbia Falls, Montana - warrants mailed to Northwestern Bank.

Verified signatures on random sample of claimants out of state and claimants in rest homes requested Power of attorney on warrants endorsed by daughter or relatives depositing warrants for claimants.

Widows

We had 196 - June 30, 1982 and 185 December 31, 1982. After review of annual questionnaires we suspended 4 claimants for excess in adjusted gross income of \$6,800.00

VISITOR'S REGISTER

HOUSE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

BILL **HOUSE BILL 156**

DATE 1-21-83

SPONSOR PAVLOVICH

NAME	RESIDENCE	REPRESENTING	SUP- PORT	OP- POSE
Kathleen McBride	Butte	H.D. 85	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

WHEN TESTIFYING PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 21,

19 93

MR.SPEAKER.....

We, your committee onHUMAN SERVICES.....

having had under considerationHOUSE..... Bill No. 123.....

first reading copy (white)
Color

A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT TO CLARIFY THAT A LOCAL HEALTH OFFICER IS APPOINTED BY A LOCAL HEALTH BOARD RATHER THAN COUNTY OR CITY OFFICERS; AMENDING SECTION 50-2-117, MCA, TO MAKE IT CONSISTENT WITH THE OTHER APPLICABLE CODE SECTIONS."

Respectfully report as follows: That.....HOUSE..... Bill No. 123.....

BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Page 1, line 15.
Following: "local"
Insert: "health"

2. Page 1, line 17.
Following: "local"
Insert: "health"

3. Page 1, line 20.
Following: "local"
Insert: "health"

4. Page 1, line 22.
Following: "local"
Insert: "health"

AND AS AMENDED

DO PASS

January 31,

19 83

(b) regardless of whether he holds a driver's license or owns a motor vehicle, has a permanent physical handicap that impairs his driving ability and impairs his mobility when not in a motor vehicle to such an extent that he needs to be driven by another person to a destination; or

(c) has a temporary physical handicap that impairs his driving ability or his mobility when not in a motor vehicle to such an extent that he needs to be driven by another person to a destination.

(2) No one applicant may receive more than one permit."

Renumber: subsequent sections

4. Page 4, line 14.

Following: "than"

Strike: "\$10"

Insert: "\$25"

5. Page 4, line 15.

Following: "\$100"

Strike: "or by imprisonment for not more than 10 days".

6. Page 4, line 18.

Strike: "5"

Insert: "6"

7. Page 4, line 20.

Strike: "5"

Insert: "6"

AND AS AMENDED

DO PASS

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

January 21, 1983

MR. SPEAKER

We, your committee on HUMAN SERVICES,

having had under consideration HOUSE Bill No. 181,

first reading (white)

A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT CHANGING THE NAME OF THE EASTMONT TRAINING CENTER TO THE EASTMONT HUMAN SERVICES CENTER; REMOVING A PROVISION RELATING TO THE PURPOSES OF THE GLENDIVE NURSING HOME FACILITY; AMENDING SECTIONS 53-1-202, 53-1-402, 53-20-102, 53-20-501, 53-20-502, AND 53-20-505, MCA; AND REPEALING SECTION 53-20-503, MCA."

Respectfully report as follows: That HOUSE Bill No. 181

DO PASS