



The Washington **cofo memo**

A Publication of the Coalition of Family Organizations

*American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy
American Home Economics Association
Family Service Association of America
National Council on Family Relations*

Volume III, No. 2

Winter/Spring 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The President and the Federal Budget	2
<i>Consulting</i> Family Issues and Public Policy, Orrin G. Hatch	4
The White House Conference on Families—Some Observations	6
The White House Conference for Children, Youth, and Parents	6
New Day Care Legislation: HR-1894.....	6
Home Health Care Proposals in the 97th Congress: S-2809 and S-234	7
Human Life Amendment.....	8
The Family Protection Act	8
The Reagan Administration Family Policy Advisory Board.....	9
Appointments of Note	9
Key Congressional Committees	10
Committees Overseeing Legislation of Concern to Family Advocates.....	11
Reagan and the Conservative Coalition.....	11
COFO and the Money Crunch	11
How Fare Black America's Children?	12

AAMFT and NCFR
2033 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/452-1930

FSAA
1819 H Street, N.W., Suite 510
Washington, D.C. 20006
202/785-2438

AHEA
2010 Mass. Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/862-8330

Editors' Note: Since the last COFO Memo, the federal government has undergone cataclysmic changes. Swept to victory by a mandate from the people, Ronald Reagan became the 40th President, and a conservative Republican Senate—the first in more than a quarter of a century—took their places. Though the House remains in Democratic control, many analysts assess the power of the conservative coalition there to be considerable also.

Evidence of the "New Right" is apparent. Although President Reagan has asked his colleagues to defer the "Moral Majority" agenda in favor of economic issues as a first and almost all-consuming priority, many family issues are included in economic decisions. Examples are federally funded abortions; Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and SSI subsidies to target groups; welfare payments, including food stamps; tax cuts; and reduction in regulations, including a variety of human safety-related issues.

The COFO Memo editors are pleased to bring you this expanded special edition highlighting the changes in the federal administration and the Congress, with an analysis of implications for family programs. Of special note is the guest editorial by Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), chairman of the powerful Committee on Labor and Human Resources, and the analysis of family programs under President Reagan's plan for economic recovery.

THE PRESIDENT AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Reagan's FY'82 budget proposal, basically engineered by Director of the Office of Management and Budget David Stockman, was sent to the Congress on March 10 with a reminder of the election-evidenced "mandate for change" and a declaration that only "politics as usual" stands in the way of reduced inflation and a return to economic prosperity. In his message to the Congress and to the American people on February 18th, the President stated the basic budget premises of a social safety net and protection of the most needy, while encouraging individuals and families to be as independent as possible without federal assistance.

The seven programs untouched which compose the social safety net are: basic Social Security retirement benefits, Medicare, veterans' benefits, Headstart, Supplemental Security Income for the blind, aged, and disabled; school lunches and breakfasts for low-income children; and nutrition programs for the elderly.

The budget proposal is based on a triad approach: reduction of individual taxes by 30 percent over a three-year period to encourage saving and investment (the essence of supply-side economics), incentives for business and industry to increase productivity, and dramatic cuts in federal spending. Eighty-three separate programs and projects are included in the spending cuts, running the gamut from yacht owners' assumption of coastal waterways use costs and Export-Import Bank cuts to reduction in school lunch and food stamp programs. Of particular pertinence for family program specialists, counselors,

attorneys, therapists, educators, and researchers is the general conclusion that disproportionately the proposed cuts are in the health, education, training, employment, social services, and income security domain, representing an aggregate 25 percent reduction in current federal spending levels. Some of these reductions will be achieved by a block-grant approach to certain education and social service programs. According to budget-makers, 20 percent in federal overhead costs will be saved by granting states the prerogative to determine specific allocations according to local need, with only broad limits imposed by the federal government. Two levels of education block grants are under consideration: one to states and one to school districts.

The education block-grant proposal will lump together Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, with provisions for disadvantaged children; PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act; emergency school aid; and adult education. To all intents and purposes, both ESEA and PL 94-142 will be repealed. The block-grant approach to FY'82 will save another 20 percent added to the 25 percent reduction proposed by specific cuts for FY'81.

Secretary of Health and Human Services Schweiker has already testified in his confirmation hearings in favor of converting the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program to block grants to states.

Specifically, the following family-related modifications are proposed:

- A workfare proposal which requires most welfare recipients, except mothers with children under 2 and mothers with children 2-6 with no day care, to work.
- Cuts in housing assistance for the poor.
- Phasing out of student benefits under Social Security, tougher eligibility requirements for disability insurance, and elimination of the burial payment under Social Security when there are no survivors. It is estimated that 3 million households will lose all or part of their benefits under this budget section.
- Reduction by more than 50 percent of school lunch, food stamp, summer feeding, and food supplements for infants and pregnant women programs.
- Imposition of a cap on Medicaid.
- Elimination of the Legal Services Corporation; decrease of legal services for the poor.
- Savings of a total of 22.3 billion in health, education, employment, and social services by deletion of categorical funding and by specific cuts such as:
 - a) a loss of 300,000 public service jobs under CETA, including programs for displaced homemakers (fifty percent of the CETA programs end March 31);
 - b) a 20-25 percent cut in vocational education, includ-

ing family life education under consumer-homemaking education provisions;

c) a 25 percent reduction in women's educational equity program; and

d) more stringent eligibility requirements for student loans.

- Substantial reductions in regulatory services, including the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

- Cuts in the Small Business Administration, including special programs to encourage minority and women business owners. In testimony before a congressional committee, OMB Director Stockman stated that the government cares more about businesses that can compete in the open market than businesses continually needing government assistance (Chrysler exempted, presumably). Cuts in SBA are therefore justified, according to the OMB director.

Immediately after the President's presentation of the budget proposals, an ABC News poll showed overwhelming support from Americans for the program of reformation. Two to one, the citizens polled felt cuts in spending and reduced income taxes will help end inflation rapidly and sharply and therefore personal financial circumstances will improve within the year. Despite the poll results, many dislike the approach and the unpleasantness of the remedy, but think it will work. Only blacks consistently oppose both "the medicine and the doctors." The highest percentage of disapproval concerned CETA cutbacks. Most citizens polled want more, not less, spent on CETA programs.

In a Gallup Poll the third week in March, however, a higher percentage of disapproval (24%) was expressed at Reagan's record than for any recent president at the end of 60 days in office. White House sources attributed the low rating to the toughness of his economic program.

Almost every program cut proposed must have congressional approval, and most Congressmen are estimating that President Reagan will get 90 percent of what he wants. Individuals oppose specific proposals, but when all is said and done, committees are reporting out approval of packages sometimes more stringent in toto than the President proposed. For example, one Congressman said the education and social services component would set the country back 30 years; but when the committee voted to approve the package, the vote was 20-0.

Both Senate and House committees are flinching at the stark education and social services proposals. The Senate Budget Committee has voted to restore 1.2 billion of the 3.1 total Reagan proposed slashing in the elementary and secondary education realm. The House Committee on

Education and Labor, under Chairman Carl Perkins' leadership (D-Ky.), has expressed doubt that budget committees have the authority to cut programs within the jurisdiction of various authorizing committees. The Senate Special Committee on Aging, in a bipartisan attack on proposed reduction of aid to the elderly, argued that women 62-65 will come "crashing through the safety net for the truly needy."

Reductions in subsidies and programs for the poor are receiving the most attention. The National Governors Association called the cuts "not acceptable" and specifically opposed the cap on the federal share of Medicaid and the proposal to increase the state's responsibility for welfare. William Goodling, ranking Republican (Pa.) on the House Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education subcommittee, which oversees child nutrition programs, called the budget reductions of 40 to 50 percent devastating. The House Education and Labor subcommittee called the child feeding program cuts "idiotic, stupid, if not criminal, unconscionable, and a blatant discrimination against the poor." Many trade associations opposed proposals pertinent to their domains, including lack of increases in milk price supports and deletion of the Legal Services Corporation.

The opposition can be summarized as disagreement with Reagan's basic premise that the role of the federal government is to provide for the common defense and *promote* (not provide) for the general welfare. The latter function belongs to the states, and his proposals will return tax dollars to the state to enable fulfillment of that role.

Reagan has said that the taxing power of the federal government must not be used to regulate the economy or bring about social change—a dramatic shift in thinking from federal policy of the last several decades. Said Reagan, "Can we continue on our present course without coming to the day of reckoning?" Apparently the day of reckoning is here; Reagan has threatened "to slaughter more congressional sacred cows than any other president in modern times." (*The Washington Post*, 2/19/81)

Critics of the proposals appraise them as an attempt to redistribute income in the nation, with the money going from poor to rich, while the middle class comes out about status quo. One education leader called the plan "Robin Hood in reverse."

The University of Chicago's Center for the Study of Welfare Policy thinks the President's proposed welfare and food stamp cuts will hit the working poor much harder than those who rely on welfare entirely and will therefore discourage welfare clients from working. These conclusions were based on calculations from 10 states.

The plan has been described by the President as a "part of

a longer-term program designed to stop inflation, reward enterprise and initiative and put America back on the road to prosperity." An ancillary goal is related to the campaign promise to "get government off the backs of the people."

The *San Francisco Chronicle* (3/13/81) said the social safety net concept has merit—but in reality the net has gaping holes in it. Said Richard Cohen (*The Washington Post*, 3/15/81): "The voters wanted a change, not a revolution. Did you vote for this? . . . To reduce food stamps, make it rougher on poor people . . . block grant to the states so that they could do with federal (not state money) money pretty much what they want? You knew with Reagan that there would be less government, but not, I think, less heart."

On the other hand, some Congressmen think the cuts are not steep enough, citing the Congressional Budget Office's estimate (in a report which the President labeled "phony figures") that the administration has understated the next fiscal year's spending level by \$25 billion. Thus their recommendations exceed even the President's proposed cuts.

GUEST EDITORIAL:

FAMILY ISSUES AND PUBLIC POLICY

by Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah)

*Chairman, Committee on Labor and Human Resources
United States Senate*

It is a pleasure to respond to COFO's invitation to discuss some of the issues and concerns related to family life that we are facing as a nation. Families are the primary source of national strength, and family relationships are the building blocks for all other social relationships and social activities. One of the family's primary functions is providing for, socializing, and taking responsibility for the development of our children. Another vital role families perform is found in the marriage relationship where couples seek and find love, companionship and security. These family ties extend to siblings, grandparents, and a variety of extended networks. Family attachments affect us from birth throughout our lives.

These are basic truisms, but in our times of stress and rapid change they can not be repeated too often. Social science has been reaffirming these ideas in this century. The importance of mothers was established initially from a psychoanalytic perspective, but I believe that importance is still accepted. Fathers were discovered as late as the 1970's; and, though they are late-comers to the social science arena, they have been found to contribute in significant ways to their children's development. We have long studied marriage and relationships between spouses, and I understand that we are now on the verge of

discovering siblings. Though the technical issues become increasingly complicated as our understanding expands, the fundamental importance of the family and the desirability of marriage and of rearing children in a family context remains firm.

The organizations which form COFO are playing a vital role in helping us understand family functioning, in preparing our young people for family life, and in helping provide necessary services to troubled families and individuals. Your sponsoring organizations represent a proud tradition of professional commitment and are valued resources to the nation. I am particularly pleased to see you joining forces to promote the common concern about families. This strength will be even more important in the coming months and years.

As we have moved forward on a wave of unprecedented scientific advances, we have let our technical abilities move ahead more rapidly than our moral development. During the industrial and scientific revolutions we have frequently been focusing only on the question, "Can we do this?" Now we must ask not just "Can we . . . ?" but "Should we . . . ?" Many of our country's greatest problems—the energy crisis, for example—are forcing us to look at both the technical question, "Can we use coal instead of oil?" and at the issue of values, "Should we have such energy consumptive life-styles?" Nowhere are moral questions and value judgments more urgently needed than in the area of social concerns revolving around the family. Though there are some topics where reasonable people will differ greatly in their evaluations and recommendations, I believe there is an even broader domain where consensus and agreement can be reached. We must take the time to ask the right questions and carefully consider the potential consequences of the alternatives.

Let me suggest some of the questions we might ask when evaluating our own personal lives, and examining effects of public policy:

- 1) Will it draw families closer together?
- 2) Will it allow and encourage parents to take more care and to assume more responsibility for their children's well being?
- 3) Does it foster lasting relationships between husband and wife?
- 4) Is it sensitive to the different sources of stress and the different resources available at various times in the different stages of family life?

Here let me emphasize that the approach I am suggesting with these questions is really bipartisan in nature. The Republican Platform called for support of traditional family values; the Democratic President called a White House Conference on Families. We must recognize that when we talk of families, we speak of things close to

everyone's heart. We must realize that there are different sets of values and be sensitive to the pluralistic nature of our society. But let me repeat my belief that there are so many common-sense issues we can address and find areas of agreement. For example, one of the recommendations of the White House Conference on Families centered on the value of home health care for the elderly. I have introduced legislation in this Congress which will move us in the direction of allowing older individuals to remain in their own homes, rather than forcing them to move into institutions to receive care. We also need to make it easier for children to take care of their aging parents in their home, when they desire. Though there may be differences on details, I have been very pleased at the broad-based support these ideas have received.

Because family issues are so important to me and to my colleagues, in my capacity as chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee in the Senate I have initiated some committee reorganization so family concerns can be addressed more directly. This year, for the first time in the history of Congress, we have a subcommittee with the word *family* in its title. The new Aging, Family and Human Services subcommittee will be chaired by my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Sen. Jeremiah Denton. This subcommittee will deal with a wide range of issues and age groups. With both a life span and a family perspective, we feel we will be able to deal more realistically and more sensitively with these important areas of concern. The word *family* in this one subcommittee title is symbolic also of the family-centered orientation I hope to bring to all the relevant proposals coming before the other subcommittees, from Education to Alcoholism and Drug Abuse. I have also asked Dr. J. Craig Peery, who is a National Council on Family Relations (NCFR) member and the immediate past-president of the Utah Council on Family Relations, to work as a special assistant for child and family issues. Dr. Peery will be on leave from the department of child development and family relationships at Brigham Young University, and we are looking forward to his contribution.

Now that I have brought you up to date on some of the perspectives and approaches we are developing in the Senate, let me ask: Have you given thought to the role you will be playing in the development of public policy during the next few years? My question is prompted by the dramatic and sweeping proposals for governmental reform which have recently been proposed by President Reagan. Ronald Reagan ran on a promise to get the burdens of excess federal government off the backs of the American people. I campaigned for him across the country because I very firmly believe that the paternalistic model we have adopted for the federal government in recent years is obsolete and is ready to crumble under the weight of its

own inertia. It is increasingly obvious that neither the 535 elected officials in Congress nor the President can regulate the affairs or the lives of all 227 million people in America. It is time for the federal government to begin to move in the direction of returning both the financial control of, and the responsibility for, government programs back to the states and local communities.

President Reagan has proposed putting most of the authorizing legislation directly affecting families into large block grants—lumping funds for programs together—and giving the amount currently being spent on those programs, less 20 percent, directly to the states. This would almost completely bypass the federal bureaucracy, and let the states administer the programs as they see fit. I have long believed that we must move in this direction. It will mean more power to the states, to the localities, and to the people. It will mean that state governors and legislatures, not federal bureaucrats, will decide how best to serve the interests of their own people. It will mean an end to the moratorium in "ego" development in state and local government which the paternalistic-authoritarian federal approach has prolonged. But it will also mean that state and local governments will be developing new policies and will have great need for expert counsel when it comes to family issues. Here I am not just speaking of values or moral opinions, for each individual has these, but there will be an increasing need for experts who have the facts. Facts based on research (who is more conservative than journal editors, $p < .05$), facts based on professional experience, facts based on study—these will all be increasingly needed as input for the decision-making processes.

As we move into this new era of what I hope will be decreased federal regulation and increased local control, let me encourage each of you to consider how (if at all) you would like to become involved in the public policy decision-making process. As states move to develop policies which will be better suited to their needs, they will need help. You have so much to offer, and the source of real decision-making power will be moving closer to you. State legislatures, city councils, and local school boards could all benefit from your contribution through direct involvement in public procedures (even elections) or via consultation. Even as we are waiting for these federal changes to occur, we can begin to develop ideas and move ahead. Let me remind you what Edmund Burke said in 1795, and it is the biggest weakness of democracy still today: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men (and women) to do nothing." (Parenthetical addition is mine.)

I hope we will all work together. At all levels—the federal, the state and the local community—increasing awareness of the importance of families should serve to make our public policy better, more sensible, and more effective. We would be interested to know of your ideas and successes.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FAMILIES—SOME OBSERVATIONS

The White House Conference on Families will go out of business on March 31. But interest in the conference and its work continues. Requests from around the country for the conference report have exhausted the supply of 30,000 that were printed. Newspaper coverage on conference follow-up and family-related issues has produced approximately 20 to 30 articles a month.

Topics which emerged as the more important issues from each of the conference sites continue to dominate policy thinking around the country. Family impact studies are under way or in the planning stages in several states; changes in personnel policy have been widely discussed; and a family-sensitized workplace is the topic of many meetings and programs in corporations and in small businesses. The marriage tax, the family rental tax, the need for federal tax incentives for better home health care programs and better dependent care for families are now being discussed and analyzed in the Congress and the Executive Branch.

The membership of the Coalition for the White House Conference on Families has decided to continue the organization for another year under the new title "Coalition for Families." And COFO, which was formed during the White House Conference era, remains strong and committed to joint endeavors, including the publication of this Memo.

The contents of this issue of the COFO Memo indicate some of the many areas of change and interest that are under way in Washington. The Memo will continue to keep its readers up to date in 1981 on the many emerging matters of interest to families and the people who work with them.

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND PARENTS

On February 4, 1981, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) issued a press release announcing the appointment of Richard M. Eyre of Salt Lake City as the national director of the White House Conference for Children, Youth and Families. The conference has subsequently been renamed "The White House Conference for Children, Youth and Parents." According to the news release, Eyre will work directly with Health and Human Services Secretary Richard Schweiker in conducting local, state, and national citizens' conferences on children and families. The news release stated that "the Conference and its report will be designed to focus national attention on the importance of child- and family-related concerns."

Eyre was quoted in the *Deseret News* of February 4-5, 1981, as saying the report from the White House Conference on Children and Youth would be used to "provide guidelines for the Reagan Administration's involvement in family-related areas."

NEW DAY CARE LEGISLATION: HR-1894

Congressman Barber Conable (R-N.Y.), ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, has introduced HR-1894 which is designed to help make child care more affordable for families. The legislation is especially directed at those families with a limited annual income. HR-1894 would expand the existing income tax credit for work-related dependent care expenses and permit nonprofit organizations providing work-related dependent care to qualify for tax-exempt status.

The use of the tax credit mechanism to benefit families (as opposed to legislation which would fund day care centers) is in keeping with the philosophy of the Reagan Administration.

Families with adjusted gross income of \$10,000 or less would be eligible for a 50 percent credit. The credit percentage would be reduced in relation to the amount of family income above \$10,000 up to the \$40,000 income level, where the credit would stabilize at 20 percent.

The present law, which provides a 20 percent credit for day care expenses regardless of income, "does not make enough of a difference in many families budgets to enable them to explore any alternative to dependent care but the very cheapest, regardless of quality," according to Congressman Conable. It is the Congressman's hope that this "increased ability of parents to pay for dependent care will stimulate the growing dependent care market to provide still more alternatives and services than it does today." (*Cong. Record* 2/18/81 p. E518)

The legislation is designed with a *refundable* tax credit, which means that families would receive the full dependent care credit to which they might be entitled even though it exceeds their tax liability, or if they have no tax liability. This is not the case under present law. The credit would be based on the first \$2,400 of annual expenses for the care of one dependent, or the first \$4,800 for two or more dependents.

Another new and interesting development is the inclusion in the bill of a dependent care credit for dependents over 14 years of age whether cared for in the home or out of the home. (Present law allows for care for dependents under age 14 only.) Congressman Conable explained that this "change is designed to respond to the growing interest in encouraging families to keep their elderly and handi-

capped dependents living at home rather than in institutions."

Tax Exempt Status for Day Care Centers in HR-1894

The new legislation would make it easier for nonprofit day care centers to qualify for tax exempt status. In communities where self-help organizing is under way to provide before and after school supervision for children of working parents, or where other innovative models are being attempted, the 501(c)(3) status from the IRS could be more easily obtained. Without the 501(c)(3) status it is difficult for these fledgling efforts to solicit the charitable contributions they often need to meet start-up and operational costs in their communities. Under the present system dependent care programs have to provide extensive and cumbersome data to the IRS to qualify for the 501(c)(3) status.

Finally the bill contains provisions to prevent the IRS from attempting to charge employees for the "free" day care services provided in their place of employment. The bill provides that any such employer-provided dependent care, including imputed amounts as well as actual payments by the employee, will be eligible for the dependent care credit. In most cases this would "neutralize the impact of being held liable for taxes on employer-provided dependent care services."

Hearings are to be scheduled by the Ways and Means Committee in the near future.

HOME HEALTH CARE PROPOSALS IN THE 97TH CONGRESS: S-2809 and S-234

As part of the growing national concern about the cost and availability of good health care, one issue has become very visible: the need for a community-based, noninstitutional long-term care system for the elderly and the handicapped. This problem received major attention at all three White House Conferences on Families. Two proposals are likely to receive serious attention in the 97th Congress.

Presently, Medicaid and Medicare are the major funding sources for long-term care services for the elderly. These services are normally delivered in *institutional* settings. Elderly persons are often institutionalized because appropriate noninstitutional services are not available or are not covered by Medicare or Medicaid, except in very limited circumstances. Of the federal support programs available, Medicare covers about 3 percent of the total U.S. budget expended on nursing homes, and Medicaid covers about 50 percent. Under these major programs, families who would prefer not to place elderly members in a nursing home are left without an effective support system. Title

XX, which offers limited funding for home health care, is available to low-income persons only; it has not met the need of millions of other American families.

With an increasingly large aging population expected in the year 2000 and beyond, and with many more of these persons living longer, there are increasing pressures for alternatives outside of institutions. Therefore, the congressional committees having jurisdiction over health care programs are looking for optional ways to address this need.

In 1980 Sen. Robert Packwood (R-Ore.) introduced S-2809, calling for a new title (XXI) to the Social Security Act, which would provide comprehensive community-based noninstitutional long-term care services. Such services presently provided under Medicare, Medicaid and Title XX would all be combined under Title XXI.

This new provision would also encompass homemaker-home health aide services, adult day services, respite services, and limited tax credit for families caring for dependent elderly relatives. A preadmission screening assessment team (PAT) would ensure that persons referred for services under Title XXI received only those services necessary to assist them in regaining their maximum level of normal functioning. PAT would be designated through state agencies as determined by the governor in each state.

Under Title XXI each recipient would be eligible for a specified number of free visits. After the free visits were exhausted, a copayment plan would go into effect based on a percentage of annual income.

A new version of the above legislation (S-2809) will be introduced in the current session of Congress by Senator Packwood. Initially, it will be designed as a 6- to 8-year demonstration project to be tested out in 8 to 10 states using a variety of designs. The bill will be referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

Meanwhile, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) has introduced S-234, a home health care bill. This legislation has been referred to the Labor and Human Resources Committee, chaired by Senator Hatch. Hearings were held on Wednesday, March 4, by the full committee. S-234 is the "Community Home Health Services Act" of 1981. According to a press release from the Senator's office, this legislation was introduced to address the gap left by Medicaid, which paid \$7.6 billion last year for nursing home costs but only \$179 million for home health care. This legislation directs the secretary of Health and Human Services to make grants to public and nonprofit entities, as well as loans to proprietary home health care associations, to meet the initial costs of establishing and operating these services. Priority will be given to establishing home health care

services in areas of the country where they do not presently exist—which is especially important in rural and urban areas with inadequate public and ambulance transportation.

HUMAN LIFE AMENDMENT

Three constitutional amendments which guarantee the right to life to the unborn have been introduced in the 97th Congress (HJR-50, Hyde [R-Ill.]; SJR-17, Zorinsky [D-Nebr.]; SJR-19, Helms [R-NC]). Hyde's proposal states "with respect to the right of life guarantees in this Constitution, every human being, subject to the jurisdiction of the U.S. or of any state shall be deemed, from the moment of fertilization, to be a person and entitled to the right of life. Congress and the several states shall have concurrent power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." Zorinsky and Helms added only variations in language, not concept.

There are pending bills, too. The intent of each is the same—to make abortion a criminal offense. The process differs: two-thirds vote of both houses is required to send a constitutional amendment to the states for ratification; a bill requires only majority vote of each house. A bill would circumvent the Supreme Court decision of eight years ago which defines persons as those who have been born. These bills and amendments define persons to include fetuses, and thereby extend the right to life to the fetus. The issue far transcends the more narrowly limited controversy of the appropriateness of federal payment for abortion. In addition to banning abortion, the bills now include certain methods of contraception (e.g., birth control pills and intrauterine devices), according to the American Life lobby.

In a news conference on March 6, President Reagan suggested that he supports legislation regarding the illegality of abortion. Said Reagan, "There really isn't any need for an amendment because once you have determined this [the unborn fetus is a human life], the Constitution already protects the right to human life." An aide to Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) subsequently said the President's comments would give the bill priority, thereby answering the suggestions of some Republicans that Congress put off social issues until it has completed work on Reagan's economic program.

The measures have opposition on both philosophical and pragmatic grounds. The long-debated concerns regarding definition of human life, and the right of parents to abort seriously defective fetuses, have been joined by voices saying such legislation is impossible to enforce and the expressed view of some in the business community who see the legislation as just more regulation.

Meanwhile the Vatican has recently made a public statement opposing diagnostic techniques, such as amniocentesis, ultrasound scanning, and chromosome analysis, declaring that these procedures are employed to give parents data regarding the condition of the fetus, in consideration of abortion. According to the Vatican, even the seriously defective fetus has a right to life in order to enter the Kingdom of God.

THE FAMILY PROTECTION ACT

This legislation was first introduced in the 96th Congress as S-1808 and HR-6028. Its sponsors were Sen. Paul Laxalt (R-Nev.) and Steven Symms (R-Idaho). The Family Protection Act is a diverse bill which addresses and challenges a variety of social policy assumptions that have prevailed in Washington for the past 20 years.

As is true of many other positions now emerging in Washington with the new Reagan Administration, this legislation focuses on ways to decrease federal influence while enhancing state and local power. However, most areas of interest in this legislation relate to social rather than economic policy. Discussed in the legislation are: prayers in school, the public school system (its textbook, teacher requirements and programs), child abuse, legal services, homosexuality, women's rights, minority rights, etc. There are also provisions in the Family Protection Act which would provide tax credits to families who care for an elderly relative or a disabled family member. In the latter examples, federal tax dollars would be used as incentives for families to take care of their own members.

Proponents of the Family Protection Act have engaged in widespread promotion of its provisions. It was discussed at all three White House Conference on Families sites and widely promoted during a March for Jesus in Washington last fall, which aimed at carrying the message of support to Capitol Hill.

Because its provisions were quite diverse in nature, the legislation had been referred to several committees on both sides of the Hill in the 96th Congress. To date, in the 97th Congress it has been reintroduced only in the House by Congressman George Hanson (R-Idaho) as HR-311. The House bill is largely the same as the legislation introduced in the 97th Congress and has been referred to the following House committees: Agriculture, Armed Services, Education and Labor, Judiciary, and Ways and Means.

It is expected that a bill will also be reintroduced in the Senate. However, since Sen. Paul Laxalt is now one of President Reagan's closest and most visible advisers, it is not expected that he will reintroduce the controversial legislation. Copies of HR-311 can be ordered from the

House Documents Room, Room H-226, The Capitol, Washington, DC 20510. Be sure to enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope.

THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION FAMILY POLICY ADVISORY BOARD

Prior to the November election, the Reagan campaign staff announced the formation of a Family Policy Advisory Board "to lay the groundwork for a major Reagan Administration effort to promote a national rededication to traditional American family values."

According to an October 1, 1980, press release of the Reagan-Bush Campaign Committee, among the 24-member advisory committee are: Jo Ann Gasper, Onalee McGraw, Mildred Jefferson, Charles Rice, Lottie Beth Hobbs, Barbara Wilke, and Congressman Henry Hyde. Chairing the Board is Connaught (Connie) Marshner, who is the Washington director of the Pro-Family Coalition and director of the Family Policy Division of the Free Congress Foundation. Recently the board has met with Secretary of Health and Human Services Richard Schweiker and with President Reagan at the White House.

Some of the recommendations made by the board in a November 12th report are as follows:

- Appointment of a special White House adviser to the President on family issues.
- Continuation of the practice started by the Carter Administration of maintaining a special liaison office in the White House to work with religious groups.
- Support for the Human Life Amendment.
- Support for legislation in the Congress which would establish jurisdictional limitation on the federal courts with regard to prayer in schools.
- Support for tuition tax credits.
- Steps be taken to prevent IRS "harassment of non-public schools."
- Reduction of the federal role in education and the return of more authority over education decisions to parents and to local school boards.
- Support for the Family Protection Act.
- Support for measures that would produce actuarial soundness in the Social Security system.
- Opposition to the drafting of women into military service.
- Leadership for the White House Conference for Children, Youth, and Parents which would be a positive force for strengthening America's families and traditional values and concerns.
- Elimination of the Office for Families in the Department of Health and Human Services.
- Use of citizen advisers on boards to operate at the state and national level.

The role which will be played by the Family Policy Advisory Committee in the months ahead is unclear at this writing.

APPOINTMENTS OF NOTE

Moving with slow deliberation Secretary of Education Terrel Bell has named Vincent Reed, former superintendent of schools in the District of Columbia, as one of the few blacks appointed to a substantial post in the Reagan Administration. The new assistant secretary for elementary and secondary education has a record of support for the basics, was widely supported by the community in Washington during his tenure in that public school system, and had the endorsement of The Heritage Foundation for his new post.

Robert Billings, who with Jerry Falwell founded the Moral Majority and subsequently served as its executive director, has been named as special assistant to Secretary Bell. Billings is a vocal opponent of sex education, abortion, homosexual rights, and school prayer. On consultant status, his job functions are not clearly delineated, though a part of his responsibilities apparently is to work on the reorganization plan. Some sources had previously indicated that he would be assistant secretary for non-public education. That appears to be one of the administrative positions which Bell has deleted in his efforts to curtail overhead costs.

In other Department of Education news, it appears that if the department is disbanded, vocational education, including family life education programs under the aegis of consumer-homemaking education, will go to the Labor Department, and education of the handicapped will move to Health and Human Services.

Speaking at the January 22 March for life, Secretary of Health and Human Services Schweiker told those present, "You have a friend at the Department of Health and Human Services." Shortly thereafter at a press conference Schweiker indicated he favors regulations which would prohibit poor unmarried women from receiving Medicaid payments for birth control and stated, "The government should not be in the business of sex education." Several recent appointments have substantiated this philosophy. C. Everett Koop, noted anti-abortionist, has been nominated deputy assistant to Schweiker and is reportedly under consideration as surgeon general, a post which requires Senate consent. Marjory Mecklenburg, a home economist from Minnesota and president of American Citizens Concerned for Life, is already in Washington assuming duties as head of the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, though according to the HHS press office, "her appointment has not yet been announced and she is unavailable for interview."

Among Elizabeth Dole's appointments in the Office of Public Liaison, the following have been named as special assistants to President Reagan:

- Diana Lozano, an IBM marketing representative and formerly of the Minority Business Development Administration of the Commerce Department: assistant for human services.
- Thelma Duggin, formerly National Republican Committee liaison to the National Black Voters programs: assistant for black affairs, youth and volunteers.
- Virginia H. Knauer, consumer specialist in the White House for other administrations beginning in 1969: assistant for consumers, aging, health care, and the disabled.

KEY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The impact of last November's election is just beginning to be felt in Washington. In addition to the significant changes expected from the new Republican administration, the shift in control of the Senate from the Democrats to the Republicans—as well as the generally more conservative trend in the entire Congress—will be as important in the development of public policy as the Reagan Administration's decisions.

Nowhere are these changes more dramatic than in the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, a committee which has jurisdiction over many of the programs of major concern to COFO members. The committee now consists of 16 members—9 Republicans and 7 Democrats; the new chairman is Sen. Orrin Hatch, of Utah; and the ranking minority member is Sen. Edward Kennedy, of Massachusetts. The full membership of the committee is as follows: **Chair:** Orrin G. Hatch, (R-Utah). **Republicans:** Jeremiah Denton, Ala.; John P. East, N.C.; Paula Hawkins, Fla.; Gordon J. Humphrey, N.H.; Don Nickles, Okla.; Dan Quayle, Ind.; Robert T. Stafford, Vt.; Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Conn. **Democrats:** Thomas F. Eagleton, Mo.; Edward M. Kennedy, Mass.; Howard M. Metzenbaum, Ohio; Claiborne Pell, R.I.; Jennings Randolph, W. Va.; Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Mich.; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., N.J.

There are several things to be noted about this new committee alignment. First, there are five new Senators on the committee, all Republicans. Second, the new ranking minority member, Sen. Edward Kennedy, relinquished his senior position on the Judiciary Committee in order to take this position on the Committee of Labor and Human Resources. According to press stories, Senator Kennedy made this change in order to play a pivotal role on the committee where most of the major debate on the future direction of domestic programs is likely to occur.

Perhaps the most significant change in this committee is

the manner in which its subcommittees have been restructured. For example, and of particular interest to COFO members, the subcommittees on Aging and on Child and Human Development have been merged into the new subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services. It is chaired by Senator Denton, a former POW and a new member of the Senate. The other members of the subcommittee are Senators Weicker and Humphrey on the Republican side, and Senators Eagleton and Metzenbaum for the Democrats. The subcommittees on Employment, Poverty and Migratory Labor, and on Health and Scientific Research have been abolished, and their jurisdictions divided between the subcommittee on Aging, Family and Human Services, and the new subcommittee on Employment and Productivity. The subcommittees on Labor, on Education, on Handicapped, and on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse have been left largely intact, and the subcommittee on Investigations and General Oversight has been created.

It is still too early to tell exactly how this newly constituted committee will operate. However, it seems clear that given the shift in political philosophy of the entire Senate, and the fairly dramatic shift in the political philosophy of this committee, there will be new approaches on most major issues. A serious reexamination of existing federal social programs seems likely; many of the new members have expressed strong views about abolishing many of these programs, and shifting the functions of others to state and local governments.

There is an article by Senator Hatch in this edition of the COFO Memo, and various COFO leaders have met with the Senator and his staff over the past several months. He is extremely interested in the work of the Coalition, and the Coalition certainly intends to make every effort to work with Senator Hatch, as well as all the other new members of the committee.

The House of Representatives Committee on the Budget has been divided into nine task forces to make recommendations about the President's proposed budget cuts: economic policy and productivity; entitlements, uncontrollables and indexing; enforcement; credit and multiyear budgeting; national security and veterans; transportation, research and development and capital resources; energy and the environment; reconciliation; and two others of special concern to professionals in the family field: Human Resources and Block Grants. **Chair:** Richard A. Gephardt (D-Mo.). **Democrats:** Brian J. Donnelly, Mass.; W.G. (Bill) Hefner, N.C.; James R. Jones, Okla.; Jim Wright, Tex. **Republicans:** Bill Frenzel, Minn.; Delbert L. Latta, Ohio, *ex officio*; Lynn Martin, Ill.; Ralph Regula, Ohio. **Tax Policy, Chair:** Bill Nelson (D-Fla.). **Democrats:** Les Aspin, Wis.; Beryl Anthony, Jr., Ark.; Jim Mattox, Tex;

Jim Wright, Tex. Republicans: Jack Kemp, N.Y.; Delbert L. Latta, Ohio, ex officio; James G. Martin, N.C.; Albert Lee Smith, Jr., Ala.; Paul S. Trible, Jr., Va.

COMMITTEES OVERSEEING LEGISLATION OF CONCERN TO FAMILY ADVOCATES

● Consumer and homemaking education in the Vocational Education Act reauthorization; child nutrition program cuts:

House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Chair: Rep. Carl D. Perkins (D-Ky.). Democrats: Ike Andrews, N.C.; Baltasar Corrada, P.R.; Norman E. D'Amours, N.H.; William D. Ford, Mich.; August F. Hawkins, Calif.; Dale E. Kildee, Mich.; Ray Kogovsek, Colo.; George Miller, Calif.; William R. Ratchford, Conn.; *Harold Washington, Ill.; Pat Williams, Mont. Republicans: E. Thomas Coleman, Mo.; *Larry E. Craig, Idaho; *Lawrence DeNardis, Pa.; Arlen Erdahl, Minn.; William F. Goodling, Pa.; James M. Jeffords, Vt.; Thomas E. Petri, Wis.; and *Marge Roukema, N.J.

● Adolescent pregnancy and family planning programs; low-income energy assistance; child abuse and neglect, and child adoption programs; the Older Americans Act and Economic Opportunity Act reauthorization:

Senate Subcommittee on Aging, Families and Human Services of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, Chair: *Sen. Jeremiah Denton (R-Ala.). Democrats: Thomas F. Eagleton, Mo., and Howard M. Metzenbaum, Ohio. Republicans: Gordon J. Humphrey, N.H., and Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Conn.

● Food stamps budget cuts, commodity supplemental feeding programs expansion to cover elderly and reauthorization of Farm Bill, including family research and Cooperative Extension family life, nutrition education and Expanded Food and Nutrition Programs (EFNP).

House Subcommittee on Domestic Marketing, Consumer Relations and Nutrition of the House Agriculture Committee, Chair: Rep. Frederick W. Richmond (D-N.Y.). Democrats: Tony Coelho, Calif.; Thomas S. Foley, Wash.; Dan Glickman, Kans.; Tom Harkin, Iowa; and Leon E. Panetta, Calif. Republicans: George Hansen, Idaho; Paul Findley, Ill.; Gene Chappie, Calif.; and E. Thomas Coleman, Mo.

*New members of Congress

REAGAN AND THE CONSERVATIVE COALITION

The President spoke to the Conservatives Conference, cosponsored by the American Conservatives Union and the Young Americans for Freedom in Washington, D.C., the week of March 16. Included in his remarks were indications that his financial proposals are only one part of

his program for returning the power of government to states and communities, and only a first step toward reordering the relationship between the citizen and government. Reagan promised to stand "shoulder to shoulder" with his fellow conservatives in the battle against abortion and for school prayer. He stressed the threat of communism as the ultimate evil and force to be defined as the one true enemy.

Bush's participation on the conference program was particularly noted, since these groups had actively opposed his presidential candidacy.

COFO AND THE MONEY CRUNCH

On March 19 eight representatives of the four COFO organizations met all day at AHEA headquarters to develop a four-year plan for the coalition. The representatives (AAMFT: Steven Engelberg, legal counsel; AHEA: Kinsey B. Green, executive director, Margaret McCullough, associate director; FSAA: Keith Daugherty, executive director, Robert Rice, policy analysis development director, and Pat Langley, director, Washington office; and NCFR: Kate Garner, president, Ruth Jewson, executive director) reaffirmed the original objectives of the Coalition of Family Organizations:

- To share resources, including expertise, networks, manpower, and money for furtherance of family-related programs—beyond the capability of individual member components (i.e., synergistic effect).
- To provide information on family issues for constituents of member organizations.
- To utilize expertise inherent in member organizations to provide information and counsel on family policy issues to policy makers and the lay public.

Many potential program strategies which would fulfill these objectives were discussed: continuation of COFO Memo, but on a more regular and systematic basis; initiation of shared legislative advocacy; a speakers' bureau of family experts; commissioning of publications on family issues; initiation of seminars or conferences for policy makers or public audiences on family policy issues; and participation in international family organizations. The hindrance to a more aggressive program seemed to be lack of an adequate financial base for growth. Many alternative sources of revenue were contemplated: organization dues; government or corporate grants; products or services for sale, fee, or subscription; absorption of shared costs by the four organizations under other budget categories; and individual member dues.

In general, conclusions were these:

- None of the four organizations is currently in a financial position to contribute substantially more to COFO than is now being committed.

- An approach that is more business-like than the current "out of the hide of staff" approach to COFO Memo must be found. Several alternative bids are under consideration.

- COFO Memo will continue as the primary vehicle for communication.

- When one organization needs the support of others for a specific advocacy issue, appropriate permission and clearance will be solicited. COFO-initiated advocacy seems improbable at this time.

- Corporate support for one or more seminars on family policy issues will be sought.

If our readers have suggestions or time, money, and expertise to contribute, we would be grateful for your commitment. Please contact your respective representative at the appropriate headquarters address.

HOW FARE BLACK AMERICA'S CHILDREN?

Child care, health, education, public welfare, and youth unemployment still remain severe problems for black children in numbers disproportionate with the rest of the population, according to a report from the National Black Child Development Institute in Washington. In a report released October 1980, they conclude: "The problems for many Black children cited in this report only begin to depict the tremendous disparity between the majority of

children and poor Blacks. While their vulnerability to poverty and discrimination certainly accounts for much of the gap, Black children also receive inadequate, underfunded, or misdirected services that do not address their enormous social and economic barriers. If any relief is to occur soon, the government must begin to design services that recognize and utilize the strengths of Black families, not just their deficits. Since some current policies that fragment families only perpetuate social inequality, government must instead initiate a comprehensive and cost-efficient array of services to prevent problems long before they become chronic and irreparable. It is not nearly sufficient that Blacks merely work in programs that serve Black families and children; rather, government must allow and promote Blacks to administer and design programs that are intended to help Black families. These reforms are vital and critical if government policy is ever to elevate the status of Black children in 1990 any higher than it is now. Only then will the statistics that still haunt Black children be eliminated."

Outspoken black Thomas Sowell, a Reagan Administration favorite according to *The Washington Post* Staff Writer Herbert H. Denton (2/5/81), has formed the Black Alternatives Association, incorporated in California. Chapters in six major cities, including Washington, were expected to be established by late March.



NATIONAL COUNCIL ON FAMILY RELATIONS
1219 University Avenue Southeast
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55414

Return Postage Guaranteed
Address Correction Requested

Nonprofit Organization
U. S. Postage
PAID
Minneapolis, Minnesota
Permit No. 1806

0016360

DR WILLIAM SILVERMAN
PO BOX 584
HICKSVILLE NY 11902