

tinuing to receive, let us say, a lot of support from the parents involved, and also claiming money from the Government as if they were a completely self-sufficient unit.

Representative GRIFFITHS. But somehow or other—and, of course, we have a lot of laws that really are penalizing marriage. Social security penalizes marriage. You do better if you are not married. So it seems to me that if you really want to help these people, and if you want a child reared in a home where there are two parents, then there should be some type of reward.

Now, I notice that you pointed out that you did not harm the family because the father was present in the home.

Mr. TOBIN. Yes.

Representative GRIFFITHS. But should we not do something really more than not harm them? Should we really not reward them?

Mr. TOBIN. Well, perhaps we should. I would like to think of how to do that, but at least the minimum that we agree on is that we should not be discouraging marriage and we should not be giving incentives as the present system does to desertion and nonformation of families.

Mr. MILLER. One minor difficulty is that as you multiply the objectives you want to reach, you make the apparatus more and more complicated. Now, where we have the man-in-the-house rule, we follow the notion of giving a bonus if there is not a man in the house. A family-centered policy might lead to a man-out-of-the-house investigation to see whether or not the father really stayed there all the time. It seems you have to be sometimes modest in what you expect the system to do, because the apparatus to handle all these other objectives really cannot be accomplished in any simple way. Every system builds in difficulties at the same time it pursues some objective.

Mrs. WINSTON. We do know, Madam Chairman, that if we were to make aid to the needy children of unemployed fathers mandatory, we would be helping to strengthen family life. This is one of the examples where, through lack of needed legislation, we promote the breakdown of families.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I just happened to find out how this business really works in Detroit by a single case. Maybe it is the only such case in the whole Nation, but I was astounded.

I knew a woman who had four children. Her husband worked for one of the automotive companies. His income was about \$8,500 a year. When he discovered that as the children began to graduate from high school, she intended that they go on to college, he said, "I have had enough of this; I intend to have some fun, myself," and he left her. They got a divorce. She told me that he lived with a woman who had eight children drawing ADC and that he, the ex-husband, had told her personally, ADC is going to pay for that house.

I assumed this was ridiculous, and I called up the welfare. As a matter of fact, that was the way it was being done. He was living in the house. He was presumably renting it to the second mother. He lived in the house and the ADC was paying for the house, only it was going to be in his name.

Now, of course, in his case, I think it would have been very difficult to reward him. He was doing mighty well—you could not have made