

The operation of the low income allowance has a similar impact on marriage. Suppose two people each with adjusted gross income of \$5,000. As single taxpayers each is entitled to a LIA of \$1,300, or \$2,600 in total. If they now marry their combined income of \$10,000 entitles them to only a standard deduction of \$1,500, for a loss of deductions of \$1,100. In this instance marriage costs over \$150 per year in additional tax liability.

It should be noted, of course, that married couples cannot regain the tax advantages of status as single taxpayers by filing separate returns. In the case of separate returns the LIA permitted is only \$650 per return and the maximum standard deduction is reduced to \$1,000. Divorce, once more, is the clear-cut answer to the problem!

THE DEDUCTION FOR MEDICAL EXPENSES

Medical expenses may be taken as an itemized deduction only to the extent that they exceed 3 per cent of adjusted gross income and the costs of medicine and drugs count as medical expenses only insofar as they exceed 1 per cent of AGI. In cases where most or all of such expenses are incurred in behalf of one spouse the medical expense deduction may be substantially larger if that spouse both has income and can file as a single taxpayer.

As we have seen, divorce is one way in which single taxpayer status may be attained and the income of a couple divided between them. Suppose that (1) married couple AX has AGI of \$20,000, all earned by A, and (2) medical expenses of \$1,000 and \$200 of drug costs are incurred in behalf of X. Filing jointly as a married couple, AX may deduct only \$400. But if A and X, following a divorce, were to divide their income so that X received \$8,000 and A \$12,000, the medical expense deduction available to X would be \$880,² or \$480 higher.

Obviously any of an infinite number of combinations of income and medical expense allocations between married couples is possible. The foregoing numbers are merely one illustration. As such the numbers have no particular significance other than to demonstrate another, probably minor, burden that the income tax law may impose on marriage.

THE CHILD AND OTHER DEPENDENTS CARE ALLOWANCE

As much as \$400 per month or \$4,800 per year may be deducted for the costs of household services or for the care of one or more dependent children under the age of 15 or an incapacitated spouse or dependent when such costs are incurred in order to enable the taxpayer to be gainfully employed. This amount is deductible, however, only if AGI is equal to or less than \$18,000. Above that level the amount of the allowable deduction is reduced by 50 cents for each dollar by which AGI exceeds \$18,000. Thus at AGI of \$27,600 the deductible amount is reduced to zero.

Let us suppose now that a married couple with two children under the age of 15 earns \$36,000, divided evenly between husband and wife. At this income level they are not permitted to deduct anything that may be spent for household services or for the care of the children. If, however, the marriage is terminated and one child is assigned to each parent, since we now have two AGIs of \$18,000 rather than one of \$36,000, the total allowable deduction for household services or child care may amount to as much as \$9,600. Thus entirely apart from the tax savings accruing from the dissolution of the marriage because of other aspects of the law, this one feature by itself may cut taxable income by close to \$10,000 and provide a tax reduction of some \$2,500.

It should be remembered that the kind of tax impact noted here is not applicable merely to younger or young middle-aged taxpayers with children under age 15. It applies as well to taxpayers who may be responsible for incapacitated parents or adult children. And, while one may strongly favor this liberal treatment of the kind of expenses under discussion, the very large difference in the treatment of single as compared to married taxpayers is striking indeed.

THE DEDUCTION FOR CAPITAL LOSSES

Net capital losses in any one year may be deducted from other income in an amount of up to \$1,000. The excess may be carried forward indefinitely and, if not offset by

capital gains, the carryover is, again, deductible from ordinary income to the extent of \$1,000 per year.

The \$1,000 limit applies irrespective of the marital status of the taxpayer. Thus if both husband and wife have suffered substantial capital losses and neither the current year nor succeeding years bring offsetting capital gains, they could double the amount deductible on this account if they attained single status as taxpayers.

This feature of the tax law as it impinges upon marriage is probably not of major quantitative importance. Nevertheless, it does, once more, raise the question as to whether any element of the tax code should operate in such fashion as to bring a higher tax liability simply by reason of the fact that the taxpayers are married rather than single.

OVERALL IMPACT ON MARITAL STATUS

To this point we have been looking at selected aspects of the individual income tax with each of them viewed independently of the others. In an effort to gain some additional perspective it may be helpful to look at the tax consequences of marriage under some illustrative circumstances with respect to level of income, the distribution of income between husband and wife, and the nature of non-business deductions. In Table 1 some hypothetical tax liabilities are presented. In the first row of this Table we have the liabilities incurred by taxpayers filing joint returns. In the two rows that follow the computations are based on the assumption that income is split equally between the dissolved marriage partners, either because one half was earned by each or because alimony equal to one half of AGI is paid to the ex-spouse. In the second row each of the parents is assigned one child and thus they both file tax returns as heads of households, while in the third row both children are assigned to one parent, who qualifies as a head of household, and the other parent files his tax return as a single individual.

It will be observed that an even split of both income and children always, in the illustrative cases presented, produces the smallest tax liability. The difference in income tax liability may amount to as much as \$98 per year even where AGI is only \$5,000, and that difference rises to a range of about \$1,500 to \$2,500 at an AGI of \$40,000, depending on whether or not deductions are itemized. These figures, however, do not include the effects, described earlier, of the treatment of medical expenses and costs of household services and care of dependents, and the capital loss effect. Thus in the case of the couple with AGI of \$40,000, for example, dissolution of the marriage could permit further deductions of \$9,600 for household services and child care, an additional \$1,000 deduction for capital losses, and \$600 of medical expenses not deductible in the joint return. This \$12,200 in reduced taxable income could bring the tax saving, assuming itemized deductions are taken, from less than \$1,500 to as high as \$5,000 per year. This amount represents nearly one-sixth of the after-tax income available to the couple filing a joint return. Similar calculations would offer startling, but less dramatic, evidence indicating how expensive marital ties can be under the Federal income tax, even at low or moderate income levels.

² \$1,000 + \$200 - .01(\$8,000) - .03(\$8,000).

TABLE 1.—EFFECTS OF MARITAL STATUS ON TAX LIABILITY, FAMILY OF 2 PARENTS AND 2 DEPENDENT CHILDREN, SELECTED INCOMES

(Tax liability in dollars)

Type of return and income and family split	AGI \$5,000		AGI \$10,000		AGI \$20,000		AGI \$40,000	
	LIA	Itemized deductions ¹	Standard deduction	Itemized deductions ¹	Standard deduction	Itemized deductions ¹	Standard deduction	Itemized deductions ¹
Joint.....	98	79	925	785	3,010	2,586	9,920	8,270
Head/head; 50-50; 2-2.....	0	78	1,672	756	2,520	2,367	7,390	6,800
Head/single; 50-50; 3-1.....	62	207	1,702	800	2,625	2,518	7,725	7,202
Maximum difference.....	98	1	253	29	490	219	2,530	1,470

¹ Itemized deductions as a proportion of AGI assumed to be equal to the average for the AGI class on joint returns filed in 1970. Computed from U.S. Department of the Treasury, "Statistics of Income, 1970, Individual Income Tax Returns" (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972)

² Low income allowance used on each of 2 \$5,000 AGI returns.

TAX POLICY AND FAMILY STABILITY

It is difficult to believe that the pecuniary incentives for dissolving marriages that are currently offered under the individual income tax are of no influence on people's decisions in this area. And the influence exerted can hardly be conducive to improved family stability. I leave it to those better qualified than I to attempt to gauge the effect. Having attempted to spell out the dimensions and sources of the tax pressure on marriage, I will venture some suggestions as to how that pressure might be reduced or eliminated. It may tempt some, as a means of enhancing family stability, to go further in the direction of favoring marriage through the tax system. I reject this for two reasons. The first is that if married couples enjoy tax concessions these concessions will appear inequitable to widows and widowers and the "wronged" parties to divorces, none of whom chooses to be unmarried. And if the special tax treatment is extended to such people holding the line against only some single people seems neither equitable nor politically viable. My second reason is that legally identifiable and recognized marriage may or may not involve interpersonal relationships that are substantially different from those that may obtain in the absence of legal or religious sanction. Men of the cloth may preach, and any of us may moralize, but surely the tax code is not the appropriate vehicle for rewarding virtue or punishing sin. Rather, it seems to me that the tax system should incorporate a completely neutral stance in this regard.

With respect to the rate structure under the income tax, neutrality requires that income be taxed to the individual who earns it or to whom it accrues. Each individual in receipt of income would be a unit for taxation, including each of the two marriage partners. If one spouse had less than some minimal income he or she could be given dependency status. Putting aside problems relating to property income, this approach would ensure that entry into or the dissolution of marriage would leave tax liability unaffected.

Property present difficulties because of community property rules in eight states, and because property may readily be divided between husband and wife and tax liabilities thereby reduced in the absence of joint returns and income-splitting. It was the first of these considerations that led the Congress to introduce income-splitting in 1948. But the results would have been far preferable if, instead, the Congress had provided that state laws with regard to community property were not to be permitted to govern in allocation of income for purposes of the Federal income tax. It is this move that I urge at this time.

The distribution of property among family members now provides a means of reducing income tax liabilities. My proposal would simply add the spouse to the potential beneficiaries and would not pose a new set of problems. Whether or not the suggested change should be contemplated, there is much to be said for either a gift tax with a much more substantial bite than that im-

posed under present law, of the inclusion of major gifts in the income of the donee.

I would not be concerned about the allocation of exemptions for dependent children between parents as taxable entities. As I suggested at length elsewhere,² the present form of the exemption would be better abandoned in favor of an income-conditioned children's allowance patterned along lines not very different from the Family Allowance Plan that was passed in the House but failed to gain approval in the Senate last year.

The problems presented by the cost of household services and child care deduction are readily solved. If the deduction is warranted for a couple with income of up to \$18,000 it should also be warranted at higher levels of income. Thus all that is required is that the provision under which the deductible amount is reduced as income exceeds \$18,000 be dropped.

If my first proposal, re-establishing the individual as the taxable unit, should be adopted neither the capital loss offset of not more than \$1,000 against other income nor the LIA or standard deduction would continue to present problems. Difficulties arise now because the amount of these deductions available is made to turn on whether two people are or are not married. Under the suggestions offered here each income recipient would constitute a taxable entity irrespective of his or her marital status. Thus neither marriage nor dissolution of marriage would affect allowable deductions for capital losses, optional standard deduction, or LIA. Much the same can be said for the medical expense deduction.

I suspect that the present income tax, despite its obvious shortcomings, is not a major influence on family stability. But it does seem to me both inequitable and potentially disruptive of an institution that has served our society well (for the most part), to continue in the tax law those features that permit tax liability to turn in some appreciable measure on one's marital status. It distresses me to think that A may never marry X on advice of their tax accountant.

19
October 1, 1973

HEARINGS ON "AMERICAN FAMILIES: TRENDS AND PRESSURES"

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this week the Subcommittee on Children and Youth, which I chair, has been holding overview hearings on "American Families: Trends and Pressures."

During these hearings we have received extremely valuable testimony from a variety of individuals and groups concerning the needs of families and children in America, the extent to which governmental policies are helping or hurting families, and what kinds of support systems should be available.

In order that these recommendations be available to the Congress and to the public, I ask unanimous consent that the prepared statements of the witnesses who appeared at the third day of our hearings be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FAMILIES: TRENDS AND PRESSURES
(Statement by Sophie B. Engel, on behalf of Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, September 26, 1973)

My name is Sophie B. Engel and I am presenting testimony on behalf of Philip Bernstein, Executive Vice President of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. My position with the Council is that of Consultant on Social Planning.

The Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds is the national association of central community organizations—Jewish federations and community councils—serving close to 800 Jewish communities in the United States and Canada. A major function of the Council is to assist these community organizations in planning, developing, and financing of health, welfare, cultural and educational services.

Our member Federations represent a network of health and welfare agencies which include close to 100 Jewish family and children agencies, about 200 Jewish community recreational and informal educational centers, 85 homes for the aged and chronically ill and general hospitals under Jewish auspices in 22 cities.

We are pleased to have this opportunity to present our views on governmental policies affecting family stability and the well being of children. At our annual national assemblies we have continually pressed for the enactment of legislation to improve the quality and quantity of health and welfare programs. We believe the central issues affecting these developments are the following:

NATIONAL POLICY ON INCOME MAINTENANCE

Of overriding importance is the need for a national income policy with national standards of eligibility to assure that all people, including children, may have at least a minimum standard of living sufficient to maintain health, human decency and dignity. A first step in this direction was the enactment by Congress last year of the Supplementary Security Income Program which replaces the federal-state programs of Old Age Assistance, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled. We strongly urge that this policy be extended to all eligible individuals and families in need, including those with both parents in the home and the "working poor."

Such legislation should include safeguards against any state lowering its present standards of assistance. It should also authorize Federal sharing in supplementation by states with higher standards. We believe this would go far in correcting many of the present inequities. At the present time families with the same income level but residing in different states are not eligible for the same services due to wide variation in State policy on income eligibility requirements. To overcome this manifest inequity eligibility for services which are subsidized in part or in whole by the Federal government should be related to the Bureau of Labor Statistics adjusted minimum income standard.

NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO STRENGTHEN FAMILY LIFE

A national commitment to strengthen the unity of the family and to enhance the development of children is urgently required. It should be the concern of government to raise the quality of all of family life in the United States. A comprehensive range of family and child care services should be available to all families and children who need them, with cost for services ranging from free to full payment depending upon the family's financial resources.

Unfortunately, the principle government program for families and children—the AFDC program—encourages separation and the disruption of family life. The requirements in many States that the father leave home in order that the mother and children qualify for AFDC should be eliminated and replaced by legislation that would encourage family stability and provide incentives to preserve the unity of the family. Mothers should be enabled to serve the best interests of their children, and thereby of society, by having the option of remaining in their homes or taking outside employment.

The sharp increase in the divorce rate and the growing number of single parent families headed by a female—the increasing number of women in the labor force—the large numbers of troubled and alienated youth—all these underscore the need for a strong government initiative to preserve and strengthen the family. In addition to supportive services, such as counseling, home-maker services, day care and foster care when needed, emphasis should be placed on preventive programs, such as family life education, nutrition and health care, cultural enrichment programs for children and youth as well as vocational and career guidance.

If we are committed to a goal of strengthening family life, the range of family services and the eligibility requirements need to be broadened considerably beyond the restrictive limitations in the current draft of HEW's Social Service Regulations. The definition of family services should encompass services to support and reinforce parental care and services to supplement parental care as needed. The prevention of financial dependency might be more possible of attainment if such services were made available to low and moderate income families at fees within their capacity to pay.

The experience of our agencies in providing services to children and their parents in their own homes has shown that the viability of the family unit can be preserved and strengthened—that placement in a foster home or in an institution can be avoided in many instances. Institutionalization, unless absolutely necessary is not only disruptive of family relationships and ties but is costly to the community.

DELIVERY SYSTEM

A network of community based services should be made available to all in need, with easy access to the system through multi-service centers. These centers should provide information and referral services, temporary emergency services and other services either directly or through arrangements with other public or private agencies in the community.

Efforts should be directed toward coordination and integration of the many fragmented services to assure the provision of appropriate services as effectively and promptly as possible.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING

We trust that this hearing marks the beginning of a far-reaching and sustained effort on the part of the Federal government to examine its policies in the context of strengthening family life and enhancing child development. Legislation to effect needed changes will require the expenditure of public funds—and the gap between needs and resources is a perennial problem. It is essential that we also direct our efforts to creating public understanding of the need to conserve our human resources.

I should like to conclude by quoting an excerpt from the resolution on Urban Concerns and Public Welfare adopted at the 1972 assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds:

"Underlying the inadequate measures to deal with America's human needs are the pervasive misconceptions regarding the nature of these problems and their causes. We deplore the growing tendency to demean and exploit the poor—the aged, disabled, and handicapped—whose disabilities genuinely entitle them to assistance. An imperative for productive action is to build far greater understanding among people generally, and particularly in the national, state, and local legislatures. The popular misinformation and distortions are reflected in the regressive legislation which will increase rather than resolve the problems.

"Leaders of voluntary agencies have a special competence and responsibility, from their knowledge and experience, to help overcome the widespread myths about poverty, social needs, and welfare. We urge that such efforts be undertaken and extended by the leaders of our Federations and Welfare Funds, and by their associated and cooperating agencies."

STATEMENT OF MRS. MORTON A. LANGSFELD, JR.
(Chairman, Planning Committee on Family and Individual Services Federation of Jewish Agencies of Greater Philadelphia)

I am greatly privileged to share today in your very important and essential examination of our American families. The trends, the pressures, and the vitality, are of extreme urgency, for careful assessment.

Both governmental and voluntary agencies have set up many policies and expenditure of dollars that have provided necessary services to children and families. However, it is a well known fact that we, together, are simply not doing enough. Family breakdown, physically ill parents and children, low income, emotional instability, and mental illness are but a few of the diagnoses made by professionals in these fields, and characterize cases today. To ensure family stability and the well-being of its members, we must find every possible means to provide services that are both preventive and supportive.

The Federation of Jewish Agencies of Greater Philadelphia serves children and youth through several different agencies. The very concept of Jewish family life—has been, always—the cornerstone of our community. We are concerned with Jewish survival, a need to strengthen Jewish identity, and have developed a network of services to meet Jewish needs. The family unit has great significance by long tradition, and we continually develop the best possible ways in which to protect and strengthen it. Our objective is to keep families together, and it is to this end, that we direct our energies.

Government dollars have come to our agencies in several different ways—bringing about a partnership of mandated governmental responsibility and the private or voluntary dollar. This combination of funds has been used to extend or develop new approaches to improve the quality of a child's life.

A variety of settings must be offered by agencies today—so that an individual child receives help in the best possible way to suit his individual needs. Large institutions may have a place in some parts of the country, but in Philadelphia, we have found that this type of care is not in the best interests of children. We have developed creative types of foster homes, small group homes, and services to children in their own homes. These are to us, the best resources to help children who can no longer continue in their family patterns because of their own problems, or when parents are unable to care for their children. The role of the voluntary agency is of tremendous importance. It provides training, standards setting, rich and creative supportive services, using volunteers as well as professional staff.

The Association for Jewish Children, a member agency of the Federation of Jewish Agencies, is a striking example of a successful preventive program—i.e., Services to Children in their Own Homes. This is a valid trend in the field of child care, and has been able to show that family breakdown is preventable. Here in this agency, it is quite evident that sound casework services for a single family in its own home, brings greater strength to the parent-child relationship. Also, the child has a better chance to function on his own, thus avoiding separation, or a long term placement.

It is my opinion that increased services to children in their own homes will bring substantial changes in the present bleak outlook for troubled children in our communities. We must find every possible way to provide funds for this much needed service. Somehow, government seems to fail to recognize the importance of such preventive services, as well as the funding. (No government funds are available for purchase of service from the voluntary agencies for services to children in their own homes). The only possibility to receive this service, is through the voluntary agency, where funds are very limited. Thus, only a small number of children can receive such care. Here, the problem becomes even more complicated because the voluntary dollars that must come from the private sector, i.e., United Funds—just are not available in all the agencies. What is the answer? Surely government funds must provide these services, and they are a serious and pressing investment consideration. If there can be an emphasis upon prevention, then, from a purely monetary outlook, dollars spent here will be translated into dollars saved in hospitals and institutions of long term placement. Damaged children become lost children if help is not offered in their early years. Family breakdown is a priority concern and must bring priority dollars and highly skilled

professional workers. Increased family hardships and breakdowns of children are inevitable, if we do not include services to children in their own homes in government policy.

In child care services, foster homes and group residences are used for children whose parents are unable to care for them properly, and separation is indicated. The choice for care is dependent upon the individual needs of the individual child. The goals and dreams of our agencies are to provide a variety of settings—a chance for every child. Government must take a hard look at these manifold needs. Institutions and group homes can be long, frustrating and often sad placements, with little hope for a child. We must invest in new ways to achieve our goals.

Dollars are a necessary consideration in all child care. If we look at comparative costs of different types of care, the picture is very striking. The costs spiral upwards, dependent upon the extent of damage to a child. In Philadelphia we spend for one child in a single year:

\$1,000 for services to children in their own homes.

\$5,000–\$8,000 for placement in foster homes or group homes.

\$10,500 in residential type group homes.

In a Pennsylvania mental hospital that serves children the State spends \$23,000 a year, per child. In a private agency in suburban Philadelphia the cost is \$17,000 per child.

If our goal is to help families to remain intact, it is glaringly seen that as the cost goes upwards, so must the funds become available to us. The sad truth is that we do not have enough dollars, and thus, children are waiting.

If prevention is the answer to child problems in the United States, we must provide more of the supplementary services that can make the difference between family health and breakdown. Also, it is necessary, if we are to discharge our collective responsibilities, that a full range of services be made available in our agencies. We have developed many of them that are essential for family rebuilding, such as, Day Care, Counseling, Homemaker Services, and Family Life Education. Governmental and voluntary dollars are matched in some of these in order to reach the greatest number of children. In other of these services, voluntary and demonstration dollars provide the help to families. I sincerely hope that increased funds will be made available since the need is so demanding.

In this field of child care, every professional and lay person must continue to seek ways and funds to give every child a fair chance to live and grow. Possible family breakdown is reduced when we have the most effective and productive skills and tools to keep families intact. Not only is the economically segment of our communities in need of preventive services, but a great segment of the borderline working class, and middle class are, also. They simply cannot afford these services and they are left unserved.

In conclusion, I am extremely anxious and hopeful that our government will take cognizance of the tremendous gap that exists between needs and available funding, particularly in the care for children in their own homes. It is an extremely important alternative to separation of children from their parents. In our country we have the greatest obligation to support and strengthen family life. I believe that preventive services are a priority concern that hold hope and promise of future healthy and happy human beings.

I do thank the Chairman and this Committee for the opportunity to present these views on the very crucial matter of American families, and our deep concern for future generations.

TESTIMONY OF REV. MSGR. JAMES T. McHUGH, DIRECTOR, FAMILY LIFE DIVISION, UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

I am Msgr. James T. McHugh, Director of the Family Life Division of the United States Catholic Conference. At the very outset I wish to commend Senator Mondale and the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth for holding hearings on family life in the United States. I welcome the opportunity to appear before this Committee and present testimony on how the nation—particularly in its law and public policy—may provide positive support for the contemporary American family.

The formulation of a clear, coherent and consistent family policy is a major item on the national agenda as we begin the last quarter of the twentieth century. At every moment of the nation's history the family has been a most important social unit. However, in recent decades we have become aware that many of our major social problems are the result of family instability and weakened family ties. And family instability is at least partially due to our failure to adopt a comprehensive and a realistic family centered policy. The object of wise social policy is not only the physical well-being of individual persons, but also their emotional stability, moral growth and ability

to live in society and relate to others. Moreover, social policy should be directed not only to the individual, but to the greatest degree possible, to the family unit as well.

The realization that the family is an important social unit was never totally ignored or denied. If anything, the family suffered more from the ambivalence of policy-makers than from outright neglect. It also suffered from the lack of an advocate that would constantly present its interests and concerns in the halls of government. Moreover, there are specific values in our society that seemed to be at odds with the values of family life. For instance, the American commitment to individualism focused on the autonomous person rather than the person as member of a family. The commitment to private enterprise has placed the family in a secondary position to national economic goals. Government has been reluctant to restrict or constrain business or industry for the good of the family unit. Thus, child labor laws, equal employment opportunity regardless of sex, color or creed, concern for the family life of agricultural and migratory workers have been recent achievements or remain goals still to be attained. Again, the ethnic, cultural, and religious pluralism of our nation has made it difficult to identify one form of family life as specifically American and thus to provide social support for such an ideal.

Within government, concern for the family was tucked away in the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor and the Children's Bureau in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Neither agency was noted for an integralist approach to family life.

During the sixties, concentration on racial inequality, on poverty, on minorities led to a rash of well-intentioned but less than satisfactory government programs. It was not a lack of will or of imagination that robbed us of success in our attempts at social improvement. Rather, it was the absence of clearly defined policies that would govern the myriad programs that were initiated at both the federal and state level. For the most part, these programs were experimental or therapeutic, but they lacked careful evaluation and follow-up. Thus, the limited successes were lost in a sea of frustration, distrust and intensified resentment.

It is time to break fresh ground and attempt the formulation of a national policy directed toward supporting the quality and stability of family life. There are a number of things that such a policy might accomplish.

First of all, a national family policy might well become the cornerstone for a corpus of social legislation that would benefit all Americans. Such policy need not be complex or terribly detailed. Its major impact will be in shaping legislation and directing the energies of government for the years ahead. As Daniel P. Moynihan describes it,

"A national family policy need only declare that it is the policy of the American government to promote the stability and well-being of the American family; that the social programs of the Federal government will be formulated and administered with this object in mind; and finally that the President, or some person designated by

him, perhaps the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, will report to the Congress on the condition of the American family in all its many facets—not of the American family, for there is as yet no such thing, but rather of the great range of American families in terms of regions, national origins and economic status."¹

Secondly, a family policy should be directed toward assisting the family play its proper role as the nation itself undergoes a radical transformation and renewal. The questions that face us as a nation are questions of values, and they are increasingly raised by today's youth. How do we eliminate poverty and discrimination while committed to an economic system built on capitalism, free enterprise and heavily tinged with materialism? How do we maintain the value of human life while allocating many of our criminal law and penal system, and while we allow the highest court of the land to ignore the evidence of science and of history in deciding that certain classes of human beings shall not be entitled to protection of the basic rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness promised by the Founding Fathers? How do we instill confidence in the democratic system, and maintain the values of honesty and integrity, when so many people look upon public service with cynicism and distrust?

The family is that basic social unit that is prepared to grapple with the value questions and to weigh the speculative theory in terms of the experience of human living. As Cohen

¹ "A Family Policy for the Nation," Daniel P. Moynihan, from *America*, Sept. 18, 1965, pp. 280 ff.

² *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, Vol. 29, No. 1, Feb. 1967.

and Connery point out in a highly perceptive article on "Government Policy and the Family".

We suspect that a revitalization of the family represents a neglected opportunity in the resolution of this crisis. As an institution, it has demonstrated a remarkable resilience and a capacity to adapt to a wide range of circumstances. It has provided a transitional experience for the individual that has linked past, present, and future. It has been a major source of cultural innovation and has proved its worth in the most simple and complex societies. Studies of values and attitudes have persistently demonstrated that the family is the primary source of both our individual and collective orientations and that this institution must be engaged if we are to achieve a lasting modification of values. The problems that confront the United States in the present day are problems that basically demand a radical shift in our values. As we move toward the solution of our problems, it is almost inevitable that we will make many false starts or that the transition to new patterns of society will create new stresses. The family, among all of our institutions, is uniquely equipped to cushion these shocks and to ease the strains that are an inevitable consequence of change. Yet if the family is to fulfill this need, it must be restored to a central place in our perception of the nature of our society and provided with the resources which will make possible the fulfillment of this role. This can only be accomplished by a major shift in government policy and action with respect to the family."²

Thirdly, a family policy should help the family maximize its strengths. The family is where deepest interpersonal relationships are formed and lived out. The relationship of husband and wife is characterized by intimacy, fidelity, mutual respect, multi-faceted communication, understanding and trust. Children are born and grow up in this environment where they come to know themselves as individuals and in relation to other persons. In the family the child crystallizes his or her own sexual identity, and achieves satisfaction, confidence and security in developing basic aptitudes and talents. Finally, as children grow to adulthood and parents see succeeding generations come into existence, a loose-knit kinship structure perdures. It is the responsibility of government to assist the family in playing its role, fulfilling its functions and achieving its destiny.

Specifically, government policy should be directed toward helping young couples achieve close interpersonal union in marriage. At the least, this entails avoiding anything that endangers the relationship. On the positive side, educational priorities should be re-examined. Family life education is still virtually nonexistent in our schools, and contemporary attempts in this area are often fragmented, ambivalent, or limited. We need a system of family life education that helps young people understand the responsibilities of marriage, sexuality, and parenthood that prepares married couples to deepen their personal intimacy without isolating themselves from society, that restores a sense of community with generations that have preceded them and with those that follow.

Moreover, in our highly technologized society, individuals and married couples frequently reach an impasse where personal identity or the marriage itself is threatened. Readily available counseling facilities and supportive health care opportunities are often needed but sadly lacking. There is a definite need for more realistic federal legislation and funding in the mental health field that will assist married couples and families to deal with the stresses and strains of modern society. Although there is a trend in family counseling toward treating the individual as a member of a family, the multi-million dollar investment of the federal government in programs dealing with alcoholism, drug addiction, delinquency, mental illness, gerontology and mental retardation often attempt to build substitutes for the family rather than assisting the family to help the person in need when that is possible.

Fourthly, though I am reluctant to suggest increasing the bureaucracy in Washington or in the many state capitols throughout the nation, we must develop some capacity to represent, and indeed advocate, the concerns of the family in the formulation of social policy that directly or indirectly affects family life. For practical purposes, this means an ombudsman that monitors all health, education and welfare legislation, which at present is still directed toward the needs of the individual or the good of society, with no recognition of the family as this basic social unit.

Fifthly, government policy affecting the family should recognize and support the corollary efforts of churches, private foundations and agencies, and other family assistance groups. The United States can learn much from Great Britain and other European nations about the role of the para-professional. For instance, there is a fairly well

established network of marriage counseling centers throughout the British Isles in which the counselors are married persons who have special training, but are not certified psychologists or psychiatrists. The marriage counseling center includes a staff of professionals who are available for referral and for supervision of the para-professionals, and this system is fairly effective in helping troubled families.

Sixthly, government policy should respect the pluralism of family heritages and family styles. Otto Pollack maintains that the function that has truly been taken away from families is the autonomy of setting its own standards. The family has been subjected to the tinkering of the social experimenters, the ineptitude of the bureaucrats and domination by self-proclaimed specialists. It is time for the family to assert its own power against the expert, and protect itself against becoming simply one more factor in the utopian schemes of today's social planners.

At this point I wish to make some tentative suggestions on how government policy and other social forces can support family life.

1. Work—Two of the most important things in people's lives are what they do, i.e., their work, and who cares about them and their accomplishments. There is abundant evidence that when a person's job is stultifying, frustrating or unrewarding, work performance suffers. Worse than that, the person tends to lose self-esteem, and in time may give up working and become delinquent in terms of other responsibilities. It is important that government and industry try to eliminate dead-end jobs and generally improve working conditions, particularly in blue-collar jobs. But it is also important that American business treat the white collar worker with respect and regard for his family life. Continual relocation, constant travel, treating the employee as a possession of the company are things that disrupt family life and destroy personal stability. Everyone needs some leisure and solitude to think, relax and share the experiences of family growth.

The wage scale normally reflects the amount of work, the skill of the worker, the longevity of employment, and the position held by the worker. In too many cases a man must moonlight or a woman may be forced to work so that family income may keep pace with the cost of living. Married and single persons receive the same wage, with the results that families bear a disproportionate share of the financial burden of supporting the next generation. One of the ways of equalizing the financial burden, and of providing special assistance to poor families is by way of a family allowance system. This may also be the first step toward a complete revision of the welfare system.

2. Health care—Scientific progress has enabled us to overcome many fatal diseases, and to restore health and physical function in many circumstances where previously a person became an invalid. But the availability of health care is limited by cost, by circumstance, and by limitations of delivering health care services. There is an increasing role for government to play in establishing a national health care program that would assure quality service to all persons, economically, equitably and with dignity. Again, the needs of families should be an incentive to legislators to find the proper plan.

3. Education—America is distinguished among the nations of the world for its commitment to general education. At present, that practically includes college for every child, placing the young person in a prolonged period of dependency and increasing the financial and emotional costs of parenting. As a result, young men and women spend years in an academic sub-culture where deep interpersonal relationships develop but where marriage is not possible and where the final reward of the entire venture is increasingly uncertain. Consequently, the cost and practicality of higher education is increasingly called into question. Of greater concern is the narrowness of approach of the present system. There is still great need for specialized educational programs including technical and vocational training, education for handicapped persons, adult education programs for personal enrichment, and government assisted alternatives to the public school. Moreover, though the major waves of immigrants have generally been assimilated, special approaches should be developed to transmit the cultural heritages of the black and brown population to the coming generations.

I would like to end on a positive note. It is frequently thought that the family is a fragile, confused, conservative institution buffeted about by the winds of change, and seeking some isolated niche apart from the world. On the contrary, the family is a flexible and resilient institution, one in which personalism can thrive, and one that can exert a directive, indeed a revolutionary force in the larger society. It is the role of government to support the family unit, and the family in turn must bring about a re-ordering of national priorities so as to maintain and sup-

port the basic human values of respect for the person, community, and transcendence. I believe it is well summed up in this statement by Leon Kass:

"The family is rapidly becoming the only institution in an increasingly impersonal world where each person is loved not for what he does or makes, but simply because he is. The family is also the institution where most of us, both as children and as parents, acquire a sense of continuity with the past and a sense of commitment to the future. Without the family, most of us would have little incentive to take an interest in anything after our own deaths. These observations suggest to me that the elimination of the family would weaken ties to past and present, and would throw us even more on the mercy of an impersonal, lonely present."

FEDERAL POLICY AND AMERICAN FAMILIES
(Testimony presented by Rev. Msgr. Lawrence J. Corcoran, executive director, National Conference of Catholic Charities)

Senators: I am Monsignor Lawrence J. Corcoran, Executive Director of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, which serves some 1,500-member agencies and institutions throughout the United States.

With a combined local community budget of near \$4 billion dollars a year, the Catholic Charities network serves millions of families in the United States. Catholic Charities represents the largest non-governmental program in the field of social welfare. Since the Conference was founded in 1910, it has been committed to providing services and supporting public policy which would strengthen the fabric of family life in our country. It is our view that the general welfare of the nation depends in large measure on the welfare and strength of its families.

While we are concerned for the welfare of all families, we have a special concern for low-income families. The proceedings of our first national meeting in 1910 indicate that the National Conference of Catholic Charities "aims to become . . . the attorney for the poor in modern society, to present their point of view and defend them unto the days when social justice may secure to them their rights."

So we are especially pleased that this distinguished Senate Subcommittee has called these hearings to explore the impact of governmental policy and program on families and children.

We understand that these hearings are preliminary and searching in nature. The influence of governmental policy on family life is so broad and deep, and the governmental responsibility so important that the interrelationship between governmental policy and family life needs constant and searching examination if our nation's families are to be strengthened and to remain strong and vital.

Our comments below reflect what our agencies around the nation report to us, and the experience we have gained in the struggle to form and maintain sound national policy to protect and nurture family life. Recently, for example, we have been discouraged by the constant efforts on the part of the present Administration to cut social service and public assistance costs, both efforts which will weaken family life in this country. We believe most strongly that the first focus or objective of national social welfare policy should be on strengthening family life. The focus which has developed recently on the part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare seems, on the other hand, to be first to return people to work, any kind of work, at any kind of wage, and to cut social welfare costs. That policy is destructive policy.

With this general introduction, may I now comment on some of the specific problem areas the Committee has enumerated.

WORK

Income and financial security for the future are essential for the maintenance of strong family life. This almost seems a platitude, it is so self-evident, but often government policy does not square with the obvious nature of the statement. Just recently, for example, the President vetoed, and the House of Representatives could not override, what we consider to be a very modest increase in the minimum wage, and a badly needed extension of its coverage. If our national policy really put strong families first on its agenda, one could hardly call a minimum wage of \$2.20 per hour inflationary. The annual wage that minimum would produce barely reaches the poverty level.

Unemployment, under-employment and inadequate and unsatisfying work or work conditions develop tensions in families which frequently result in the disintegration of families, force mothers of small children to

work, separate children from their fathers or their parents. We see the results of unemployment, inadequate wages and unsatisfying work daily in our agencies around the country. So a strong and expanding economy, designed for maximum employment opportunity, with reasonable family-supporting levels of minimum wage for all employees must become a consistent governmental policy. The kind of economic policy we have seen in the past several years, with rampant inflation, rapidly rising prices, high unemployment and almost unprecedented corporate profits, has been placing very real strains on millions of poor and modest income families.

Secondly, since a sense of security is needed to sustain family life, we would urge, as we have urged before Congress in the past, that the government make a firm and enduring commitment to being the employer of last resort, so that despite occasional economic dislocations or fluctuations in our economy, those who are able to work will find meaningful jobs available to them.

In this connection we are not impressed by the relatively unconstructive "make-work" programs which have been devised to reduce the public assistance rolls in states such as California. Work must be meaningful, must be adequately compensated to provide family support, and must provide the opportunity for human satisfaction and advancement.

In addition to the provision of work opportunities by government, if necessary, we see it as entirely appropriate for the government to help those in need secure the education which would enable them to improve their skills and advance in the labor market. Recently, for example, a situation in California came to our attention, where in order to continue receiving public assistance for herself and her children, a woman was ordered to go to work, rather than complete her college education which would have enabled her to become a certified teacher.

In a related matter we would urge more adequate income carry-over programs such as unemployment compensation and the liberalization of unemployment compensation benefits to strikers engaged in legitimate labor disputes centering around economic and non-economic benefits for the workers and their families.

Several other points related to the matter of work:

We urgently need better urban mass transportation systems. Middle class people in suburbs have benefitted from one of the largest governmental welfare programs—the development of highway systems to let them come downtown to work at white collar jobs. At the same time, countless companies have moved from the central cities into suburban areas. With grossly inadequate public mass transportation systems, poorer people, frequently members of minority groups, living in central city areas, find it difficult to get to where the new jobs are. At the same time, what public transportation there is frequently is under-utilized, transportation systems lose money, and fares become much too high. Clearly, mass transportation is necessary for the public welfare. Daily experience in city after city points more and more to the necessity of a system of integrated public transportation in our urban areas as a normal function of government supported entirely by tax money. Transportation affects the ability to work, and consequently affects family life.

But even more important than better public transportation is the need to develop a neighborhood economic development strategy. We need neighborhood economic development programs to place job opportunities near people, as well as to encourage the maintenance of strong neighborhoods. Large areas of many of our cities contain no job opportunities at all, especially for younger people. Secondly, the almost total dislocation of jobs from neighborhoods in urban areas results in young people having to go without work models, since they have no opportunity to observe those close to them in work situations.

We were happy to see the Senate begin to deal forthrightly with the matter of earned retirement income—the pension. Vesting rights, insurance and portability are important to the security of American families, and we hope the legislation clears Congress and is signed by the President and is improved in subsequent years.

Increased attention must be paid to the important role government must play in providing training for second careers. We have in mind not only workers whose jobs become obsolete in our economy, but also the growing number of women whose families are grown, who have many productive years before them, but who have no career or work skills when they could once again enter the labor market.

Finally we need on-going planning, government programs and forceful governmental action to deal with severe economic dislocation. We do not feel, for example, that governmental responsibility was adequately exercised several years ago when the NASA budget was trimmed (something we favor)

"Making Babies—the New Biology and the 'Old' Morality," Leon R. Kass, *The Public Interest*, No. 26, Winter, 1972, p. 51.

and countless engineers glutted the market. We saw the effect of that dislocation on family life. And it is certainly clear to all who believe that our country can care for its defense with a more modest Defense Department budget that we need the kind of programs which will efficiently transfer military or military-related employment and

production to the private sector. We need, especially, the kind of attention in Congress which will see to it that the government develops the economic programs which will reduce the dependence of many of our congressional districts on military or military-related employment. How else can we develop and maintain a vital and enduring peacetime economy?

The agencies affiliated with the National Conference of Catholic Charities are constantly forced to deal with the wreckage in families of inadequate government economic policy and inadequate programs guaranteeing productive and satisfying work for our citizens.

INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND FOSTER CARE

The experience of our agencies leaves little doubt that the lack of certain supports for families in stress, and unnecessary institutionalization of children and parents, place severe strains on family life and often result in the breakup of families. We would make the following observations on needed social service and other governmental programs to relieve the stress and strengthen families.

High mobility in our society, and the vanishing of the extended family, leaves countless married couples with little immediate personal support in times of need or stress. Thus the adequate provision of homemaker services is essential if children are to be maintained in the home during illness or other emergencies.

Likewise we need to extend day care as a supplement to strengthen family life by providing for children while parents are working, and also as an important assist to single parent families. Even single parent families with the parent at home need the relief and leisure which can sometimes only be provided by day care. At the same time, day care programs should not be a method by which we subsidize under-employment or low wages paid by the private sector of the economy.

These helps—day care, homemakers—are essential public programs in our country, since our modern economy no longer encourages the extended family system which had these built-in supports. To avoid unnecessary institutional care, we need more adequate financial resources for day care and homemaker services. We also need high national standards in the day care and homemaker services.

Let me observe that the move of profit-making companies into the day care field gives us concern; the government must insure that this does not deflate standards which was the case in the nursing home field. This movement also makes us uneasy in terms of the possibility of profit-making concerns forcing non-profit services out of the field, or absorbing them, ultimately leading to increased costs for day care.

Frankly, we have some serious question as to whether the profit sector of our economy should be permitted at all in the fields of providing direct human care services, such as health care, nursing care, day care. These services are not subject to much consumer choice; they are necessary services in providing for the general welfare. It seems contrary to the humanitarian spirit that should motivate our solicitude for our fellow citizens that profit or excessive income should be derived from the provision of those personal services which are basic to a decent human existence.

One of the greatest strains on families in our country is that imposed by illness or the breakdown in the health of family members. The inadequacy of our medical delivery system and the private health insurance emphasis on crisis care rather than preventive medicine results in needless institutionalization of parents and of children.

This nation urgently needs a universal health insurance system, under the Social Security system, and a greater re-orientation of delivery to see that the health needs of the poor are adequately met, and to insure that the emphasis is on preventive care, rather than on the high costs resulting from major illness when preventive care is not available. The legislation on health maintenance organizations, which has been moving through Congress, is badly needed, on a much larger scale than presently proposed. It is disturbing to us that the present Administration has backed off considerably from its previous strong stance for change in the delivery system through HMO's.

Let me cite but one instance of a serious local problem resulting from an inadequate delivery system, inadequate funding for HMO's, and the lack of an overall health strategy and health insurance system for all American citizens. Bexar County, Texas

(largely San Antonio), has approximately 240,000 medically indigent citizens. State law in Texas prohibits doctors from working on a contract basis with any but public hospitals or health services, and as a result, the clinics in San Antonio operate on a limited, part-time, basis, and on the time of doctors who volunteer. Many citizens, particularly many Mexican-Americans, have no access to regular health care, especially preventive care.

Several years ago that community suffered a disastrous and prolonged diphtheria epidemic. The epidemic raged some seven months before local public health officials called the Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta for some assistance. There were inadequate public health services for immunization, and, in the meantime, immunization shots which might have been available at a public cost of some 17¢ per citizen were being given by private physicians at from \$10 to \$15 each.

Since that time two groups in San Antonio have attempted to form Health Maintenance Organizations. Citizens associated with the Commission for Mexican American Affairs applied for a non-profit charter and were denied it by the State Board of Medical Examiners and by the Secretary of State, apparently because the Board of Directors for their HMO was not completely made up of physicians. They have since sued on constitutional grounds and their case is before the Federal District Court. On the other hand the Bexar County Medical Foundation (completely controlled by the leadership of the local medical society) applied for and secured a grant to begin organizing an HMO, and is presently in its second year of federal funding. However, the Medical Foundation has stated its HMO would not treat indigent patients.

Something surely is wrong with federal policy if such a situation obtains in San Antonio, as well as in other communities in our country. The National Conference of Catholic Charities feels that present health care policy in the United States is skewed toward the affluent and toward high costs. We favor federal policy which will reorient the delivery system so as to meet the preventive health care needs of the poor, and a universal federal health insurance system. Both elements of policy are needed; health insurance alone without preventive care delivery will only keep costs moving upward. We do believe that sound federal policy and programs in the health care field will reduce institutionalization of parents and children.

One final observation on institutionalization: Sometimes placement of children is needed; but we find that there is a lack of resources to apply in situations especially involving retarded or other difficult to place children. We need more help here from the federal government.

MOBILITY

Mobility quite obviously poses great strains for individual and family life, whether that mobility is a result of governmental employment programs (military transfers), economic dislocation, or the private search for more satisfying and better jobs. I believe the Defense and State Departments do recognize their responsibility as employers, but I do not have the experience to speak to the adequacy of their programs. Rather I would speak to mobility in the private sector, and present some ideas as to how we might deal with the problems arising there.

First of all, much mobility is involuntary, and results from the lack of strong local economies, or the impact in local communities of the decisions reached by remote corporate managers. I would again reiterate the need for a strong neighborhood economic development strategy, to build and maintain enduring job markets locally.

Secondly, it seems to me that we must begin to insist that responsibility for economic dislocation be shared by corporate employers and the government; the burden cannot fairly continue to be placed on the individual family with modest assistance from unemployment insurance. It is not sufficient for necessary moving costs involved in taking a job to be tax deductible.

The business community has found it advantageous to meet the economic costs of moving when it transfers executives—paying moving costs, often insuring against loss in the sale or purchase of adequate housing. The same benefits should be provided by perhaps a combination of the private and public sector for the average worker who finds himself without a job because a plant shuts down, or a company relocates, or almost a whole industry relocates, as was the case with the textile industry. Something similar should be done also for the wage earner who cannot find employment locally, when there are open job markets in other parts of the country. I do not, however, mean we should support involuntary mobility. Eligibility for public assistance should not have moving to an area of job surplus as a requirement. But the costs of moving should be met for a worker who voluntarily relocates.

WELFARE

In August, 1970, I testified before the Senate Finance Committee on the proposed Family Assistance Act. I said then, as I say now, that "it is not necessary to dwell on the need for welfare reform, which is acknowledged by almost everyone—the general public, the welfare recipient, welfare administrators and workers, and indeed by the Congress of the United States."

While there have been improvements—notably the transference to the federal government of assistance to the elderly, blind and disabled (even though the payment levels are inadequate)—the situation of families and children in the welfare system has deteriorated since that time. I noted at the opening of this testimony that despite its proclamations about getting public assistance to the people who need it most, the present Administration seems to have spending cuts, return to work, and a weakening of federal standards as its prime goals in the field of welfare.

Let me state firmly the belief of the National Conference of Catholic Charities that the prime goal of our welfare system must be to protect, nurture and strengthen family life by the guarantee of adequate income, and the provision of supportive services. And the prime purpose of providing social services must not be to get people off of public income maintenance into meaningful employment, desirable as this is, but, again, to strengthen family life.

We are discouraged at what we observe to be a steady effort on the part of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to dismantle the federal protections which had been built into the financial assistance pro-

gram, by offering the State great leeway in determining and handling the eligibility process. We fear a massive effort to sharply cut the number of people receiving public assistance—to cut off from assistance millions of families who are or have been eligible, and who desperately need income security. We continue to be concerned by what we called in 1970 "the pernicious condition which presents some parents with the terrible choice of remaining with their family and not receiving public assistance or deserting their spouse and children so that the family can receive the financial assistance it needs to exist."

We are also very disturbed by efforts in Congress and in HEW to substantially weaken the programs of social service available to our citizens, and to tie social services directly to a "return to work" objective. The most recent regulations on social services proposed by the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW are grossly inadequate, as are the regulations recently finalized on eligibility for financial assistance. Both will be destructive of family life in our country and hit especially sharply at the family life of poor people whose marriages are already under great strain.

Just as the federal government has assumed responsibility for minimum guaranteed assistance to the elderly, the blind and the disabled, we believe that the Congress must devise a program for the federal government to assume responsibility for income maintenance for families in need. We need a public assistance program which will not weaken family life by making the parent dependent on income focused on children, and will not require the father to be absent. We need federal administration of the program, federal eligibility standards, federal minimum payment levels, and federal administration of the program.

I would like to make one final observation on the need for the federal government to assume responsibility for an adequate income maintenance program. We note with interest the tentative proposal of the Administration to provide a cash allowance to those whose incomes are inadequate to purchase or rent housing in the private housing market. We do not believe it would be wise governmental policy to chop necessary income maintenance programs into bits and pieces and distribute them in various areas of need in this manner. Rather, except for health insurance, they should be consolidated into one overall income maintenance strategy. We would also like to place on record our fear that separate administration of a cash allowance program in the field of housing would result in inflated rents in those cities with low vacancy rates. We believe that income subsidies, as essential as they are, cannot be a substitute for other federal programs designed to stimulate and enlarge the housing supply in our country.

In addition to an adequate federal income maintenance program for families, we need a system of social services which are not part of or dependent on financial assistance, and which are organizationally and administratively separated from the financial assistance function of government.

And in the social service field we need the maintenance of a public-private partnership. The collaboration of the governmental and voluntary, non-profit sectors in the provision of social services has been beneficial to those served and also in the efforts to establish a

strong and helpful social service system in this country. Such collaboration manifests in practice the democratic principles which we all espouse.

We also need the maintenance of strong and vital multi-purpose legal service programs. The advances made in recent years to extend needed legal services to the poor must be strengthened. Legal service lawyers should not be restricted in their activities any more than lawyers are who serve the more affluent; legal service back-up centers must be maintained and strengthened; and the whole legal service program needs more adequate funding. The provision of such a program is an important complement to the services necessary to strengthen family life in the United States.

TAX SYSTEM

In our view the present tax system, federal, state and local combined, contains some serious inequities, and disincentives for family life.

On the federal level, present deductibles for family members are insufficiently large to encourage family stability and development. The need for more adequate deductibles realistically reflecting some of the basic costs involved in rearing and educating a family, are especially important now that there is evidence that the population growth rate in the United States has stabilized.

Some other deductibles—notably the deductibility of interest payments in the purchase of housing—discriminate in favor of the more affluent and those who own property, while quite clearly discriminating against renters and the bulk of the poor families of the country.

Thirdly, the health needs of our nation's families, particularly the marginally poor and modest income families whose health needs so often go unmet because of lack of financial resources, suggest the need for the complete deductibility of medical and dental expenses until such time as we develop a universal health insurance system.

Also on the federal level, in order to relate deductibility more closely to the concept of an income maintenance program, consideration might be given to relating deductible amounts to income levels: the lower a family's income, the higher the deductible per family member.

Finally on the federal level, it is quite clear that the present social security tax system places an inequitable burden on poorer wage earners and families.

There are some tax disincentives on the local level which might properly be the subject of federal attention also. We have in mind particularly the present nature of our property tax system, as it is especially burdensome on some groups in our population, as it subsidizes the profits of slumlords in our cities, and especially as its administration results in the inequitable distribution of tax resources in the field of education. I understand that education is properly a function of the states. There are a number of cases in the Federal Courts challenging the present administration of the property taxes on the state level. The evidence is so overwhelming that the educational needs of poorer families, and often of minorities, have for generations been sacrificed in favor of the affluent, that all federal assistance in the field of education ought to be designed to make up for this inequity until state tax systems result in an even distribution of state resources to meet educational needs.

Secondly, on the state level, the continuance of high rates of sales tax, particularly on food and other essentials for family life, discriminate by placing a far heavier relative burden on poor and moderate income families than on the affluent. Federal tax policy ought to be devised to correct this skew, and to discourage the continuance of the sales tax. While revenue sharing has in some instances enabled states to consider correcting the system, revenue sharing, along with reductions in the categorical programs, is not the answer.

All in all, we do believe that attention to the above problems and closing some of the glaring loopholes in our present tax law is properly part of a federal effort to protect and nurture strong family life in our country.

HOUSING, ZONING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

No one believes that housing legislation in the United States has been adequate. But the evident housing programs of the current Administration have disastrous implications for the family life of the poor as well as for the middle income family. The Administration declares moratoriums and impounds with impunity and our shortage of housing grows shorter still. At the same time, the Administration's overall economic policy encourages the rise of interest rates to levels unprecedented in the nation's history, forcing countless families into a new form of bondage, sharply increasing the cost of housing, and making homeownership a goal beyond the reach of additional millions of our citizens. Obviously congress must assert its will over the Administration's reckless program, and

then, while current programs continue, do its own evaluation of the impact of federal housing programs of the past 25 years in order to devise a better program which will increase our housing supply and substantially improve rural and urban living for our nation's families.

The Administration has one proposal which interests us, and that is to seek a formula which would space a family's housing costs out more evenly over its lifetime income expectancy. At the present time the average family's income peaks far after its need for housing space peaks, and this is certainly a disincentive to strong family life.

Federal attention should be increasingly given to the obvious ways in which zoning is being used on the local level to maintain and even increase economic segregation in our urban areas. As jobs expand to suburban areas, restrictive zoning policies result in the inability of poorer families to become more affluent since they are unable to locate their homes near job growth. And as I mentioned earlier in my testimony, more adequate urban mass transportation systems are needed. Also needed is a vigorous neighborhood economic development strategy to help rebuild inner city areas and to help maintain strong neighborhood life in our cities.

One other aspect of urban development bothers us very much. Not long ago Art Buchwald wrote a column which with grim humor portrayed a coming pattern of re-segregation in our cities. Because of income disparity, booming inner city land costs, and the inadequacy of government aids to housing rehabilitation, inner cities had become white, surrounded by black suburban rings. The results of the present non-policy are evident even not far from this Capitol building.

It strikes us that there are at least two problems which must be given attention in the development of federal policy which would strengthen the fabric of our cities and thereby strengthen family life. First of all, ways must be found to give the poorer and moderate income family the money to rehabilitate urban housing. Secondly, something must be done to halt the grossly inflated value of urban land to insure that in our rapidly urbanizing nation all of the nation's families will be able to have access to housing in our cities in the future. Leaving land costs to the present patterns of speculation, to the supply and demand force created by those who have money to invest simply squeezes the poorer families of our nation out of present and future opportunity. We could cite from the experience of our agencies around the country family after family who has had to move repeatedly because of urban renewal or private rehabilitation, and the absence of any way for the poorer family to get a stake in the rehabilitation of our neighborhoods.

Any reappraisal of the government's role in housing and urban rehabilitation must rest on the expression in the Housing Acts of 1949 and 1968 that our goal must be a decent home in a decent neighborhood for every family in our nation. We need to spell out again and provide the resources to meet concrete numerical targets such as were detailed in the 1968 Act.

Let me close my testimony with thanks to you, Senator Mondale, and to your distinguished conferees on the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth. The attention you are calling to the effect of governmental policies and programs on family life is sorely needed. Our nation depends on strong and vital families and we look forward to the day when this fact is more clearly recognized as a matter of federal policy and when all federal policy initiatives are evaluated with their impact on family life in mind.

Thank you.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST
(By Rev. William H. Genne)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, my name is William Genne. I am a staff member of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., serving the Council's Division of Education and Ministry as Coordinator of Ministries with Families.

The National Council of Churches is the agency through which thirty-two Christian Churches of the Protestant and Orthodox traditions seek to cooperate in their various ministries. Since its organization in 1950, the Council has tried to carry forward the concerns of its predecessor organizations for the strengthening and enrichment of family life, not only in this country but around the world as well through our overseas units. The former Federal Council of Churches created its Commission on Marriage and the Home in 1932; and ever since there has been an identifiable structure at this level to represent this concern.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FAMILY

During these more than forty years of helping families help themselves we have learned much from the families we have

sought to serve. Strong, healthy family life does not happen automatically any more than we "fall into love". Just as love must be nurtured and helped to grow, family life must be nurtured by arduous effort. A growing love and a growing family life are both full of growing pains.

In 1966 the National Council of Churches joined with the Synagogue Council of America and the United States Catholic Conference in adopting "A Joint Statement on Marriage and Family Life in the United States" (attached). This statement reads in part:

"To help families develop foundations for personally meaningful and socially responsible behavior, we offer the following affirmations on which our historic faiths unite.

"We believe, and unite in affirming, that God . . . did create us male and female and did establish families as part of his Divine Plan . . .

"We believe and unite in affirming that our sexuality is a wondrous gift from God to be accepted with thanksgiving and used within marriage with reverence and joy.

"We believe and unite in affirming that our understanding of God's plan for marriage ideally calls for lifelong commitment in fidelity to a continuing, supportive relationship in which each partner helps the other develop to fullest capacity. . . .

"We believe and unite in affirming that children are a trust from God and that parenthood is a joyous, though strenuous, adventure in partnership with God for the procreation and nurturing of each child. . . .

"We believe and unite in affirming that family life is the cradle of personality and character for each child and created an environment for the societal values of each succeeding generation as well as the principal source of meaningful personal relations for each adult member of our society. . . .

"We believe that the family is the cornerstone of our society. It shapes the attitudes, the hopes, the ambitions, the values of every citizen. . . .

"Therefore, we the major religious groups in the U.S., join in exploring all ways and means available to preserve and strengthen family life in America to the end that each person may enjoy fulfillment in dignity, justice, and peace."

THE FAMILY AND THE TOTAL ENVIRONMENT

It is within this context, then, Mr. Chairman, that I say that the families of America and the World need a total environment, both internal and external, if these families are to realize their fullest potential and render their greatest service to humanity.

Because we believe that every aspect of life has moral significance, the Council has had to be concerned with every aspect of life as it either enhances or destroys the quality of human life.

Therefore, the National Council of Churches has developed many policy statements and programs to strengthen and enrich family life. It has frequently supported the objectives of proposed legislation and government programs which would help improve the total social and cultural environment in which families must live.

These policy statements, developed and adopted by the representatives of our member churches, do not profess to speak for every member of those communions. They do represent the majority judgment of those leaders who, working together through the National Council, have sought to relate the moral insights of their Christian faith to the corporate life of our communities.

We cannot, in the time available to us, enumerate all the concerns of our common life that would have an impact on family life. Every effort to build international, economic or racial justice, which is the foundation of peace, would, of course, have a beneficial impact on all of the families of this world. The elimination of racial and sexual discrimination, the achievement of a more just distribution of income, the conversion of our multi-billion dollar swords into plowshares—these and others are examples of areas over which Congress can, if it wills, exert some control, to the tangible benefit of all families.

Let me speak, however, to a few concerns which relate more specifically and directly to families—and to the institution of marriage which confers legal status on families in our culture—to which this committee might direct its attention:

The conditions of marriage

Since the states reserve to themselves the right to determine the laws governing marriage and the dissolution thereof, there is a hodge-podge of fifty-one jurisdictions (including D.C.) with differing legislation on this matter. Not all states report their statistics to the federal bureaus concerned with such matters. This lack of complete statistics is a real handicap to researchers and family-helping specialists.

In 1963 the National Council urged the Senate to ratify the convention proposed by

the United Nations favoring free consent to marriage, a minimum age for marriage and the registration of all marriages. To date the Senate has not taken action on this matter, because, we understand, it has not been officially submitted by the State Department.

Such confusion and inaction tend to indicate to young people that marriage is not a serious concern of legislators. Any young person knows that it is easier to get a marriage license than it is to get a driver's license for an automobile. If our governments at all levels persist in such a casual attitude toward marriage, we should not be surprised at ever increasing marital discord and failure.

Education for Family Life

In 1968 the same three organizations mentioned before addressed themselves specifically to sex education as part of the training for adult life and responsibilities (cf. The Interfaith Statement on Sex Education, attached). While recognizing the primary responsibility of the home and the distinctive responsibility of the churches in education for an understanding of human sexuality, this statement recognized the responsibility of the schools and other community agencies in this important task.

Since the three major faith groups are united in this concern, we would urge the agencies of government that have to do with education at all levels to develop more adequate programs for adulthood and family life. The time for a conspiracy of silence and neglect is long past.

Education for family living calls for community offerings for every age in the life cycle from pre-natal education for retirement and eventual death. Legislation to guide and resources to actualize programs of education for all ages is a necessity in our modern society.

Education is, of course, an aspect of child development and we strongly urge the attention of the committee be directed toward adequate care and education in early childhood, especially in those instances where both parents are working outside the home.

Health Care and Services

There is a basic need for adequate health care in our country. In addition to the hospitals and health care services provided by our member churches in this country and overseas, the National Council of Churches has repeatedly (1960, '67, '71) spoken out for a better delivery system and a more adequate provision of health care services in this country. As recently as 1971 it said:

"The General Board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. endorses the development of a national health system which will assure quality health care as a right to all persons in an accessible, effective and efficient manner, with a method of funding which makes this possible. It calls upon units of the Council to support the achievement of his goal in appropriate ways."

Adequate health services would include not only medical and dental services but also mental health facilities, including marital and sexual therapies which are so basic to healthy family life. Counseling and services to help families voluntarily determine the number and spacing of their children is a vital component of any family health care system (1961).

Economic Supports

There seems to be a moral dilemma in the most affluent nation in the world having persistent pockets of poverty gnawing at the vitality of the body politic. When we have the resources and are under the moral imperative to share with the less fortunate members of our human family, it seems as though we ought to be able to figure out some ways to insure a basic decency of life for all persons. In 1968 the National Council stated:

... the National Council of Churches endorses the concept and desirability of a guaranteed income. Such a program should meet the following criteria:

- (1) It should be available as a matter of right, with need as the sole criterion of eligibility.
- (2) It should be adequate to maintain health and human decency.
- (3) It should be administered so as to adjust benefits to changes in cost of living.
- (4) It should be developed in a manner which will respect the freedom of persons to manage their own lives, increase their power to choose their own careers, and enable them to participate in meeting personal and community needs.
- (5) It should be designed to afford incentive to productive activity.
- (6) It should be designed in such a way that existing socially desirable programs and values are conserved and enhanced.

We recognize that the guaranteed income is not a substitute for programs of full employment and human resource development. It is not a panacea for all the socio-economic problems encountered by the family and the individual in the course of a life cycle. At the same time, we are compelled to acknowledge that our socio-economic system works imperfectly. It is, therefore, the responsibility of society to devise new institutions which more adequately fulfill basic human rights.

The most dangerous person to any society is the one who has no stake in it. When we urge the government to insure the basics of health and decency, as well as order and tranquility, we are reminded that these benefits should be available to all, including our native American Indians (1955), migratory and seasonal farm workers (1951, 1966) and all Americans regardless of race, creed or national origin (1966). Only as each person is given visible and tangible interest in our so-

cial structures can they be expected to work for those social structures.

HOUSING

As far back as 1953, the Council expressed its concern about adequate housing as a necessity for healthy families. We realize this is a complicated question involving land, taxation, construction costs and financing as well as the overall design to enhance family living. Blighted cities, "ticky-tacky" suburban developments, and the deterioration of many smaller communities all testify to the need for strenuous efforts by legislative bodies to create better ways of providing adequate shelter for the families of America.

The recent practice of encouraging "urban homesteader" to rehabilitate unused houses in some of our cities seems to offer some hope within the American tradition of individual initiative and self reliance. This and many other proposals regarding land use, property taxation and housing and urban development ought to be a high priority for this committee.

Cultural and media environment

In the sub-committee's study of the impact of legislation and governmental policies on families, you would do well to study the reports of the Presidential Commissions on Population Growth and the American Future and on Obscenity and Pornography. This is not to be construed as a blanket endorsement of all the specific recommendations in those two reports but simply as an observation that they do address two important areas that have an impact on every person in our land. Some of us fear that these reports have been rather quickly passed by because of an emotional rejection of one or two of the sensitive items on which they comment. Our only plea is that there should be continuing dialogue on the total reports, until agreement is reached on many areas discussed in those reports as they affect our national life.

These two reports direct attention to two important areas of the total environment that affects every family and person in America. Because of many changes in society, technologically and philosophically, parents are frequently confused about their own values and consequently are unable to share with their children clear bases for moral decision making. Parents and their children have been battered by repeated wars and other upheavals so all of us need the help of all governmental agencies as well as all community organizations, including the churches, in the painstaking job of rediscovering the basic moral values to which we need to recommit ourselves.

CONCLUSION

Many religionists have the feeling that God is at work exposing cynicism and arrogance and reminding us that love, honor, honesty and a willingness to stick by one's vows, especially the marriage vows, are fundamental to a healthy society.

We therefore applaud your committee's concern to stabilize, strengthen and enrich the families of children and youth, and pledge our continued interest and cooperation as specific legislative proposals are developed.

AMERICAN FAMILIES: TRENDS AND PRESSURES (By Leon Smith, director, Marriage and Family Life Education for the United Methodist Church)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to appear before your Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth to take part in the hearings on "American Families: Trends and Pressures."

At the outset, it is only fair to point out that even though I am presently Director of Marriage and Family Life Education for The United Methodist Church, I have not been elected by our more than 10,000,000 members to represent them here today. I come to you as an individual professional concerned about the well being of the families of this nation. Nevertheless, I draw upon my experience in helping to draft official statements of our church concerning families and base my remarks on these documents, two of which are attached and quoted as indicated: I. "Social Principles of The United Methodist Church" adopted by the 1972 General Conference and II, the "Resolution on the Family" accepted by that General Conference and referred to the churches for study.

First, I would like to commend you and your Committee for your concern for all the families of this nation. Then, I would like to make a few specific suggestions and offer a framework of support for your efforts.

1. We agree with your statement "that nothing is more important to a child than a healthy family" and "that often too little consideration is paid to the role of family in

the prevention and solution of children's problems."

Officially our church has stated: "We believe the family to be the basic human community through which persons are nurtured and sustained in mutual love, responsibility, respect and fidelity. We urge social, economic, and religious efforts to maintain and strengthen families in order that every member may be assisted toward complete personhood." (I, p. 7.)

2. Because of the high value we place on families, especially with regard to their influence on the well being of children and youth, I believe it is time that we took the 1970 White House Conference on Children seriously and reordered our national priorities so as to give first place to meeting the needs of persons, for we recognize "that human values must outweigh military claims as governments determine their priorities." (I, p. 21.)

As a church we have called on our people to "actively work to change our national ... priorities so that the government addresses itself more directly to the human needs within our society." (II, p. 7.) "A high priority must be given to the rights and needs of children." (II, p. 6.) We believe that "children have the rights to food, shelter, clothing, and health care as do adults, and these rights we affirm as theirs regardless of actions or inactions of their parents or guardians." (I, p. 10.)

3. One effective way to implement our basic concern for children, youth and families is to establish a National Institute for Families whose chief officer would have Cabinet status. Purpose of such an Institute would be to foster family well being through research, education, and action programs. As I see it, the Institute also would have the power to review all governmental policies affecting families and to make recommendations to the proper authorities in all branches of government. I believe we need a National Institute for Families to do just what this Committee is doing in these hearings, but to do it on a continuous comprehensive basis and more in depth than can be done in a few days. Again, our church has declared that social structures, including government, which affect families "must be under constant scrutiny and judgment to measure their influence on the family." (II, p. 3.)

4. As a prime concern of the Institute—or of this Committee—I would urge major programs to strengthen family life and sex education, including preparation for marriage and parenthood—from headstart through high school and into college and professional education. For example, every high school student should have an opportunity to learn what it means to be married and to be a parent. Massive educational programs are needed to prepare teachers for these tasks.

Again, "the church supports public schools and other agencies in programs of family life and sex education." (II, p. 6) As a Church, "we support the development of school systems and innovative methods of education designed to assist each child toward full humanity. . . All children have the right to a full sexual education, appropriate to their stage of development, that utilizes the best educational techniques and insights." (I, p. 10.)

These above positions are based on the fact that "we recognize that sexuality is a good gift of God, and we believe that persons may be fully human only when that gift is acknowledged and affirmed by themselves, the church, and society." Since "homosexuals no less than heterosexuals are persons of sacred worth . . . we insist that all persons are entitled to have their human and civil rights insured." (I, p. 7-8.) Further, we call "for the enactment of civil rights legislation prohibiting discrimination because of sexual orientation in employment, housing or public accommodations." (II, p. 8.)

5. Because of the close relationship between marital interaction and child development, ways must be found to support the continuing enrichment of marriage across the years. (II, p. 9.) Further, in terms of marital and family crises, counseling services must be made available to all our people.

Specifically, our national health insurance program must be written so as to include marriage and family counseling as well as pastoral counseling. When individuals with personal and family problems seek counseling almost twice as many turn to a minister as to a medical doctor. And more than half of them bring marriage and family problems. When fees are required for professional marriage and family counseling, they should be covered by our national health insurance. (I, pp. 10, 11, 16; II, p. 7.)

6. Children and families are affected by the environment in which they live. This includes housing and community development. "Massive programs of renewal and social planning are needed to bring a greater degree of humanization into urban-suburban life styles." We "must judge all programs, including economic and community development, new towns, and urban renewal by the extent to which they protect and enhance human values, permit personal and political involvement, and make possible neighborhoods open to persons of all races, ages and

24

income levels." (I, p. 13.)

7. We have a special concern for families living in poverty. "In order to provide basic needs such as food, clothing, shelter, education, health care and other necessities, ways must be found to more equitably share the wealth of the world. . . . To begin to alleviate poverty, we support such policies as: adequate income maintenance, quality education, decent housing, job training, meaningful employment opportunities, medical and hospital care, and humanization and radical revisions of welfare programs." (I, p. 16.)

Regarding migrant workers, "we call upon governments and all employers to insure for migratory workers the same economic, educational and social benefits enjoyed by other citizens." (I, p. 16.)

8. Families are acutely affected by military service and the disruption of family life it requires. As a church "we support those individuals who conscientiously oppose all war, or any particular war, and who therefore refuse to serve in the armed forces. We also support those persons who conscientiously choose to serve in the armed forces or to accept alternate service." (I, p. 19.)

At the present time our government's attitude against amnesty is dividing families who could be brought back together by change in governmental policy.

9. Employment and income are basic to family well being. Thus in the economic realm, "we recognize the responsibility of governments to develop and implement sound fiscal and monetary policies that provide for the economic life of individuals and corporate entities, and that insure full employment and adequate incomes with a minimum of inflation." . . . We believe private and public economic enterprises are responsible for the social costs of doing business, such as unemployment and environmental pollution, and that they should be held accountable for these costs. We support measures that would reduce concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. We further support efforts to revise tax structures and eliminate governmental support programs that now benefit the wealthy at the expense of other persons. . . . We believe governments have the responsibility, in the pursuit of justice and order under law, to provide procedures that protect the rights of the whole society, as well as those of private ownership." (I, p. 14-15.)

10. Finally, for the office of a framework of support for your efforts that goes beyond these statements and beyond the church itself, I would like to share with you a dream.

I have a dream of establishing in this nation a Family Action Network that will be a membership organization of a million persons who are concerned about families and who want to join in action programs to strengthen family life in this nation. In local communities all across this land members will form task forces to work on particular problems or issues affecting families where they live. At the national level we will study the structures of society and help them become aware of their effect on families—including the mass media, business, education, medicine, religion, and government. Specifically, one part of the Family Action Network would be a citizen lobby for families. In such an organization, Mr. Chairman, I believe you would find support for your efforts to strengthen the families of the children and youth who are so concerned about. (II, p. 7-8.) Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF MR. CHRIS HOBGOOD

(Representing the Departments of Christian Education and Church in Society of the Division of Homeland Ministries of the Christian Church—Disciples of Christ)

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth, my name is Chris Hobgood. I am pastor of the First Christian Church in Alexandria, Virginia. At this time I am representing not only myself, but also the Departments of Christian Education and Church in Society of the Division of Homeland Ministries of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ). The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) is a Protestant denomination with approximately 4,500 congregations and 1.3 million members throughout the country. While this statement is a personal response of myself and members of these two national program units of our church, it does reflect the thinking of a number of persons who are concerned with development of both family and social or community ministries to individuals and families through channels of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) at its various levels: local congregations, regional and national. Therefore, this statement suggests the direction of some of the

concerns and future programs of the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).

The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) strongly affirms the central importance of the family in the molding and supporting of persons. We believe that it is the family which can and should provide the basic sense of personhood and self-worth for children, as well as security and affirmation for youth and adults. To say that the family can and should serve these functions, however, is not to suggest that it is currently doing so in every instance. We are deeply concerned, in fact, about the failure of a great many families to serve these functions of developing and supporting persons.

While we believe that these families—and more particularly the persons in these families—must themselves bear the responsibility for such failures we maintain that the culture in which we live brings many pressures to bear on these persons and families in such a way as to contribute to said failures. Some of the pressures of divisiveness are primarily cultural. Many others are directly or indirectly the result of governmental policies.

We do not suggest that the government can pass laws and establish policies which eliminate family failures. We do believe, however, that the various governments under which we live—local, state, federal—can be cognizant of the effect of laws and policies upon families. More than simply being aware, however, we believe that government can seek to avoid creating laws and policies which negatively effect the ability of families to serve the functions of development and support of persons. In addition we believe that government can at times and in some areas take positive actions to support the healthy functioning of families.

We believe that there are several specific areas where governmental policy and/or legislation have in the past, are at present, or can in the future directly impinge upon the welfare and stability of families as they seek to serve these essential functions of development and support of wholesome personhood. Among the most important of these areas are the following:

CHILD CARE DEVELOPMENT

As more families face the situation of both parents working outside the home, or as necessitated in growing numbers of one-parent families, we are greatly concerned that satisfactory child care and development facilities be available and accessible. Such facilities must be humane and complementary to the families' individual life styles. Since life styles and needs vary, facilities must vary in their functions and goals. Rather than neutralize the significance of the family, as some have said is the danger of such facilities, effective child development programs should reinforce the values inherent in the family while enabling the child to develop progressively through effective instruction and activities. Governmental support must be available to private agencies which attempt to provide such services. It may also be that the government itself may at times and in certain places be obligated to provide such services. We believe that the Child Development Act (S. 2007) was a step in the right direction and very much regret its veto by President Nixon. We hope that similar legislation will, after careful study, be enacted in the very near future.

We see such legislation as not divisive of the family but as supportive of individual persons in their own growth. Satisfactory child care facilities can be supportive of the family as they provide extended family relationships while encouraging individual family members to work for their development and effectiveness as parents and family members. The availability of standard child care/development centers can serve to relieve tensions and frustrations which may exist in their absence. With these goals in mind,

therefore, we affirm the need for facilities which are flexible, open to and supportive of parental involvement, and soundly based in principles of developmental psychology.

HUMAN SEXUALITY

We believe that the government has a responsibility to be a resource and an advocate in the area of human sexuality. It must be a resource in providing information and services to persons and families for the task of sound education in sexuality. While we affirm that the schools and the churches have a responsibility in sex education we maintain that it is ultimately the task of the family, and particularly the parents, to provide such education. We find, however, the parents are frequently ill-equipped for this task, and it is in providing information and resources for them that the government may be well equipped.

In addition, we believe that information and counseling in birth control must be available to parents and potential parents. Such a service—which may well include dissemination of birth control devices and abortion counseling and referral—could prevent many unhappy family situations and neglected children. Both of these goals could be implemented by the Congress by adding provisions for these services to future legislation that provides federal financial assistance for clinics, hospitals, etc.

As an advocate the government must support the right of women to equal opportunity. The passage of the Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution is a logical first step in this direction, followed by vigorous enforcement of its provisions. In this way all persons may have opportunity to find fulfillment for themselves as persons. Even without the Equal Rights Amendment, however, the government can provide support for women in their struggle for equality of opportunity.

MASS MEDIA

We are particularly concerned about the effect of mass media, and especially television, on families. We regret the general lack of substantive material found in most commercial programming. We are concerned about stereo-typical pictures of families which give little support to viewing families in their struggle for a meaningful life together. We deplore the very low quality of so-called children's programming on commercial television, with its major faults of banality and glorification of violence. Even more do we deplore the nature and constancy of advertising which seeks to use children as tools in consumer warfare. The licensing procedures of the Federal Communications Commission should be reviewed, so that quality programming, and not political harassment, becomes the criterion for licensing.

THE ECONOMY

The affect of the present state of the economy on families is of concern to us. As inflation continues we see more evidence of parents seeking to work more hours apart from their families in order to keep up with prices. Furthermore, with the vast discrepancies in income level between various families, we are particularly concerned about what these discrepancies say to our children and youth about equality of opportunity. Children in lower income families, especially if they are also minorities, know very well that equality of opportunity is a hollow phrase when their parents are unable to find work, or can find only low-paying jobs, or must work at two or three jobs in order to provide bare essentials. We question an economic system that, increasingly, favors the very affluent and where even the middle class, like the poor, are unable to function with must equality.

WELFARE LEGISLATION

Persons and families receiving welfare assistance must have the same opportunities to enjoy a meaningful family life as those who are more fortunate. Particularly does this refer to families receiving Aid to Dependent Children support. Such legislation must provide for adequate time for the family to be together as well as taking into consideration the need for satisfactory child care facilities at times. Furthermore, present Aid to Dependent Children grant levels tend to keep families in poverty and therefore are a disservice both to the families and to the nation.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

We are distressed at the growing divorce rate, but do not feel that the answer is to be found in strengthening divorce laws. In fact, we support the growing trend toward the adoption of some form of "no-fault" divorce laws which we believe frequently lessen the tension and hostility involved in many divorce actions. We are more inclined to believe that the strengthening should come at the other end, that is, in marriage laws. We would urge consideration being given to a re-examination of laws governing marriage which might require more thought being given to the nature of the commitment being made than is presently the case. The time may well have come when the federal levels needs to take an active role in effective marriage laws. With the mobility of our society the differences between states' laws become increasingly counter-productive. We doubt the wisdom of the federal government's enacting marriage laws, but we do feel it could take the initiative in encouraging the coordination of states' laws.

MENTAL HEALTH

The other major point at which response to the growing divorce rate might be made is in the support and strengthening of mental health services. We regret the recent cut-

back in federal support to mental health and counseling services. Such support must be increased, both as a preventive measure and as a reconciling force in marriage and family breakdown. Marriage and family counseling services are greatly needed for families of all economic levels, and the provision of such services must be made a priority.

FAMILY STABILITY

At several points we find governmental policy and legislation working against opportunities for family togetherness and stability. Particularly is this true in regard to the government as employer or as government policy affects private employers. Employment conditions which require frequent and/or long-term separation of the employee from his or her family should be avoided whenever possible. When travel is necessitated, compensation should be provided either for the family to accompany the employee or compensatory time off should be available to the employee. Opportunities for families to be with employees on the job site should be made available whenever possible. Frequent moves from community to community should be avoided whenever possible to enable the establishment and maintenance of roots in a community. Persons in prison should be much more accessible to familial visits both in frequency and duration. Many other changes which provide opportunity for family togetherness could also be implemented.

In conclusion we re-affirm our belief in the essential importance of the family in developing and supporting persons. We trust that the government shares a similar belief and will work to enable the family's functioning effectively. Perhaps a "family impact statement" accompanying new legislation, as suggested by Senator Mondale, would be helpful in alerting persons to implications for families. Whatever the recommendations from this sub-committee may be, we fervently hope that they will be supportive of the family in both specific and general ways.

Thank you.

TOWARD A NATIONAL FAMILY POLICY

(By Andrew Billingsley, Ph. D., vice president for academic affairs, professor of sociology, Howard University)

The author of this paper, Andrew Billingsley, has been Vice President for Academic Affairs and Professor of Sociology at Howard University in Washington, D.C. since 1970. He was previously Assistant Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Associate Professor of Social Welfare at the University of California at Berkeley.

He is the author of "Black Families in White America" (Prentice Hall, 1968) and "Children of the Storm" (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972).

A native of Birmingham, Alabama and a veteran of World War II, Dr. Billingsley did his early college work under the G.I. Bill of Rights at Hampton Institute in Virginia. Later he completed a degree in political science at Grinnell College in Iowa, and subsequently obtained advanced degrees in the social sciences at the University of Michigan and at Boston University. He earned the Ph. D. degree at the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare at Brandeis University in 1964 where he wrote an award-winning dissertation on the professional and organizational context for child welfare services.

Dr. Billingsley is married to the former Amy Loretta Tate who is active in the Parent Teacher Association for the District of Columbia Public Schools where their two daughters, Angela and Bonita are students.

TOWARD A NATIONAL FAMILY POLICY

Introduction

Mr. Chairman, please permit me, first, to commend this Committee and other members of the Senate and the House who have decided to give concerted attention to the needs for federal guidance and action designed to enhance the well-being of children within the context of their families. It is an area of our national life which has been long neglected with very grave consequences to the development of childhood and family life among all segments of the national population and most especially among the low and middle income sectors and among those ethnic groups who have faced historic patterns of racial discrimination.

As I understand it, your Subcommittee is conducting a series of investigations designed to help clarify the role of governmental policies in the development of strong families "on the premise that nothing is more important to a child than a healthy family, and on the belief that often too little consideration is paid to the role of the family in the prevention and solution of children's problems." This is a concern which I have held for some time and by professional training, systematic research, observations as a citizen and family member, I have come to the belief that among the greatest needs of the nation at this time is a concerted national policy, augmented by new legislation which will give priority and coherence to national, regional and local efforts in the public and private sectors to reverse the present trends toward the disintegration of family life and to enhance both the structure and the functioning of families in the nation both for the sake of their members, especially their children, and for the contribution a

25
strong and viable family life can make to strengthening the social and moral fabric of other major institutions and, indeed, the nation itself.

As a social scientist and as an educator concerned about the development of values and social structures which bring out the best, most creative and humanistic characteristics of people, I am often appalled at the manner in which the nation assigns priorities to the various aspects of our national life. While we often give lip service to the importance of families, asserting from time to time that the family is the most important institution among us and is the bulwark of our culture and society, the allocation of the nation's resources and attention bespeak otherwise. This problem of misplaced priorities was addressed by Dr. Kenneth B. Clark in an appearance he made before a Senate Committee as early as 1967. "I think the bug is about as good an index of the priority society gives various problems as one can find. Our space program and the Vietnam war have budgetary supports which indicate tremendous seriousness. Our anti-poverty programs have budgetary indications of secondary, tertiary, peripheral priorities, and I don't think that we will solve the problems of our inner cities by relegating them to peripheral priorities." All of us must be grateful that our participation in the Vietnam War has finally been brought to an end. Yet the cessation of hostilities seems to have made no impact whatever on the budgetary priorities of the nation.

Indeed, when Daniel P. Moynihan was Counselor to the President, he warned us publicly that the end of the war would bring no appreciable increase in budgetary support for social programs of a domestic nature. The government, supported by the overwhelming majority of its citizens, seems incapable of redirecting the vast economic resources devoted to war and war-related activities in order to enhance the quality of life for children and their families who are certainly the nation's greatest resource for the future.

When we speak of enhancing family life as a major goal of federal policies, it is not simply a matter of budgetary allocations, federal spending or welfare payments. The matter is much more complicated, complex and intricate. A family is viable, in our view, to the extent that it is able to maintain its physical, social and psychological integrity, meet the instrumental and expressive needs of its members young and old, and meet the requirements which society places on all family groups. This is the definition of a healthy, well-functioning family. Family viability, then, is a much more important concept than family stability which refers simply to staying together. The ability of a family to meet this test of viability depends quite heavily on its base of economic security, housing and health care, the quality of its education and the support from other major segments of the larger society. It depends, also, on a host of other factors all of which are amenable to social policies at the national level.

In a paper prepared for the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, very ably chaired by Congresswoman Martha Griffiths, we have set forth our conception of the requirements of viable family life as follows: What the average man desires and needs are (1) a good job, (2) a good home, (3) good health, (4) a good education for his children and (5) friendly relations with his neighbors. To the extent that men have these resources available to them, their family life

will be strong, stable and secure and they will function very well indeed in meeting the needs of their members and the requirements of the larger society.

The manner in which family functioning is influenced by social policies and social forces outside the family itself is illustrated by the following diagram taken from *Black Families in White America*. In this book, my wife and I have described a social systems approach to the study of family life. It suggests that the family is a dependent unit of the larger society, highly influenced by the policies and operations of these major segments or systems of that society. These systems have both a direct influence on family functioning and an indirect influence through their interrelatedness with each other. Thus while family viability can be enhanced by strong economic support—a good job at an adequate income, by adequate, safe and sanitary housing and by effective education, it is also necessary to recognize that these systems are themselves highly interrelated and interdependent. All are necessary and neither is sufficient in itself to produce and sustain viable families. The communications media, for example, have both direct and indirect influence on family life in the values they portray, the resources they provide as well as their teaching potential. This industry has not yet lived up to its potential for the enhancement of family life. Indeed, if we single out television as an example, both public and private, the performance is as disappointing as the potential is great.

In order, then, to utilize the resources of all these major segments of our national life,

Instrumental needs are those basic needs for food, clothing and shelter. Expressive needs are needs for satisfactory relationships including tender love and care.

to enhance family functioning we need a national family policy.

Elements of a national family policy

A national family policy initiated by the Federal Government would designate the family unit, in all its variety of structure and forms, growing out of the cultural pluralism of the society and the varied and changing value systems, as the most important unit in society. We sometimes say that the family is the most important unit in society today but there is no national policy or commitment to that view.

Thus, a host of other units turn out to be more important in the sense that they get more attention, protection, admiration and support from the national society than do families.

The designation of the family unit as the most important unit in society would require a national commitment to use all the resources of the Federal Government at all levels and the private sectors of society as well, to enhance the functioning of families. It may well be advisable that each of the major governmental functions, agencies, departments and programs should be evaluated according to their impact on family life. They should then be reconceived, redesigned, budgeted and administered in ways specifically calculated to enhance the functioning of families. Many of these agencies and programs now have the opposite effect. Such policy would require a conception of adequate, optimum and satisfactory family functioning.

If the family in all its variety is viewed as a subsystem of the larger society, then the enhancement of the functioning of family life is a responsibility of the larger society more than of the individual members of the family. This is a hard concept for Americans to grasp. We are so individualistic in our value system, so prone to blame the victim, so laissez-faire in our conception of collective responsibility, and so hostile toward people who seem to be poor, weak, and relatively helpless.

Yet these approaches and programs grow-

ing out of these approaches have not solved the problems confronting family life in the nation today, and they do not seem likely to do so. Viewed in the context of a creature of society and a dependent unit of the larger society, it becomes fairly clear what the priorities are for the enhancement of the functioning of families in this society. Measures designed to enable the families to maintain their viability, that is to say effectively meet the needs of their members, especially their youngest members, must emanate from the most important systems of the larger society with a bearing on family life. Chief among these are the economic system, the systems of housing, health care and education. Others are important too, but these are critical. And while all these systems are interrelated, a priority must be given to changes in the way the economic system functions for low- and moderate-income families.

One measure of the level of economic security of American families is suggested by the following data. The Labor Department has estimated that an urban family of four members in order to afford a modest standard of living needs an annual income in 1970 of at least \$12,132. We also know that half of all American families earned less than that. These families are especially vulnerable. Furthermore, the Labor Department estimated that in order to manage well that same family would require an annual income of \$18,545 per year. And we know that three fourths of all American families had incomes less than \$15,000 in 1970.

And if we consider the Labor Department's lower budget of \$7,183 barely enough to keep the family together, we must observe that nearly a third of all American families cannot sustain themselves at an acceptable level of economic well-being, health and decency. In my view it would be a mistake to base a national family policy on a level of economic security less than the Labor Department's intermediate budget based as it is on a very sophisticated estimate of the actual cost of living. A policy based on present conceptions of poverty levels would be self-defeating. A disproportionate share of the national resources must be devoted to the most disadvantaged populations in the nation. Otherwise, it will be difficult to ever solve the nation's social problems.

Presently the major national programs designed to reflect a basic commitment to the family are the welfare programs growing out of the Social Security Act of 1935 as revised by successive Congresses. The most notable of these programs is the program of financial aid to families with dependent children. This and related programs have had enormous benefits to recipients. In the ten years between 1960 and 1970, the number of recipients in this program rose from 2.4 million to more than 10 million. In a very careful analysis of studies of welfare, Henry Cohen has observed that since the inauguration of President Kennedy in 1961, the number of persons receiving public assistance doubled and that two-thirds of this increase occurred since President Nixon took office in January of 1969.

Despite its popularity with both the Congress and the people, this public assistance approach has a number of glaring problems for effective family functioning. First, the

level of assistance is not sufficient to enable families to move out of poverty. Second, it is not provided to family units, but to individuals and thus has some inherent anti-family consequences. In more than half the states, even to this day, it is necessary that men, husbands and fathers leave their families by death, desertion, divorce or separation in order for the children and their mother to receive assistance. Third, in its

manner of eligibility, administration and supervision it provides anti-work incentives which further erode the stability of family life. In most states any earned income results in a net loss or support. Fourth, the value context within which aid is administered and viewed in the country perpetuates negative attitudes toward and negative definitions of poor and needy people thus striking at the foundations of pride and dignity which are necessary ingredients of strong family life. When Professor Kenneth Clark testified before a Senate Committee in 1967, he argued against a simplistic economic solution that ignored the complexities of human existence. He said, "I think if you were to give every poor family \$5000 now, the way welfare is administered, it is my personal opinion that this would not affect one iota the observable pathologies of the slums. I think the way welfare is administered, it seems to be calculated to dehumanize people, to make them see themselves as unworthy." Finally, its unevenness of levels in locally administered programs and the gross inequities which result make for hardships and feelings of relative deprivation and discrimination on the part of recipients and potential recipients and political pressure on the part of the more favored jurisdictions.

Professor Charles Hamilton has recently conducted studies which show that the major beneficiaries of welfare payments are not the poor recipients but other sectors of society. In his study Professor Hamilton observed that the large sums of money paid out in the present forms of welfare move very rapidly from the hands of the poor to the hands of the not-so-poor, and in fact they move very rapidly from the core of the urban city to the suburbs. He concludes:

"The money comes into the Black communities, to the tune of millions of dollars per year, but it goes right out. It is paid out to absentee landlords, to exploitative merchants, to credit gougers and loan sharks. The people we traditionally call 'welfare recipients' are, in fact, really conduits. They conduct money from one segment of the economy [the public sector] to another [the private sector]. The real welfare recipients are those people who prey on the conduits every welfare-check day."

Little wonder then, that the American people, the dominant majority would rather keep the present system, corrupt as it is, than to make any major reforms in it.

It is in part because of these critical limitations of public assistance and partly because of its mounting size and costs that the most far-reaching reforms so far advanced were put forward under the sponsorship of President Nixon for the development of a Family Assistance Plan to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children plan. The Family Assistance Plan (FAP) was debated in the Congress, but not passed. It had several features which made it an outstanding advance over AFDC. First, it provided uniform rules of eligibility throughout the nation. Second, it provided a floor of guaranteed income for each family. Third, assistance would be available on the basis of need providing only that there was at least one child present. Thus families headed by men who are unemployed, men who work but who earn less than the level provided by the assistance plan, as well as families headed by women would all be eligible. There would be no requirement for the father's absence in order to become eligible. Each of these family types would be treated equally. Additionally, it provided that day care facilities should be provided for working mothers based on their ability to pay.

These features are absent from present programs and while representing a significant social advance with enormous consequences

for the strengthening of family life among very poor populations, they were also among the more controversial features of FAP, particularly its proposed support for families of the working poor. From the point of view of family strengthening features, there were three major limitations of the FAP. First, the level of assistance was still not high enough to bring families out of poverty. The average assistance of \$2400 per year for a family of four with no additional income seemed hardly adequate to the conditions of modern urban life. Furthermore, most of the northern urban states already provide levels of assistance higher than that.

A second limitation of FAP was its uneven treatment of the local jurisdictions, and its uneven provision of relief for heavily taxed states in the urban north and west. Still a third limitation of FAP was its inclusion of a provision for mandatory work on the part of mothers of young children, with no specification that a minimum wage be paid or that suitable employment be available or

that the mothers be able to freely choose occupations. So, the strongest features of FAP which had the effect of strengthening family life were severely compromised by its mandatory work feature for mothers of young children.

Despite its promise of a movement from welfare to workfare, the FAP suffered the major dysfunctions of the AFDC program; namely, it was based on a limited conception of the needs for economic security in a highly complex industrial nation at this time. Its focus on particular families was an advantage over the earlier focus on particular individuals, but it did not represent the necessary focus on the larger institutional fabric of society as a source of meeting the economic security needs of the poor as these institutions now serve the nonpoor.

In order for the economic system to function as well for the enhancement of family life among low- and moderate-income people as it does for others, three efforts are necessary which will benefit all American families. These are the elimination of poverty, the elimination of structural unemployment and underemployment and the elimination of economic and job discrimination based on race, region and religion. A prime requisite for the fulfillment of these goals is an expanding and diversified civilian economy with full employment. A second requisite is a program of family economic supports for those not able to earn enough to move out of poverty. Families function better and they can take better care of their children when there is a variety of economic opportunity, including meaningful jobs for the adults in the family. Illness, crime and other forms of maladaptive behavior go up in direct proportion to the rise in economic insecurity and unemployment. Economists suggest that full employment would reduce unemployment at any particular time to around three to four percent. It now hovers around six percent according to government figures which underestimate "hidden unemployment" by at least fifty percent. And for most of the years since the Korean War, the unemployment rates in the Black community have exceeded the depression level unemployment rates experienced by the larger society.

A strong corollary to unemployment is underemployment where men and women work only part of the year and where they work for wages which are clearly substandard and where they work in situations and jobs which do not utilize their abilities and aspirations to the maximum. This particular problem is more pervasive in the Black community than is unemployment. It is the lot of a large segment of the working poor who constitute in turn the largest segment of the poor in the Black community. In the low-

income Black community, most families are headed by men who work every day and still are not able to move their families above the poverty line. Clearly what is needed is not a work incentive plan, but a work opportunity plan with options and rewards commensurate with the aspirations of all men.

Contrary to popular belief, even in the Congress, poverty cannot be abolished by work incentives and even work opportunities alone. A family policy designed to enhance the functioning of families would not insist that mothers of young children abandon them against their will and go to work at meaningless jobs in order to insure that their children are properly fed. Family solidarity would be more highly valued than work, per se. Nearly fifteen percent of poor families in the country and nearly a third of poor families in the Black community are headed by women with young children who should not be forced to go to work. The need, therefore, is for a program of family assistance which guarantees all American families a minimum income which will support a safe and sanitary standard of living. In 1973 dollars, that requires an income for a family of four in the neighborhood of \$6500 per year.

A policy and program of guaranteed family income adequate to the family's need must be tailored to the variety of conditions which exist in various parts of the country. By the government's own standards, \$2400 a year is not enough to move a family of four out of poverty. Indeed, it is less than half enough. Another approach has been taken by the National Welfare Rights Organization. They have called for a minimum income of \$6500 a year, a position which has also been unanimously supported by the Congressional Black Caucus.

Still another approach has been taken by a group of ten Black economists who developed a program for People United to Save Humanity (PUSH) which incorporates many features of the basic requirements for family economic security. It recommends a program of tax credits for a family of four amounting to \$5000 per year in 1972 dollars. In addition, it provides for work incentives by permitting families and individuals to keep half of all earnings until they reach the level of \$10,000 in combined earnings and tax credits. There would be no mandatory work requirement. A breakdown in the level of assistance provided in this plan is shown in the following Table.

TABLE I.—AFTER TAX INCOMES UNDER THE PUSH PROPOSAL
FAMILY OF FOUR, INCOMES UP TO \$10,000

Earnings	Credit	Tax	Net income	Refund
0	\$5,000	0	\$5,000	\$5,000
\$2,000	5,000	\$1,000	6,000	4,000
\$4,000	5,000	2,000	7,000	3,000
\$6,000	5,000	3,000	8,000	2,000
\$8,000	5,000	4,000	9,000	1,000
\$10,000	5,000	5,000	10,000	0

According to a Gallup Poll conducted in 1970, a national sample of Americans estimated that the minimum income necessary to support a family of four was \$126 a week. The federal government's own Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated in 1970 that a minimum of \$136 a week was necessary for a family of four in metropolitan areas to maintain a minimum level of health and safety.

It must be clear from the above discussion that none of the current proposals before the Congress for family assistance policies are adequate to meet the real needs of the people who live outside the American dream. The question, then, becomes not so much which specific programs should be recommended, as

how to develop a general national policy which requires every major government program to be conceived, designed, budgeted and operated so as to enhance the viability of families.

Thus, full employment, a minimum wage which assures that one wage earner can support a family of four at the minimum necessary for safety, health and decency, plus a guaranteed floor under the income of all American families would reflect a national commitment to the enhancement of family life which would go a long way toward solving the basic problems low- and moderate-income families face in this society at the present time. These programs need to be supplemented by a national system of health care along the lines recommended by the Kennedy-Griffiths Bill and the Congressional Black Caucus, a system of child care centers along the lines of those vetoed by the President in 1971, a national commitment to a decent, safe and sanitary home for every American family, and as much education and technical training as individuals wish to absorb and can be useful to the maintenance and further building of the society. And to undergird this commitment, a national program of family assistance which adopts the best features of the current proposals including FAP.

However, in all these matters, the economic base is paramount. Economic justice and equity according to the needs and values of the people is a requisite for a sound national family policy. In their massive "Counter-budget," the National Urban Coalition expressed a set of national priorities for the years between 1971 and 1976 much as the Freedom Budget Panel did for the years 1967-75. The Urban Coalition placed at the top of its priority list full employment and economic growth along with reasonable price stability. It further urged a national "Guarantee that no American will go without the basic necessities: food, shelter, health care, a healthy environment, personal safety and an adequate income."

Finally, if family life is to be enhanced by national policy, local initiative must be meaningfully established. Parents, neighbors, relatives and friends must have a major share in the decision making about the functioning of all those institutions in the community and the larger society which have such an important and fateful bearing on the manner in which families function. In this way, families may regain a measure of their rightful influence on the institutions which supplement and often supplant them. Urie Bronfenbrenner in his book, *The Two Worlds of Childhood*, has reminded us that the segregation and separation of children from the totality of the human experience represented by the variety of ages, sex, family structures and community members is surely one of the more crippling aspects of the society in which we live.

There is, of course, a great deal of concern, a great deal of human kindness, and a certain degree of altruism among the American people. The problem is, these values are not sufficiently rewarded, focused or developed by the leadership, by the professions, by the mass media, by the government, and so the baser motives of man are allowed to take precedence. And those more privileged sectors of the society, those with access to certain kinds of power and influence are encouraged to use it in their own interests, in the interests of their own group or social class or race, and so the social well-being of the total society is neglected, and the well-being of those who are the least powerful, those who are very young or very old, those who are Black, or poor, or dependent must take a back seat.

Dr. James Comer, in his book *Beyond Black and White*, states the problem clearly. He says, "We live in a society that makes trust and respect difficult. Our social system produces too much uncertainty, fear and anxiety."

27
ety. . . This is due largely," he continues, "to the fact that America has a defect in its executive or leadership structure. . . In fact, the behavior of too much of our leadership group resembles neurotic patterns in individuals—fleeing from responsibility, failing to face up to reality, self-destructiveness." These words by Professor Comer were written more than two years ago and they are almost prophetic when we look at today's headlines and today's television. "The task confronting America," he continues, "is the creation of a mature, representative leadership group and the development of specific social programs that take excessive insecurity out of American life." Take excessive insecurity out of American life. It is very clear to us as we have observed the present dismantling of social programs and the reluctance to create new, better, comprehensive policies and programs that the nation is not now embarked upon that course.

President James E. Cheek of Howard University has observed that the nation needs to make a commitment to equity and parity among all major segments of its population as a matter of simple social justice. This requires a certain reordering of the national priorities. I am convinced that we have the resources and the capacity to do so. The development of a comprehensive and coordinated family policy would be a giant step in that direction.

DEINSTITUTIONALIZATION—AN UNMET CHALLENGE

(Testimony of Gunnar Dybwad)

Mr. Chairman, my name is Gunnar Dybwad; I live in Wellesley, Massachusetts and am professor of human development at the Florence Heller Graduate School of Brandeis University. I am also serving as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Special Education to the Massachusetts State Board of Education and as Vice-Chairman of the Massachusetts Advisory Council for the Planning, Construction, Operation or Utilization of Facilities for the Mentally Retarded. Before the problems of mentally retarded citizens and their families became my main professional focus and concern, I had been Executive Director of the Child Study Association of America, head of the Children's Division in the Michigan State Department of Social Welfare, and had worked many years in correctional institutions for juveniles as well as in prisons and reformatories.

I want to thank the Committee for asking me to participate in these important hearings dealing with American Families: Trends and Pressures.

The particular concern I would like to share with you today deals with the children who for various reasons live apart from their families, in large public institutions. Specifically, I want to deal with a new program emphasis known as de-institutionalization, which has been endorsed by many authorities on the national scene and in many of our states. Institutions for children have, on the whole, not been an area of great achievement in our country, as Albert Deutsch and other writers have dramatically documented. In the field of juvenile delinquency, de-institutionalization is being pursued with vigor in at least some of our states, and I would mention here in particular New York State and Massachusetts. While in the field of childhood mental illness we face many serious problems, institutionalization plays

a lesser role, indeed many states have been very remiss in developing specialized residential treatment facilities for this group.

Without doubt the most serious problem of institutionalization in our country is found in the state residential facilities for the mentally retarded, in terms of the number of children involved, in terms of the length of time individuals spend in these institutions (often enough, indeed, almost their entire lifetime), in terms of the emotional impact on families, in terms of the cost factor (approaching \$10,000 a year per child), and last but not least, in terms of its impact on the institutionalized children themselves. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I need to emphasize that although designated for the mentally retarded, these institutions have harbored to this day many other children for whom appropriate facilities were presumed to be lacking, such as the child with spinal bifida, a congenital malformation affecting the spinal cord, who may not have any impairment of intelligence, the child with autism, or the child with specific perceptual disabilities. Many of the children in these institutions are multiple handicapped, afflicted with cerebral palsy, seizure problems, blindness, deafness and a host of other disabling conditions.

I am, of course, keenly aware that within the broad scope of your Committee's present hearing the problem which I am addressing may appear to be of minor significance. But it is not minor to the families involved, and I was encouraged by the fact that the Committee desired these hearings "to identify the pressures on various kinds of families and discover ways to alleviate them."

And pressures are indeed mounting in this area. There is pressure from parents who worry where, after their death, their retarded or otherwise developmentally disabled child now living with them will be cared for in the community. Years ago the chances were slim that a severely disabled child would outlive his parents, indeed, grow into adolescence. The advent of antibiotics and other progress in medicine and public health has strikingly changed the picture. There is, on the other hand, pressure from parents who long ago were advised to place their child in an institution and now bitterly oppose official plans to move their child back home or to some community placement. And there is pressure on parents from institutions who want to close down buildings and from state administrative agencies which have enunciated a program of phasing out institutions altogether.

The extent of the conflict engendered can be seen from the fact that at this very time legislation has been submitted to California's Governor for signature, which prevents the State Administration from closing any mental health or mental retardation institution unless the Legislature specifically approves such a plan. Just day before yesterday, in Minnesota, I was handed a flyer urging parents to protest plans to abolish the state institutions for the mentally retarded, and urging them to join a new "Organization of Concerned Families" to fight de-institutionalization plans. In other states protest meetings have been held and in Michigan legal action has been initiated to prevent closing of such an institution. Significantly, the opinions of workers in the field differ just as sharply, some feeling strongly that the closing of state institutions for the mentally retarded should be programmed out like the hospitals for the mentally ill, only at a somewhat later date. Other workers consider it totally unrealistic to carry through a program without the backstopping role of the state institution. In the

organizational field, national associations have issued policy statements recommending at least a phasing down of institutions, while local groups are apt to take the opposing view.

Reference needs to be made here to a pervasive confusion regarding the term de-institutionalization. It should not be understood merely as a process of removing individuals from existing state institutions but as a process of making large state institutions unnecessary by providing in the community, other modalities for care and treatment, more humane, more effective and more responsive to the needs and rights of the individuals involved. Too many of the present State efforts towards de-institutionalization have focused only on providing a substitute abode for the person to be moved out of the institution, with often grossly insufficient attention to the many other life-needs of disabled persons. Thus parents and professional workers alike have complained that in many instances the person is merely moved from one large institution to a smaller one, is left without adequate activity, guidance or supervision, still in relative isolation from the rest of the community. There is more than ample evidence that many individuals go to institutions in the first place because of the lack of community programs and services. Waiting lists for institutions are to a considerable extent waiting lists for a reasonable array of services the community or state has failed to provide.

Therefore, if de-institutionalization is to embrace both prevention of institutionalization and return to the community of individuals now in the institution, it is contingent on the establishment of a network of community services. Here lies the crux of the problem. Two interrelated problems are intervening. The one is fiscal in nature, the other is organizational.

The fiscal point relates to the well-known sociological concept of system maintenance. An example will suffice. Even though the Governor of Massachusetts and his Secretary of Human Services have made de-institutionalization in the areas of mental health and mental retardation a top priority, essentially in pursuit of Departmental goals established as long ago as 1966, a recent report from the Massachusetts Advocacy Center highlights that the vast majority of the Department's resources continue to be allocated to the institutions, with only a small fraction going to community services. Massachusetts, along with all other states, undertook a statewide comprehensive mental retardation planning effort ten years ago under the provisions of PL 88-154. While the report itself was excellent, practically nothing happened as a consequence towards facilitation of community services, with the result that Massachusetts like many other states lacks the kind of basic services parents need for their handicapped children and for themselves.

Here is a matter to which your Committee might want to give some attention. Reorganization is in the air and has been, for quite some years, not just in the federal establishment but in state government as well. However, as one watches the succession of re-

organization moves, usually engineered by experts in management and administration, one sees forever a reshuffling and reordering of the upper and middle echelons, a game of musical chairs moving agencies and positions hither and yon, and at times removing them. Yet little if anything ever happens on the front line, in the area of direct consumer services, and this means, in our context, services to parents of handicapped children. This brings us back to the focal point of your hearing.

There are, of course, exceptions to what I consider a generally gloomy picture across the country, and I shall give a few examples.

In New York State, the Eleanor Roosevelt Developmental Services provides the six-county Capital District with imaginative approaches. Although a new institution was built for this area, the director, Dr. Hugh Lafeve, preferred not to use it as a massive residential resource. Instead he utilized a considerable number of the staff positions for service, teams organized in each of the six counties, leasing many of the residential care buildings to local organizations, public and private, for a variety of purposes including day care, respite care, etc. all on behalf of the developmentally disabled. The nature of these services is strikingly different from those in most of our state institutions. I personally know of no other instance where state owned buildings have been put to such innovative use and really made a part of community efforts. It is worthy of note that Dr. Lafeve was mainly responsible for the closing of a large institution of the Provincial government of Saskatchewan, through initiating and nurturing a system of dispersed community services.

Ohio has most recently enacted a Law (HR-761) to make possible the setting up of group homes and other related community services. The program was implemented by substantial appropriations for construction of residential facilities at the community level and for purchase of care. Eligible for these services are not just those presently in institutions (a restriction which has been set up elsewhere) but anyone who at some time might become an institutional resident. A key point of the Ohio situation is the District Case Management Service encompassing no less than 8 levels of differential care in the community, from room and board with minimum supervision all the way to room and board with skilled nursing care.

This 8-level community residence model undoubtedly was influenced by the earlier work done by the ENCOR organization in Omaha, Nebraska, serving a 5-county area, one of the first structured de-institutionalization demonstrations in the country.

In Michigan David Rosen, Past-President of the National Association of Superintendents of Public Residential Facilities for the Mentally Retarded, is developing in the Macomb/Oakland area a network of community services somewhat similar to the Eleanor Roosevelt Developmental Services. But of particular interest is a project he is just undertaking with support from HEW's Social and Rehabilitation Service. This project is a frontal attack on a problem which has led to much negativistic thinking regarding the possibility of de-institutionalization. To quote from the project description:

"It is becoming increasingly clear, that while many mentally retarded persons have been returned to the larger community, a substantial segment has been routinely passed over for such consideration. This group is variously referred to as the 'hard to manage', 'really tough ones', 'hard to place', etc. The persons comprising this category are the youngsters and adults exhibiting a wide range of behavior problems such as hyperactivity, tantrum behaviors, and those with complicating physical handicaps that compound learning difficulties such as the blind, the deaf, and the infirm.

"In a recent survey, it was estimated that of the approximately 1,000 mentally retarded persons living in State institutions from Macomb or Oakland County, at least half are considered 'hard to place'.

"If the movement of deinstitutionalizing the retarded is going to go beyond the point of mild satisfaction, a vigorous effort must be directed at seeking model placements and programs for these individuals who, while not readily appealing as traditional candidates for community living, neither require nor deserve institutional residence.

"It is the intent of the Macomb-Oakland

Residential Center to assure swift return to the community and quality support services for all the retarded citizens of Macomb and Oakland Counties. The specific intent of this proposal is to seek aid for the development of a six member team which would concentrate exclusively on satisfying identical priorities for the 'hard to place' population as are sought for the minimally handicapped."

What is most significant about this project is that it is not a small demonstration but rather is designed to return to the community of this 2-county area, in each of the 3 project years, 100 hard-to-place individuals. The success of this project will go far in pointing to a community solution for chil-

28

children for whom today the institution is thought to be the only answer; in other words, it will decrease community demands for institutional placement.

I. From the foregoing comments it can be concluded that de-institutionalization as a nationwide program constitutes a problem of considerable magnitude, involving hundreds of thousands of children and adults, and very considerable funds. Yet, present institutional costs exceed one billion dollars annually, constituting an expenditure with very poor returns, a vast investment in brick and mortar and a heavy burden on the families and on the retarded children and adults themselves. Contrary to the opinion of some of my colleagues, I believe that in the long run the results of de-institutionalization, namely care in the community, will lead to substantial savings because the time and degree of dependency on services will be substantially curtailed, and general rather than specialized agencies will be increasingly utilized. However, as in any major enterprise, the new management system, i.e., a network of community services, cannot be instituted on a broad scale without investment of some major funds. The question, of course, suggests itself whether this would be an appropriate area for federal funding. I hope your Committee can give this due consideration.

II. A multitude of federal programs have been available on behalf of developmentally disabled children and their families, both in the institution and in the community. Among them are a variety of statutory insurance and social service benefits, with an elaborate array of rules and regulations. The most recent are the rules proposed by the Social and Rehabilitation Service September 5 concerning families, children, aged, blind or disabled individuals. It is not feasible to go into the technical details here; what can be stated simply as the essence of the problem is that there is no clear federal posture toward the problem here under discussion. Programmatically, as has been indicated before, we have statements from the highest echelons of the federal government not only strongly endorsing de-institutionalization by actually setting target dates and numbers. Yet the appropriations and, equally so, the rules delineating the manner in which money may be spent, obviously give any form of support for community programs a very low priority. This is a matter which definitely calls for Congressional review and appropriate Congressional intervention in the expectation that a coherent federal posture can be developed, sympathetic to the cause of de-institutionalization.

III. Community programming for developmentally disabled children and children with any other type of severe handicap depends to a very considerable extent on the availability of special education services. This does no longer necessarily mean special classes or special schools because in many cases the utilization of special resource teachers and methods will enable a child with special needs to remain in his regular class or home-room. For some children, however, special classes are still an unquestioned necessity. The main point is that de-institutionaliza-

tion, i.e., prevention of institutionalization or return to community care of institutionalized children is largely dependent on special education services. In this area federal leadership and federal support on a project basis is urgently needed. Here again appropriations are at odds with federal programmatic pronouncements.

IV. New rehabilitation legislation recently passed by Congress is awaiting the President's signature. It is of considerable significance to the problem of de-institutionalization because it has repeated references to services to severely handicapped persons. Rehabilitation as a field has responded to the needs of the severely handicapped with hesitation, in spite of convincing demonstrations of their potential for production and partial self-support. Therefore, in this area we not only have again a discrepancy between federal program goals and the unduly limited funding, but we have on the national scene the challenge that if the federal government is interested in implementing a policy of de-institutionalization, it must be prepared to support action programs designed to gain acceptance for severely retarded persons within rehabilitation services specifically, and the American economy in general.

V. For future consideration I would like to put before this Committee a rather specific and highly technical matter which is of crucial import in the development of a system of residential facilities in the community, appropriate to the spectrum of dependency and needed care. I refer to the matter of the varying building codes in force in this country, to the life safety code and to the local zoning ordinances. Many of these codes and ordinances are based on attitudes toward severely handicapped persons which no longer represent the current state of knowledge and practice. They are predicated, one might say, on institutionalization rather

than on de-institutionalization, on segregation rather than integration. At the same time they are so intimately related to preservation of life that their sponsors are not inclined to favor changes toward greater flexibility. And yet, coming back to the focal point of this Hearing, the American family, parents should be able to arrange to have their severely handicapped son, who has lived with them into adulthood, move into a small group residence that has more the characteristics of their own home than of an emergency hospital ward. The time is ripe for a broad scale approach to this problem.

VI. There is another technical area that is of significance to the process of de-institutionalization but also relates in a very tangible way to the Committee's overall interest in the changing role of the family in the prevention and solution of children's problems. In general our attention is focused on the relative roles of the family and of government in deciding courses of action for children with special needs. In the area of institutionalization parents have had and still are granted, or at least will claim, considerable discretion in deciding on their children's care. Still today they can bring their child to a state institution which in effect is closed and arrange for the child to be admitted as a "voluntary" resident. A good number of parents have been vociferous in claiming their right to decide whether or not their child was to be released from the institution or not. But times have changed. The President's Committee on Mental Retardation has published and distributed the Declaration on the Rights of Mentally Retarded Persons, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly. Eighteen year olds can vote, including, as a matter of recorded fact, 18 year old developmentally disabled individuals in state institutions. States have adopted statutes giving children down to the age of 12 (in Michigan) the right to admit themselves without parental consent to a residential drug treatment facility. Is it not time for us to consider under what circumstances a young man or young woman, 16 years of age, should be able to renege the "voluntaryness" of his admission, through his parents to a state institution for the mentally retarded?

On the basis of my own years of experience in the correctional field I can state that imprisonment in our institutions for the mentally retarded is often vastly more uncomfortable, vastly more restrictive, vastly more interfering with personal integrity than in institutions for juvenile delinquents. The rights of the institutionalized child would appear to call ever more urgently for reappraisal.

VII. As I read over the general introductory statement to these Hearings with the long catalogue of family problems, I could not help but wonder how parents could be enabled to keep up with all the flow of information essential for their pursuit of the happiness of their child and their own. Obviously one of the great problems of the federal government is to be on speaking terms with the concerned citizen, and that is why I decided I should bring to your Committee's attention a rather unique communication device, initiated by two concerned mothers in Seattle, Washington, who have organized themselves as "Trouble Shooters, Inc.", affiliated themselves with a community center, and started to publish INSIDE SCOOP. Time does not permit me to read from this remarkable publication, so I have appended two sample pages because what concerns me very deeply in this whole process of de-institutionalization is to provide for parents clear information in helpful form on the options available to them and their children.

[From Inside Scoop 1X, a regular monthly publication of Troubleshooters Inc., a project of Northwest Center]

WHAT'S NEW WITH THE TROUBLESHOOTERS?

Every day new problems arise that seem to have no solutions. We try to develop a system for these unique or complex problems of mental retardation. Why systems? Because we have found if one person has an insoluble problem, you can be sure other people have the same problem. Therefore, we develop systems that can be used all over the state of Washington.

DEAR KATIE: I am a caseworker and I have a client who is 83 and has a severely retarded daughter who is 36 years old. Mother is not able to care for herself or her daughter now and I was wondering how to get the daughter in Fircrest. Both mother and daughter really require nursing home services.

CARING CASEWORKER.

DEAR CARING: We love your concern. Why worry about Fircrest? Why not use our latest system (developed while I was talking to you), the Mother-Daughter-Serve-Alike System? Both ladies are on public assistance. Both are in need of nursing homes. How nice that they could be together and receiving the care that they both need. New friends will no doubt make life a lot more pleasant for both mother and daughter and how much easier for the daughter when she is left

alone. Please let us know if this system works for you. READERS: Call AT 4-1037 if you know of any family situations of this type in nursing homes, ICF's etc. Husbands and wives, too:

HOPEFUL KATIE.

DEAR JANET AND KATIE: Another mother suggested that I call you. I am a mother of a 22 year old retarded son. I'm on public assistance (disability) since I broke my leg, then a knee, then had two heart attacks. I have 2 daughters 14 and 16. Their father deserted them all my son needs help. He was kicked out of one school because they said he was a grump. He didn't like the sheltered

workshop because the kids teased him. He was at Rainier for one year, coming home in April. Since then I have called 35 places for help but no one can help me. I only want him to be happy and busy. My friend said you could help us.

HELPLESS MOTHER.

DEAR MOTHER: First, don't make another telephone call. Katie once got herself into that trap when Patrick was about 4 and ended up with nothing. Second, sit down with your son and write down what you really want for yourselves. In the meantime we will relate your problem to a Rainier Field Worker and see if he can pull it all together. Next Chapter: Mr. Henry Frank, arranged for your son to apply at a Sheltered Workshop. The sheltered workshop would love to serve your son, but needs more support than the usual \$5.00 per day. Your local County Mental Retardation Board is very interested in funding a program that would offer intensive, individualized skill training to someone like your son. Finally, no one wants to be a 'grump'. How long has it been since he had a complete physical examination? Maybe he needs a vitamin B shot, iron or some calcium or a tranquilizer. Next Chapter: A doctor in your local area is interested and you have an appointment.

What is the moral of this story? What is the system that Troubleshooters developed? Try to stick with one person or agency and keep demanding the service you need. We parents let them off the hook if we say "Thank you, anyway". Another time, another parent, another son, try asking the agency, the volunteer organization, the workshop, etc., to put their refusals in writing or take a tape recorder and ask the intake person to speak right into the microphone! No mother needs to go to 35 places to get help from one, or two.

Troubleshooters JANET and KATIE.

This edition of the Inside Scoop is featuring the educational needs of all handicapped children in the Seattle School District and those in contracting districts.

DEAR JANET: My daughter is 19. She has worked in a sheltered workshop this summer, but now she can't get to it. She doesn't really have any work skills. Could she get some vocational training? I think she could be a good worker.

WORKING MOTHER.

DEAR WORKING: We, too, have great respect for work. Your school is obligated to offer an educational program to your daughter until she is 21 or until she has work skills. Why not talk to your principal and ask what their plans are for your daughter. Then do one more thing. Talk to Renee Nowak, president of the Pacific School P.T.A. and get together with other concerned parents to develop a truly meaningful vocational education post graduate program (18-21) for your daughters and sons.

WORKING JANET.

DEAR KATIE AND JANET: My daughter is 13. She is severely handicapped with cerebral palsy. No one knows if she is mentally retarded or not. Also, doctors and teachers have argued about how best to teach her. The doctors say her behavior is neurologically originated. The agency teachers feel she is emotionally upset and that I aggravate her condition. I'm confused and hope she will get a new chance in Seattle Public Schools.

CONFUSED MOTHER.

DEAR MOTHER: Oh, how we do understand! But good news is here for you. In our Seattle Public School District there will be a complete evaluation center. Children such as your daughter with unique learning problems will be able to go to this center for complete study and personalized evaluations where finally a program of education will be developed just for your daughter. Call Mr. Bill Attebury

587-5025 for placement of your daughter into this special testing program.

KATIE AND JANET.

DEAR KATIE: My son was kept in terrible programs for the deaf and then kicked out of public school in 1969. He proved not to be deaf at all! He has been taught perfectly at a private school since 1970. Now the public schools want me to bring him back. I hate and fear the public school. I should sue them not give them back my child. What do you say?

FRIGHTENED MOTHER.

DEAR MOTHER: Again, I understand. Remember, there has been a complete change in the special educational division of Seattle Public Schools. Also, in the last years, Seattle Public Schools has paid for your child in his private non-profit school. Now, special educators want to make up to you and your son, but most importantly, they want to serve other children who have mysterious learning problems. I can't advise you more than to say my son also suffered as your son, only my son never received any education from the Seattle Public Schools. Now new people and new techniques can and will offer programs to all. Your son, as mine, has been one of the martyrs to bring about this great social change. But they have helped thousands of children everywhere. Now your son can help develop programs in the public schools where all can benefit.

UNDERSTANDING KATIE.

DEAR JANET: My child has learning and language disorders. He has always been in school but not always in his own district. He is now in junior high. Under HB 90 can I force my school district to provide him with a program at his local school instead of bussing him to Seattle?

LLD MOTHER.

DEAR MOTHER: Your child is being contracted for in Seattle Public Schools. Your school district has met its obligations by contracting with a neighborhood school district (Seattle). Why not join with other parents of similar need and help develop an LLD Program at the secondary level in your district? Be grateful that your child has been in school now start working for a better program.

JANET.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org