

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: PREVENTION AND SERVICES

79609140

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., ON JULY 10, 11, 1979

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1979

49-914

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

06-135391

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
PHILLIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island
GEORGE MILLER, California
MICHAEL O. MYERS, Pennsylvania
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
TED WEISS, New York
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PETER A. PEYSER, New York
EDWARD J. STACK, Florida
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
WILLIAM R. RATCHFORD, Connecticut
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
DON BAILEY, Pennsylvania

JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
JOHN N. ERLÉNBNORN, Illinois
JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
MICKEY EDWARDS, Oklahoma
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
KEN KRAMER, Colorado
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
DANIEL B. CRANE, Illinois
JON HINSON, Mississippi
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

PAUL SIMON, Illinois, *Chairman*

JOHN BRADEMÁS, Indiana
EDWARD P. BEARD, Rhode Island
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUGUSTUS, F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
EDWARD J. STACK, Florida
CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky,
Ex Officio

KEN KRAMER, Colorado
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
ARLEN ERDAHL, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio,
Ex Officio

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held in Washington, D.C. on:	
July 10, 1979-----	1
July 11, 1979-----	147
Statement of—	
Allen, Clara L., Director, New Jersey Division on Women, Department of Community Affairs, Trenton, N.J.-----	67
Allison, William W., deputy director, Community Services Administration-----	213
Barnes, Hon. Michael D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland; accompanied by Cynthia Anderson and Lise Moulton-----	13
Boggs, Hon. Lindy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana-----	[2
Brown, Sam, Director, ACTION; accompanied by Torrie Mattes, Office of Policy and Planning; Kathleen Fojtik, National Technical Assistance Center; and Sharon Vaughan, Women's Shelter, St. Paul, Minn-----	181
Campbell, Jane, National Council of Churches-----	150
Dames, Cynthia, battered womens project, Santa Fe, N. Mex-----	140
Edelstein, Dr. Saul, director, emergency services, George Washington University Hospital-----	39
Ferraro, Hon. Geraldine, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York-----	5
Fleming, Richard C.D., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Neighborhoods, Voluntary Associations and Community Protection, Department of Housing and Urban Development; William Allison, Deputy Director, Community Services Administration-----	209
Goodrich, Hon. George Herbert, associate judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, head of the Family Division-----	50
Green, Kinsey, executive director, American Home Economic Association-----	159
Grimes, J. Robert, Assistant Administrator, Office of Criminal Justice Programs, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; accompanied by Jeannie Neidermeyer-Santos, program manager, family violence program-----	188
Halsey, Capt. Patricia, U.S. Marine Corps; and Lt. (jg.) Serge R. Doucette, Jr., Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for the Navy, head of family advocacy program-----	58
Hyde, Hon. Henry J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois-----	16
Marschner, P.J., director of program development, Center for Women Policy Studies, accompanied by Diane Hamlin, director, Resource Center-----	228
McMahon, Ginger, martial abuse project, Delaware County, Pa-----	136
Meyer, Jeanie Keeny, police department, Kansas City, Mo-----	33
Mikulski, Hon. Barbara A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland-----	23
Moore, Janice, My Sister's Place, Washington, D.C-----	133
Nazeer, Freda, director, legislation and research, General Federation of Women's Clubs on behalf of Mrs. Quint-----	198
Olson, Beth, Junior League, Jacksonville, Fla-----	154
Pence, Ellen, State Director of battered women's programs, Department of Corrections, St. Paul, Minn-----	107
Ramirez, Blandina Cardenas, Commissioner, Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; accompanied by June Zeitlin, Office of Domestic Violence-----	166
Stahly, Geraldine, WomenShelter, Long Beach, Calif-----	128
Warren, Faye, General Federation of Women's Clubs, deputy director for the Hands Up program-----	200

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera.—	
Allen, Clara L., director, New Jersey Division on Women, Department of Community Affairs, Trenton, N.J.:	
"Accused Wife Slayer Defied Court," newspaper article from Star Ledger, October 3, 1978-----	Page 93
"Atlantic County Abuse Center, Counseling, Referral, and Shelter Program for Victims of Domestic Violence," article entitled-----	87
"Battered Women's Guide," a leaflet-----	84
Prepared statement of-----	71
"Section 10—Coordination of Federal Programs"-----	90
"Section 11—Definitions"-----	92
"Senate Committee Substitute for Senate No. 807"-----	95
"Senate No. 3244"-----	98
"Shelter for Battered Filled to Capacity," newspaper article from Star Ledger, March 11, 1979-----	94
Allison, William, Deputy Director, Community Services Administration:	
Factsheet-----	216
Information requested entitled "Community Services Administration Support of Domestic Violence Projects"-----	220
Prepared statement of-----	214
Barnes, Hon. Michael D., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland, prepared statement of-----	13
Boggs, Hon. Lindy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Louisiana, prepared statement of-----	2
Brown, Samuel W., Director, ACTION Agency, prepared statement of-----	183
Campbell, Jane, National Council of Churches:	
Letter to Chairman Simon, dated July 11, 1979-----	149
Prepared statement on behalf of-----	147
Dames, Cynthia, battered women's project, Santa Fe, N. Mex., prepared statement of-----	117
Doucette, Lt. (jg.) Serge R., Jr., Medical Service Corps, U.S. Navy Reserve, head, family advocacy program, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy:	
"Family Advocacy: Program Elements and Format," article entitled-----	57
Prepared statement of-----	55
Fleming, Richard, C. D., Deputy Assistant Secretary for Neighborhoods, Voluntary Associations and Community Protection, Department of Housing and Urban Development:	
Letter to Chairman Simon, enclosing information requested-----	219
Prepared statement of-----	212
Goodrich, Hon. George Herbert, associate judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, head of the Family Division, prepared statement of-----	49
Green, Kinsey, executive director, American Home Economics Association, prepared statement of-----	156
Grimes, J. Robert, Assistant Administrator, Office of Criminal Justice Programs, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, prepared statement of-----	192
Hyde, Hon. Henry J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, prepared statement of-----	16
Marschner, P. J., director of program development, Center for Women Policy Studies, prepared statement of-----	235
McMahon, Ginger, administrative Director of a domestic violence project, Delaware County, prepared statement of-----	125
Meyer, Jeanie Keeny, police department, Kansas City, Mo. prepared statement of-----	31
Mikulski, Hon. Barbara A., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland, prepared statement of-----	23
Miller, Hon. George, a Representative in Congress from the State of California, prepared statement of-----	30
Moore, Janice, My Sister's Place, Women's Legal Defense Fund, Washington, D.C., prepared statement of-----	123
Olson, Beth, Junior League, Jacksonville, Fla., prepared statement of-----	151

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.—con.	
Pence, Ellen, State Director of battered women's programs, Department of Corrections, St. Paul, Minn., prepared statement of.....	Page 101
Quint, A. M., president, General Federation of Women's Clubs, prepared statement enclosing a resolution.....	202
Ramirez, Blandina Cardenas, Commissioner, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, Office of Human Development Services, prepared statement of.....	171
Stahly, Geraldine Butts, executive director, WomenShelter, Long Beach, Calif., letter to Select Education Subcommittee, dated July 10, 1979, enclosing a statement.....	119
Warren, Faye, General Federation of Women's Clubs, deputy director, Hands Up program: Prepared statement of.....	204
Projects of:	
Battered Spouses—Big Rapids Intermediate Women's Club, Mich.....	208
Battered Spouses—Junior Women's Club of Golden Beach, Md.....	206
Child Abuse and Neglect (CA/N) North Carolina.....	205
Family abuse and neglect prevention and education program—Haven Hills, Inc.—Canoga Park Women's Club, Canoga Junior Women's Club, Calif.....	207
West Virginia's campaign against child abuse and neglect....	207

APPENDIX

"Battered Wives," article from Baltimore Jewish Times.....	530
Carstenson, Dr. Blue, legislative director, Minnesota Social Service Association, St. Paul, Minn., letter to Congressman Erdahl, dated July 9, enclosing testimony.....	244
Catania, Susan, chairwoman, Illinois Commission on the Status of Women, letter to Chairman Simon, dated June 1, 1979.....	409
Center for Women Policy Studies: "A Message To Parents About: Child Sexual Abuse," a publication entitled.....	436
"Family Violence Program," fiscal year 1978, local projects.....	461
Literature, a listing of publications.....	491
Response to violence and sexual abuse in the family, a publication entitled: Vol. 2, No. 2, November/December, 1978.....	410
Vol. 2, No. 5, March 1979.....	418
Vol. 2, No. 6, April 1979.....	426
"Violence In the Home Is A Crime Against The Whole Family," a publication entitled.....	453
"What If Your Child Has Been Sexually Molested," a booklet entitled.....	458
Cochran, Johnnie L., Jr., assistant district attorney, Los Angeles, Calif.: Congressional testimony.....	407
Letter to Chairman Simon, dated July 6, 1979, enclosing recommendations.....	402
Cotter, Hon. William R., a Representative in Congress from the State of Connecticut: "Help for Battered Women in Connecticut," a list.....	261
Testimony of.....	258
DASH, Inc., a group of citizens in a 13 county area of eastern Kentucky, testimony of.....	280
Family Service Association of America and The National Conference of Catholic Charities, position statement.....	262
General Federation of Women's Clubs, Washington, D.C.: "Domestic and Personal Violence," article entitled.....	509
Hands Up booklet.....	500
Hands Up objective, 1979.....	508
Kuhle, Shirley J., president, Nebraska Task Force on Domestic Violence: "Rural Perspective on Domestic Violence," statement on.....	321
Statement presented to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 9, 1979.....	328
Moakley, Hon. John Joseph, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts, testimony of.....	314

	Page
National Council of Jewish Women, New York, New York, testimony of	272
National Technical Assistance Center on Family Violence, Ann Arbor, Mich., summary report of domestic violence assistance organizations...	330
Nordenbrook, Ruth, chairperson, Committee of Women and Criminal Justice, Section of Criminal Justice, American Bar Association, statement on behalf of.....	245
Parolla, Helen R., director, Public Policy Center, National Board, YWCA, testimony of.....	270
Pence, Ellen, State Director, Minnesota programs for battered women: "Minnesota Data Collection on Battered Women: System Design and Data Analysis," excerpt of a report.....	287
Testimony of.....	284
Pines, Burt, city Attorney, city of Los Angeles, Calif., domestic violence program.....	367
Schindler, Jayne, legislative chairman, Colorado Eagle Forum, Wheatridge, Colorado, Statement in Opposition to H.R. 2977, dated Oct. 4, 1979, enclosing several newspaper articles.....	537
Simons, Larry L., national vice president, International Brotherhood of Police Officers, statement of.....	256
Stern, Barbara, Rockland Family Shelter for Victims of Domestic Violence, Nyack, N.Y., written testimony of.....	241
Stonehill, Harriet, director of Public Affairs, B'nai B'rith Women, Washington, D.C., statement of.....	277
Womens Justice Center, Detroit, Mich., statement of.....	499

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: PREVENTION AND SERVICES

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1979

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION,
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 9:50 a.m. in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Paul Simon, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Simon, Beard, Miller, Stack, Kramer, and Erdahl.

Staff present: Judith Wagner, staff director; Thomas Birch, counsel; Sylvia Corbin, executive secretary; Rhonda Barovsky, secretary; and Jennifer Vance, minority legislative associate.

Mr. SIMON. The subcommittee will come to order.

Last year this subcommittee first looked into the plight of families troubled by violence. Witnesses told of the widespread nature of family violence, and for many women there is no alternative but to leave their homes. Yet, communities often lack the resources to develop services for prevention of abuse and aid to victims.

Those testifying agreed Federal funds could stimulate support of shelters and help battered women. There is now before this subcommittee legislation to provide this Federal support. Our hearings today and tomorrow will provide us a chance to consider that legislation and to examine further the serious problems faced by women who are abused.

Witnesses this morning include people from those institutions in our society which often come into contact with battered women first, police, doctors, and the courts, and provide some help, but usually are not able to give the kind of support needed by a woman who has been beaten. The shelters that have been set up in communities for battered women attempt to offer these services.

We will hear this morning, too, from individuals working directly in shelters. Today's hearings should give some picture of what has been done and what is still lacking.

I might add that two members of our subcommittee, Representative George Miller and Representative Erdahl, have also been among the leaders in seeing that we move on legislation in this area.

I am pleased to call as our first witness one of the cosponsors and leaders in this area, one of the most distinguished Members of the House, Representative Lindy Boggs. We are pleased to have you here.

[Prepared statement of Hon. Lindy Boggs follows:]

TESTIMONY BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE LINDY (MRS. HALE) BOGGS

Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it is a great pleasure to be here this morning for hearings on the Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act, a bill which our colleagues Barbara Mikulski and George Miller and I have been working for several years now. I know that I speak for all the cosponsors—and we have about 70 thus far—when I say that we deeply appreciate the interest of Chairman Paul Simon and the Subcommittee members in this bill and this issue, and I feel confident that these hearings will be the springboard for further congressional action.

Because we have numerous distinguished witnesses who will address the national trends concerning violence in the home, I would like to direct my brief remarks to the idea of a Federal role in responding to the problem of family violence.

I share the concern many of our colleagues express over the pervasive influence of the Government in the personal and business affairs of our citizens, and therefore in no way do I—or any of the cosponsors—envison that the Federal role in assisting victims of family violence is to bring more Federal regulation or rulemaking to this very private matter.

On the contrary, we envision a minimal Federal role under which local community organizations, both public and private, nonprofit voluntary agencies, will be able to call upon the vast resources of existing Government programs in a coordinated, useful fashion. Also, of course, the participation of individuals or families in any federally funded domestic violence programs would be totally voluntary.

It seems to me that whatever the committee and the Congress decide to do regarding domestic violence, we should help local communities continue the innovation and the initiative already begun. This is a newly emerging issue which we are just beginning to understand, and we cannot presume that we have all the answers here at the Federal level.

I also think it is important to make the point that domestic violence does not occur in a vacuum. Many families troubled by violence at home also have serious problems in other areas, such as juvenile delinquency or runaway children, drug abuse or alcoholism, unemployment, mental illness, poor health, or inadequate education and employment. As a result, it is critical that any Federal response coordinate existing Government efforts in these areas so that victims of family violence have access to a wide range of needed services.

It has been very gratifying to see the growing public and congressional interest in the issue of family violence. I would like to take this opportunity to commend Secretary Califano for establishing this spring an Office on Domestic Violence at HEW. With a small budget this Office will be organizing the Federal effort to identify those Federal health and social programs which should be made more useful to community groups working on domestic violence.

Under its present constitution, the Office on Domestic Violence is limited to coordinating services and providing information. The bill under consideration at these hearings proposes to give this Office an additional responsibility, that of providing small grants to support direct services to families troubled by violence.

Today's hearings will give the subcommittee the opportunity to see the wide variety of local responses to domestic violence, and we will also hear in more detail the activities and plans of several Federal agencies.

I look forward to working with the subcommittee, the Federal officials and with citizens concerned about family violence as we develop an effective and appropriate Federal role in solving this terrible problem which affects so many families all over the country.

**STATEMENT OF HON. LINDY BOGGS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA**

Mrs. Boggs. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, members of the committee, for allowing me to be here. I hope Barbara Mikulski will be along soon because she is such a leader in this regard and has so much indepth knowledge about the problems and about the solutions to the problems.

Of course, it is a pleasure to be here and to have you again take up this legislation for us. It is a bill, of course, that George Miller and Barbara Mikulski and I have been working on for a long time. I am sure that I speak for all of our cosponsors—and we now have over 70 of our colleagues with us—when I say that we really deeply appreciate your interest, Mr. Chairman, and the interest of the members of this subcommittee in the bill and in the issue. I feel confident that these hearings will be a springboard for further congressional action.

We have numerous distinguished persons here who will address the national trends concerning violence in the home, so I will not go into the areas of their testimony. But I would like to direct my brief remarks to the idea of a Federal role in responding to the problem of family violence.

I share the concern many of our colleagues express over the pervasive influence of Government in the personal and business affairs of our citizens, and therefore in no way do I or any of the cosponsors envision that the Federal role in assisting victims of family violence is to bring more Federal regulations or rulemaking into this very private matter.

On the contrary, we envision a minimal Federal role under which local community organizations, both public and private, nonprofit agencies, will be able to call upon the vast resources of existing Government programs in a coordinated, useful fashion. Also, of course, the participation of individuals or families in any federally funded program would be totally voluntary.

It seems to me that, whatever the committee and the Congress decide to do regarding domestic violence, we should help local communities continue the innovation and the initiative already begun. This is a newly emerging issue which we are just beginning to understand, and we cannot presume that we have all the answers here at the Federal level.

I also think it is important to make the point that domestic violence does not occur in a vacuum. Many families troubled by violence at home also have serious problems in other areas, such as juvenile delinquency or runaway children, drug abuse, alcoholism, unemployment, mental illness, poor health, inadequate education, and inadequate job opportunities.

As a result, it is critical that any Federal response coordinate existing Government efforts in these areas so that victims of family violence have access to a wide range of needed services.

It has been very gratifying to see the growing public and congressional interest in the issue of family violence. I would really like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to commend Secretary Califano for establishing this spring an Office on Domestic Violence at HEW. With a small budget, this office will be organizing the Federal effort to identify those Federal health and social programs which should be made more useful to community groups working on domestic violence.

Under its present constitution, this Office on Domestic Violence is limited to coordinating services and providing information. The bill under consideration at these hearings, proposes to give this Office an

additional responsibility, that of providing small grants to support direct services to families troubled by violence.

Today's hearings will give the subcommittee the opportunity to see the wide variety of local responses to domestic violence, and we will also hear in more detail the activities and plans of several Federal agencies.

I look forward to working with the subcommittee, the Federal officials, and with all the citizens concerned about family violence as we develop an effective and appropriate Federal role in solving this terrible problem which affects so many families all over the country.

I thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to say so.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very, very much.

I would have one brief question. Anytime we move into any area, whether it is school lunches or you name it, there are those who say this is a responsibility for State and local governments, that the Federal Government should not get involved. How do you respond to that particular comment?

Mrs. BOGGS. I think the Federal Government has an obligation to meet a national problem by helping to coordinate existing programs. The Federal Government is already in, out in the field in the area of health, drug abuse, runaway children, and so on, in the field of delinquency, in the law enforcement agencies and across the board in health and education and social services.

The agencies are there. They need coordination to help families who have particular types of trouble. And also I think the Federal Government has a responsibility for helping to provide the technical assistance and whatever other small assistance that the local groups, the community groups, the State and local public agencies, as well as the private nonprofit agencies, are already using to meet the problem within their own communities.

It is almost impossible for them to do it alone, and they need a coordinating agency for the other Federal programs that are already in the field.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Mr. Beard?

Mr. BEARD. I agree, basically, with what you said about the Federal responsibility. I think for too long we have allowed this issue to flounder around, and I think it is to the credit of the chairman, Chairman Simon, and certainly since George has been in the Congress, George Miller, that this issue has remained alive. We hopefully will have some meaningful legislation that will come forward.

I think, too—and again, this is a domestic issue for this country—that people's biggest complaint, the taxpayers, is that money is always going elsewhere overseas to everyone and his uncle, but not for programs here to take care of our own people who are sometimes neglected. I think we have an opportunity here to do something.

Mrs. BOGGS. Thank you, Mr. Beard.

Mr. SIMON. The man I referred to earlier who is now here, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Lindy, I am sorry I walked in late in your testimony, but I want to thank you for coming this morning. I also want to thank you because I do not believe that without your support, your staff's help

and your help in writing the legislation, we would be here. Although it seems we are not terribly far along, we are a lot further along than we had thought when we set out on this road. Your support in going around talking to other Members of Congress to try to get them to support this effort, at a time when social legislation is not in vogue, has meant a great deal to me and, I am sure, to the other coauthors of the legislation.

We appreciate your taking your time and all of the effort you have made on this behalf. I also can thank you on the other end of the spectrum, in child abuse. The other day on the floor, your statements clearly persuaded a significant number of people who were not sure that that was a real issue. We got that appropriation. So I plead with you to stay involved. Thank you so much.

Mrs. BOGGS. Thank you so much for all of your work, George. You know I will stay involved. I have not yet ridden the paddy wagons, as you have, but I may even do that.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Erdahl?

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just want to thank Mrs. Boggs for being with us this morning and for the leadership she exerts in this area which affects far too many families in our society.

Mrs. BOGGS. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very, very much for your appearance and your leadership.

Mrs. BOGGS. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Our next witness and another colleague, a new colleague from New York, Representative Geraldine Ferraro.

STATEMENT OF HON. GERALDINE FERRARO, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you and the subcommittee for affording me this opportunity to testify before you this morning on the subject of domestic violence.

Rather than reiterate the specifics of the pending bill, I would like to focus on the need for this type of legislation.

Before I decided the people of the Ninth Congressional District could settle for no less than my representing them down here in Washington, I worked as a prosecutor in New York City. I created a unit in the district attorney's office in Queens County called the special victims bureau, and I served as its chief. I called it the special victims bureau because it handled the people who came into the system most traumatized by criminal offenses.

We attempted to carry them vertically through each step with the same attorney handling the case and eliminating the delays and unnecessary anxieties which surround a criminal justice system as large as ours.

Among our victims were women and children who had been physically and sexually abused both within and without the home. It is, of course, the former which I will address today.

Perhaps before doing so, however, I should give you a little historical background to explain how cases of domestic violence are

handled in New York City. Family court, in the role of *parens patriae*, assumes jurisdiction over all matters involving members of the same family. It is the court of original jurisdiction over all matters involving members of the same family. It is the court of original jurisdiction in all cases of physical child abuse, as distinguished from sexual. It is only after hearings and a judicial finding of severe abuse that the matter is referred to criminal court for prosecution under the assault statutes. And so it should be.

If the primary purpose of our system is to protect the child, then placement in a substitute care facility pending determination of the charge makes sense. Providing the parent with counseling toward the goal of returning the child to a family unit also makes sense. It is considered a civil proceeding with much relaxed rules of evidence and, I would hasten to add, with much greater chance of success.

Until September 1977, that was the rule when a spouse or other relative was the victim of assault by a family member, but unfortunately, it didn't work as well. Women who had been beaten could only go to family court because, as I mentioned earlier, it was the court of original jurisdiction and because marriage seemed a sacrosanct union that the authorities were loathe to disrupt. It is interesting to note that New York, which does not recognize common law marriage, gave greater protection to a woman who was living with a man than it gave to a legally married woman.

Unlike the child who could be removed from the premises of the abuser and placed in foster care, the wife had no such choice. She would go to the family court, wait in what is known as intake, and request an order of protection pending a hearing. The speed with which she got that order and an appointment before a judge depended upon how badly beaten she was when she appeared before the intake officer.

If her bruises were not either visible or serious in the opinion of the person viewing her, she could wait as long as 2 weeks to see a judge and get an order.

All of that changed in 1977 when New York State passed legislation giving a woman the right to choose either family court or criminal court. But once that choice is made, it is a final decision. She can't have both.

There we were, an office processing 40,000 arrests annually, and now we were getting into family matters. If it was a misdemeanor, we gave the woman a summons returnable on a day that was convenient for her to get a sitter for her children. We armed her with an order of protection and told her to serve her husband or have a friend serve him with the summons.

Let me clarify that assault in the third degree can be serious injury. But in order for it to be a felony assault in New York, which raises it to assault second, there must be either the use of a weapon or disfigurement or permanent physical injury. So a black eye, a few stitches, or even a broken nose may not fit the designation of a felony.

Many times, as the court officer handed a battered wife a summons and order of protection, she would look at me in disbelief, tears

streaming down her face, and would ask, "Where can I go? He'll kill me if I go home."

The advantage a woman had in coming to us was that we gave them immediate service with the order. The disadvantage was that a criminal action had begun, and the burden of proof was really quite different.

Perhaps the fears that these women had were unfounded. In all the cases I handled, not one woman received injury upon serving the summons. Nonetheless, in their minds the fears were real. I don't know whether after serving the summons they ever went back into the house between their court appearances.

Queens County has the dubious distinction of having the highest incidence of intrafamilial abuse in the city, but we have no shelters. The other counties had a few, but they were impossible to get into. And again, I was the prosecutor. My training is in criminal justice, not psychological counseling. We just did not have either the facilities or the ability to give the professional counseling or to find adequate help for these women.

You may say: Surely she had a parent who would take her, or a friend. I hasten to point out that the women who show up in criminal court have reached the end of their line. There was no place else to go. Most turn to the courts, not as the first alternative, but as a last resort. I would also like to stress the fact that for many of these women, there would be a long wait before they felt safe in returning home. And returning home, believe it or not, is what they want. These women know that divorce and separate homes are an impossible dream, something they can't afford.

As a former prosecutor who faced these women every day, the Miller-Boggs-Mikulski bill pending before the subcommittee has my full support. The legislation addresses this issue by providing funds for shelters and for direct aid to the victims and their dependents. It is designed to give the highest consideration to the discretion of the community. It provides a limited Federal role, but at the same time it would give, for the first time, a Federal commitment. The commitment would mean a great deal to the people on the local level who deal face to face with the problem of domestic violence.

Domestic violence is not a new phenomenon, nor is it a figment of the feminist imagination. We have all seen pictures of macho cavemen dragging their woman by the hair into caves of connubial bliss. Our problem is that since that time, we have insisted that what went on in that cave was a personal matter between husband and wife, parent and child. The subjects were seen as inappropriate for Government intervention—we had no right to enter that cave. I hope that we would all agree that the days of women and children being chattels are gone forever.

I would also hope that the days of reluctance on the part of Government to get involved in these matters is also passing. Support for local services to aid the victims of domestic violence would not be an excessive intrusion into the sacred marriage relationship. It wouldn't be a sign of the demise of the American family.

In fact, this legislation can be pointed to as a force which will strengthen these families because it provides aid when the marriage is

floundering. It is also, in my opinion, a cost-effective approach to the problem. Divorce and alimony and child support are really luxuries that can be accomplished only by those who can afford that status. Abandonment and welfare rolls are the alternative for those who can't.

There is another phase of domestic violence which I would like to briefly address. Our society recognizes the plight of the abused child and the battered spouse. But there is another victim who is just now emerging on the national scene. There is, unfortunately, a whole new pattern of behavior which is evolving in families without father figures and with grandparents who move in to share expenses.

Last year, a case came into my bureau of a 65-year-old grandmother who had been struck several times by her 16-year-old grandson. After talking to the complainant and her daughter, who was the defendant's mother, for about 20 minutes, I decided the kid couldn't be all bad because these two were off the wall. Then I met the kid—gorgeous but rotten. His father was in jail serving 20 years for a sodomy conviction. His mother was a weak willed, not too bright giggler who was dominated by her mother, who was providing support for her and her two sons.

What to do? The grandmother wanted the young man locked up for life. The mother didn't want him at home. He was too old and too difficult to be placed in foster care. His lawyer pleaded him guilty and he got 30 days. The boy needed counseling. He needed a temporary shelter. But we had nothing to give him. That young man has fallen between the cracks.

I was the one who should have worried the least about him, but I considered him my failure and society's. He too is a victim, just as the battered wife is. I know he had nowhere to go but down.

Perhaps the subcommittee can rectify this hopeless situation for future young men through your action on domestic violence legislation. Remember, it was counseling he really needed. Again, I hasten to point out that this is not an unusual situation. It is, however, just beginning to come to our attention. I would suggest that when the bill is marked up, that it doesn't include an age definition. The indication, unfortunately, is that domestic violence can be committed by minors.

You would imagine that my experiences in the D.A.'s office would have left me jaded and cynical. But they haven't. Instead, my dealings with special victims have left their scars. If I sit and dwell upon the stories that were told to me, I would probably end up in tears, and I am not a weepy woman. My campaign slogan was "Finally—a tough Democrat." It was chosen because I was a tough prosecutor.

What I am trying to share with you is the fright, the fear, the hopelessness of situations that you and I cannot imagine. But situations which become everyday events from which many in our society cannot escape. The domestic violence legislation pending before this subcommittee is a first but tiny step in the right direction.

The subcommittee has before it the opportunity to make, at very little cost, a great deal of difference in the lives of millions of American families. As a sitting Member of Congress and as a former prosecutor who dealt with some of those tragic cases, I ask you not to let this chance, the last chance for many families, slip by us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you for your practical insights into this matter. I have no questions.

Mr. Beard?

Mr. BEARD. [Nods negatively.] She said it all.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Kramer?

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We welcome you not only as a fellow member but as my neighbor. I am sorry and apologize that I was not here to hear the first few minutes of your testimony. Perhaps you covered this, as I have not yet had a chance to read your statement. However, can you tell me what you envision the Federal role to be in helping to alleviate the problems you have posed?

Ms. FERRARO. I think what this piece of legislation does, which is give money to the States so that they can provide facilities, shelters, counseling, without a tremendous amount of Federal intervention, is the right direction to go in. The agencies that deal with these problems are not equipped to handle them. For instance, the district attorney's office, had we had the funds to provide a psychologist to deal with these people as they came in, it would have made a tremendous difference in their lives and in our ability to handle the cases.

I do see the Government as recognizing the problem and as moving in a first step toward assisting the local governments to administer programs.

Mr. KRAMER. Do we have time for a followup question?

Mr. SIMON. Yes.

Mr. KRAMER. I grant you that most of these people, from my own experience, often have nowhere to turn and nowhere to go. But ultimately, do you see these shelters as really being a way in which to provide something other than just intermediate relief? In other words, aren't we really going to be dealing with an ultimate situation in which a battered woman is still going to be ultimately faced with the problem of returning to her home or ultimately leaving her family setting as she knows it?

In most cases the shelter will provide a temporary sanctuary for her during periods of the greatest abuse, but it will not be a solution to the woman's home problems. Do you agree or disagree with that?

Ms. FERRARO. I do. I don't see the shelters as being a permanent place where a woman will go to get away from her home situation, but there is a definite need for a temporary spot. I will give you another example. I had a young woman come in to me who had a child who was about 4 months old. We were all playing house with the baby, feeding it. She had another child who was 2 years old. Having had three children, let me tell you, this 2-year-old was the best behaved kid I had ever seen. He was just terrific.

They were around the courthouse all day while we were going through the process of getting the summons, the court order, and all of the rest of that stuff under control. It came time for her to leave. She didn't have anyplace to go, and because her parents had disowned her when she married this guy—it was a mixed marriage—and she had no money, what ended up happening was we took a collection with the detectives and people working in the office, and we each put in a dollar to give her money to get to a friend's house.

The point is she had no temporary spot to go except the friend, who had to take in, at this point, a 4-month-old baby and a 2-year-old child as well. Now, friends can be patient, but they are not patient that long. If you don't have family, it is a real problem. Where is she going to go after a day or two of this friend's kindness? I don't know.

But if we had a temporary shelter for her to move into, enough time for her to have her husband appear in court, enough time for them to get some sort of meeting or agreement with reference to support or with reference to where they were going to go, whether it was counseling or divorce, that temporary shelter would be a first step, but it is a necessary first step, for her to pull her life together.

You cannot imagine what desperation is when these women say to you, "I have nowhere to go, and if I go home he will kill me." Shelters are just a first step; I keep repeating that, but it is really important. They have nowhere else to go.

But, I do not see it as a permanent solution to a situation.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Geraldine, given your very direct and tough statement today and your very moving statement the other day on rape, I think I am going to enjoy your service in Congress far more than I had anticipated. It is somewhat lonely around here on some of these subjects.

[Applause.]

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask you something. You make a point in your statement, and I think you have the direct experience to amplify on it if you just take a moment, because I think some people may not understand, or the record should at least be built, that by the time a woman has come to you to file charges to go through the court procedures—could you just describe what she has gone through before she made that decision?

I mean, you say there is no place else to go. Most turn to the courts, not as a first alternative, but as a last resort.

Ms. FERRARO. Again, I could sit here and give you examples all day of situations that happened. Going back a little bit to the historical background in New York City, when I said it was usually a family court matter, it had always been. And I told you what we did with misdemeanors only. I didn't mention felonies because, as I indicated to you, a felony required the use of a weapon or disfigurement or permanent impairment. When you got to that point, the police were ready to come in and arrest in most instances.

In one instance I had, a woman's teeth were knocked out, but the police refused to do anything and they sent her to family court. She spent an entire morning in family court, because there was such a backlog—they have intake all day long in family court in New York City. By the time she got up to the woman, she was told: "You know, you do have your choice of having him arrested or coming in here and waiting to see the judge." She said, "Don't have him arrested, because I am afraid."

She came in to me and I brought her into the courtroom, in to a judge who was very knowledgeable, but he had been an assistant D.A. in Manhattan and we were Queens County, so there is always that little bit of antagonism between the two. Unfortunately, the woman

turned out being the one who was hurt because he turned around and said, "I am not going to order an arrest of this guy." He said, "It is obviously serious permanent injury, so send her back out and let her have him arrested."

I was so frustrated that I ordered the guy's arrest, and I didn't really have the authority to do that without putting my job on the line. I did it anyway. Her mouth was a disaster. She had no teeth. She was bleeding. I said that a woman came to us as a last resort. I know for certain that was not the first time he had hit her, but it was the time that was the last straw and she finally came in and said: I have nothing else I can do.

He was arrested but you have a judiciary that looks at the situation and says, again, it is a husband and wife thing. The wife is always advised that he can end up in jail. But, they then tell her that if he is working and if he ends up in jail, she won't get support. So immediately the woman is made to feel guilty for having started this action.

I find that it is tremendous frustration on the part of the victims and tremendous frustration felt by the system—both the criminal justice system and the family court system. Again, I don't know how it works outside New York, but I know how it is in New York City. And I feel that in an instance like this; we have got to provide some means of assistance to her and some means of assistance especially when she has children.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you for your perceptive and knowledgeable testimony. Your last exchange with Mr. Miller brings to mind a question. We often hear that while these situations may come in to the court, very few of these abusers ever end up in jail. Could you elaborate a bit? What has been the success—and I am not trying to single you out, but obviously you have the experience as a prosecutor—of really getting these people who are guilty of crime actually being penalized or sent to prison?

Mr. FERRARO. I will give you a little bit of background on my experience with the defendants who came in. In most instances they were not people with prior criminal records. They took out their anxieties or whatever on their wives, in the sanctity of their homes. Many of them were people who were considered stalwart people in our society. We had many police officers and firemen, as well as others, who came within the system. So there is no specific type of person who commits an assault on his wife. But there is a specific type of person who cannot escape from that assault, and that is one who cannot afford a divorce.

The success rate for us depends upon how you measure success rates. If you measure success rates with a plea by the man to harassment, where he gets a conditional discharge and the conditional discharge is that he seeks psychological counseling and is on probation for a certain period of time, then we were very successful. And I think that is really the direction we must go in, toward counseling.

If it is success rate measured by time in jail, no, we were not. The men rarely received prison time on conviction. They rarely went to

trial unless it was a really serious thing, stabbing as a part of the assault and things like that.

We always got a plea and it was to a lesser charge. The reason we did that is if it is difficult to get the Federal Government to come in and give money for assistance, it is twice as difficult to get jurors to convict a man for belting his wife.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Stack.

Mr. STACK. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to commend the distinguished member from New York for a very effective portrayal of the problem. And just as she has had experience on a practical basis with this problem, I too had ample experience as a county sheriff of a county in Florida with a population of 1 million people.

We found that domestic violence, or domestics, as we referred to them in the profession, was one of our major concerns. The typical scene would be a Friday night when either momma, poppa, or both got into the sauce and went to work on each other. At that point, the first contact with social agencies would be the police. Someone would call the police.

Many people may not be aware of this, but this is the most dangerous situation which confronts a police officer. There are more police officers either killed or injured in dealing with domestic violence than in any other area. A great deal of work has been done on this by Professor Bard of the University of the City of New York. You may know Professor Bard. I brought him down to our county to teach our men how to approach these situations to minimize the danger.

Of course, what we are dealing with, as you so well point out, is a deep-rooted socioeconomic problem, and it is not one we are going to resolve simply by sending people to jail. It is much deeper than that. We need, of course, temporary shelters. We have them in my county to an extent, but unfortunately, there is an absence of local funding to meet the problem appropriately.

We have a program called women in distress which does provide temporary shelters for women such as you have described. But we need to go beyond this. We need, certainly, counseling of all involved. Certainly counseling of all involved is very much a problem. The fact is it is intimately related to the problem of child abuse, which is a growing problem in our Nation. These two are very much interrelated.

I would say that I think this committee is doing a great service in calling this matter to public attention. I think the legislation proposed certainly will help to deal with the problem. It is an area in which we need help.

The appropriate Federal role is, in my view, to provide the requisite dollars so that we can have shelters as needed, and also counseling to deal with the essence of the problem. Beyond that, of course, the ultimate solution lies in a better educational system, which in turn will provide people with a better stake in the economy.

This has to be our overall goal, but these things are going to take a long time to achieve. I think we are moving in that direction, but in the interim I think the points that you have made are well taken and I think it is appropriate for Congress to address them. I commend you for your testimony.

Ms. FERRARO. Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Ms. FERRARO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. I note the presence of one of the chief sponsors, Barbara Mikulski. If you would care to join us here temporarily before we call on you as a witness, we would be pleased to have you join the subcommittee panel.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My heart, mind and feet welcome that suggestion. [Laughter.]

Ms. MIKULSKI. I would like to yield, if I could, to Congressmen Barnes and Hyde, who I know have other business, and then perhaps I could be the wrap-up speaker.

Mr. SIMON. Right. If we could have both of them come to the table and make their brief statements, then we can ask questions.

I noted our colleague from Pennsylvania, Representative Bob Edgar, was here temporarily and apparently had to leave, but he did show up to indicate the support of the legislation.

Not in order of seniority but in order of appearance here, I will first call on the new member, Representative Mike Barnes.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND, ACCOMPANIED
BY CYNTHIA ANDERSON AND LISE MOULTON**

Mr. BARNES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In order to expedite the hearing, I will not read my entire testimony but would request that it be inserted in the record.

Mr. SIMON. It will be entered in the record.

[The prepared testimony of Hon. Michael D. Barnes follows:]

TESTIMONY OF HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and members of the Subcommittee on Select Education today. I am very pleased to have with me two persons from my own Congressional District of Montgomery County, Md., who are very familiar with the field of domestic violence, and who work on a daily basis with the victims of domestic violence.

I would like to introduce them to you at this time.

Cynthia Anderson has been the Coordinator of the Montgomery County Abused Persons Program since its inception in 1977. She was instrumental in establishing this program and is a pioneer and a highly-respected authority in the field of domestic violence. Those of you who served on this Subcommittee in the 95th Congress will perhaps remember hearing from Ms. Anderson when she testified on this subject in March, 1978.

I am also pleased to have with me Ms. Lise Moulton, who is a social worker and a full-time member of the staff of the Abused Persons Program in Montgomery County. Ms. Moulton is also here representing the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence which, as you know, is coordinating the efforts on behalf of H.R. 2977 and other legislative initiatives in this area.

Both Ms. Anderson and Ms. Moulton are available to answer any questions you may want to ask them regarding Montgomery County's program. In their work with the victims of domestic violence every day, they see the shocking physical abuse, the desperation, and the human tragedy; but they also witness the changed courses of victims' lives that bring an end to their suffering; they witness hope; they witness the positive first step out of the violence and sometimes even the permanent change in the behavior of an abusive spouse that saves a marriage and a family. These things can result from a compassionate, constructive and comprehensive program.

The Abused Persons Program in Montgomery County is one in which we on the local level take a great deal of pride and one which I would not hesitate to hold up as a model for programs throughout the nation. On that note, I would like to call your attention to a letter dated July 2, addressed to Chairman Simon, from Dr. Ellen Weber Libby, who chairs the Community Crisis Center Citizens Advisory Committee in Montgomery County. I am told that all members of the Subcommittee received a copy of this letter, but, if you have been out of your office a few days, you may not have yet seen it. The letter is an expression of support for H.R. 2977 and is also an invitation to you to tour the community shelter in nearby Bethesda and to speak personally with the residents and staff who participate in the Abused Persons Program.

I myself have done this and can say from a very personal standpoint that I was moved by the experience, that I learned from it, and that I came away comforted that such a shelter and such a program exist in my own community. I came away determined to do whatever possible as a Member of Congress to see that this and other shelters can exist to aid the persons who need them.

When Cynthia Anderson testified before you one year ago, she very aptly described our community and its need with respect to this problem, and I would like to quote from her testimony:

"Our county represents a largely affluent urban population, neighbor to the Nation's Capital...and home to many government officials and industry executives. Though the availability of human services in our county is high compared to many areas, the coordination of the needs of battered women and their children is often complex, very time-consuming, and basic needs such as alternate housing are frequently unavailable to women without good earning capacity."

In an average month the Montgomery County Program, which at this time is funded through the County Department of Health, receives 100 crisis calls over the Hotline, offers shelter to at least 65 persons—both women and their children—and will at any given time be servicing between 60 and 80 clients—services that include shelter for up to three weeks, information and referral either by phone or face-to-face, legal advice, counseling, support groups, financial assistance, emergency medical services, childcare, even employment assistance—to name a few. Where the abusive spouse is willing, individual or group marital counseling is offered to work on permanent behavioral changes.

While domestic violence, and more specifically spouse abuse, is certainly nothing new to our society, what is relatively new is our willingness to bring this problem out into the open, to examine it, to study the victims, the abusers, the causes, the results. Such studies, plus abundant demonstrations of need, have fortunately spawned action programs in many communities across the country. I hope that the Congress this year will recognize the validity and the need of such programs and will offer Federal support and leadership to augment and stabilize what is being done at the local level.

I would offer one word of caution—which in today's climate might seem unnecessary—let us not create new layers of bureaucratic red tape that ensnarl the federal monies to the point that after the slow trickle-down process, through all the federal and state administrative wickets, nothing remains for the safe, secure shelter of a woman and her children who might flee their home in the middle of the night. These are the victims, and they need help—immediate, compassionate, no-questions-asked help.

I support H.R. 2977 because I know it was written in this spirit and I know from reading last year's hearing record how eloquently witnesses like Barbara Mikulski and Lindy Boggs reiterated this point time and again.

H.R. 2977 would direct a full 75 percent of the appropriated funds to community-based programs and local public agencies. This would, hopefully, mean a relatively direct and uncomplicated route for the Federal funds to reach and benefit the individual victim. Established, well-run programs already in existence—such as that in Montgomery County—would be eligible for such a grant and could go right on operating as they do now. New programs could be established and receive the federal monies necessary to get off the ground.

The grant process in H.R. 2977 will hopefully allow the flexibility necessary to apply exactly the right approach to the particular community and its particular needs.

The remaining 25 percent of the money would go toward long-term state planning for citizen participation, a national information clearinghouse, educational media, and the coordination of the programs at the federal level.

As with almost every other problem we face, this one must be confronted through a combined Federal, State and local effort. Many localities and many States are already working; I believe it is time for the Federal Government to join the team. I commend you, Mr. Chairman, for holding these important hearings this week and I urge you and Members of the Subcommittee to act as quickly as possible to bring this bill out of the subcommittee and the full committee. I offer my assistance to you in any way possible.

Thank you again for allowing me this chance to appear before you.

Mr. BARNES. Thank you.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before you this morning. I am particularly pleased to have with me two individuals from my own congressional district in Montgomery County, Md., who are very familiar with the field of domestic violence and who work on a daily basis with the victims of domestic violence.

I would like to introduce to the subcommittee at this time Cynthia Anderson, who has been the coordinator of the Montgomery County abused persons program since its inception in 1977. She was instrumental in establishing this program and is a pioneer and, I know it is fair to say, a highly respected authority in the field of domestic violence. Those of you who served on this subcommittee in the 95th Congress will recall hearing from Ms. Anderson when she testified on the subject in March of 1978.

I am also pleased to have with me Ms. Lise Moulton, who is a social worker and full-time member of the staff of abused persons program in Montgomery County. Ms. Moulton is also a representative of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, which, as you know, is coordinating the efforts on behalf of H.R. 2977 and other legislative initiatives in this area.

Both Ms. Anderson and Ms. Moulton are available to answer any questions you may want to ask them regarding Montgomery County's program. In their work with the victims of domestic violence every day, they see the shocking physical abuse, the desperation and human tragedy; but they also witness the changed courses of victims lives that bring an end to their suffering. They witness hope. They witness the positive first step out of the violence and sometimes even the permanent change in the behavior of an abusive spouse that saves a marriage and saves a family.

These things can result from a compassionate, constructive, and comprehensive program. The abused persons program in Montgomery County is one in which we on the local level take a great deal of pride and one which I would not hesitate to hold up as a model for programs throughout the Nation.

On that note, I would like to call to your attention a letter dated July 2, addressed to Chairman Simon, from Dr. Ellen Weber Libby, who chairs the Community Crisis Center Citizens Advisory Committee in Montgomery County. I am told that all members of the subcommittee received a copy of this letter, but if you have been out of your office a few days, as I have, you may not yet have seen it.

The letter is an expression of support for H.R. 2977 and it is also an invitation to you to tour the community shelter in nearby Bethesda, Md., and to speak personally with the residents and staff who participate in the abused persons program.

I myself have done this and can say from a very personal standpoint that I was moved by the experience, that I learned from it, and

that I came away comforted that such a shelter and such a program exist in my own community. I came away determined to do whatever possible as a Member of Congress to see that this and other shelters can exist to aid the persons who need them.

In an average month the Montgomery County program, which at this time is funded through the county department of health, receives 100 crisis calls over the hotline, offers shelter to at least 65 persons, both women and children, and will at any given time be servicing between 60 and 80 clients, services that include shelter for up to 3 weeks, informatin and referral either by phone or face-to-face, legal advice, counseling, support groups, financial assistance, emergency medical services, child care, even employment assistance, to name a few. Where the abusive spouse is willing, individual or group marital counseling is offered to work on permanent behavioral changes.

As with almost every other problem we face, this one must be confronted ultimately with a combined Federal, State, and local effort. Many localities and many States are already working. I believe it is time for the Federal Government to join that team.

I commend you, Mr. Chairman, and the leadership of the members of this subcommittee for holding these important hearings this week. I urge you to act as quickly as possible to bring this bill out of subcommittee, out of full committee. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation and I certainly offer you any assistance I can provide as we move this bill through the legislative process.

I thank you again for allowing me and my two experts from Montgomery County to appear before the committee this morning.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

We will hear from Mr. Hyde and then we will ask questions. My colleague from Illinois, Henry Hyde.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY J. HYDE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. HYDE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I deeply appreciate Congresswoman Mikulski giving us her time. I have a very brief statement to make, which I will ask leave to be included in the record.

Mr. SIMON. It will be entered into the record.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Henry J. Hyde follows:]

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE HENRY J. HYDE

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I greatly appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to express my strong support for H.R. 2977, the Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act.

As one who supported this legislation in the last Congress, and as a cosponsor in this Congress, I am firmly convinced of its merits.

In these times of rapidly-mounting inflation, amid strong calls for reduced Federal spending, I would not normally call for the creation of another, new Federal program.

The Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act is an exception. This program is simply an initiative to encourage local units of governments and others to address one of the most immediate and personally tragic problems confronting society. In the case of victims of crime compensation, it is true that there may be other sources of reimbursement for medical bills—but where a family has been torn asunder by domestic violence, the need is for prompt and specialized

attention that can best be supplied by a specific program so directed. This legislation is a modest attempt to stimulate local organizations to move in this direction.

It is clear that the supporters of this measure do not intend to involve the Federal Government in long-term Federal funding. Safeguards are built into the legislation stipulating that Federal funds cannot be used for more than 25 percent of a community-based program. An applicant cannot receive Federal funds for more than 3 years, and funds will not go directly to an individual.

What the legislation proposes, and the reason for my strong support, is to provide leadership to local communities—initiative—a clearinghouse for information.

There is no requirement that a State or community participate in the shelter program. There is nothing compulsory about it.

Domestic violence is increasing throughout the country—it cuts across income and educational lines—striking out at mothers, fathers, children, grandparents, sisters, and brothers. The reasons are as varied as the victims.

The Federal Government cannot and should not attempt to solve a domestic abuse situation, but we can provide a small amount of funds to help provide a place to go to get one's wounds bound up, to get shelter, and some consolation and counseling for a problem for which facilities are woefully lacking at this time.

If the Government Printing Office can provide booklets on such things as "Imaginative Ways with Bathrooms," "Dried Flower Arrangements," and "Keeping Your Pet Healthy," surely we can show a little direction to communities in how to deal with domestic violence. If we can fund the arts and humanities, we can show a little leadership in this area as well.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Miller, said that this legislation represents an "investment in the American family." I wholeheartedly agree with you, and urge that H.R. 2977 be reported to the House at the earliest possible date.

Mr. HYDE. In these times of austerity, budget cutting, and proposition 13 atmosphere, it is a good idea for a prudent Congressman not to urge any new programs; take a look at the ones that exist and maybe cut them down or eliminate them. Such an idea occurred to me on victims of crime compensation, something which I supported in the last Congress. But there are other areas that can fill that need, other programs to help reimburse victims for their medical bills.

But this particular need is unique. The domestic violence situation requires a program specifically tailored for immediacy and for specialized expert counseling and care. This program is simply a nudge to local units of government, to local organizations to get into this field to provide a place where immediate counseling, immediate shelter, and the specialized attention that the battered spouse and the battered children need is available.

Montgomery County obviously has an exceptionally fine program. There are many areas that do not. There are many areas where a woman has no place to turn and must get some specialized counseling to avoid a situation that could result in even worse crimes being committed, in somebody being killed, in children's lives being ruined. So the need is there.

Now, why should the Federal Government get into this? If you look at this bill, it is as modest as any program could possibly be. Twenty-five percent is all that this program proposes to put into a local operation, a community-based program, and then it cannot last for more than 3 years, and the funds are not going to get to any individual.

Now, it just seems to me that if the Government Printing Office can provide booklets on such interesting titles as "Imaginative Ways With Bathrooms," "Dried Flower Arrangements," and "Keeping Your Pet Healthy," if Congress can spend money repairing the roof on the

Kennedy Center, then we can show a little direction to communities on how to deal with domestic violence.

There is a tremendous need for this program. The Federal Government often before in history has shown the way to local governments, to local groups. Here is a way for the expertise, the technical knowledge and a modest amount of funding to encourage local governments to get into a program where a need exists. Once these programs are ongoing, the Federal Government can gracefully withdraw, having encouraged and having helped found what I think is a very essential service.

So this is an exception, I think, to our need to cut down on new programs. This is simply encouraging local units to start their own program. The financial involvement is minimal. The good to come from it is beyond measure and I heartily support this program and this legislation.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, very much.

May I direct one question to Ms. Anderson and Ms. Moulton? If you have had a chance to look at the bill itself—

[Ms. Anderson nods affirmatively.]

[Ms. Moulton nods affirmatively.]

Mr. SIMON. Would it be of practical help in your Montgomery County situation? We will before too long be marking up the bill. Would there be any modifications you would suggest to the bill?

Ms. ANDERSON. I think one of the aspects of the bill is that it specifically states that moneys will be restricted going to some extent into public programs, and we are a public program that is fully financed at this time by our county, with one exception that we have CETA-funded positions for staffing our shelter component.

I anticipated that question and have thought about how we could respond to that. I think it could be of benefit to us by enhancing our program. There are certain basic services that we can already provide, and I think we are a very comprehensive program in basic services. But let me give you one example where I would see applying for a grant if this bill went into effect.

Clearly, we need to be addressing the needs of the children who come into our shelter. We have women staying in a shelter, bringing their children for sometimes as long as 3 weeks, and on some occasions as long as 4 weeks. We are identifying that often these children are traumatized by the violence they have witnessed between their parents.

At the moment, we have very limited capability, other than offering recreation types of activities, to really intervene in helping these children deal with the trauma they have observed.

One of the ways, if this bill went into effect, that I would be interested in applying for a grant would be to do some very specialized work with the children who are in our shelter program.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Ms. MOULTON. Let me speak for the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, because in Montgomery County we have a very lucrative county which gives a lot of money to our particular program. But I would like to speak to all of the shelters across the country who are living on nickels and dimes, shoestring and donations. The turn-away rate in some of these communities is from 200 to 300 women and children per month.

Their shelter is so small that they must turn away families who are in desperate need. And there are shelter programs in this country at this time that are closing because the women who have devoted themselves, either doing volunteer work or who are terribly underpaid and, of course, understaffed, can only sustain this for so long. So may I speak to the need, the tremendous need of moneys, even the seed money which this program is, only seed money.

Twenty-five percent of your operating budget, of \$50,000, is not enough to shelter, feed and provide some support services to these women. So we believe that this is only an effort to involve the communities, but at least some starting money.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Mr. Beard.

Mr. BEARD. No questions.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Kramer.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Can you tell me how successful you have been in terms of providing large-range solutions to the problems of the people you have served? In other words, what percentage of cases wind up returning to their original environment and then experience a repetition of the kind of activity that brought them to you in the first place?

Ms. ANDERSON. In helping Congressman Barnes' office prepare some of the testimony before this committee, we went back and looked at some of our recent data which we have been keeping in the last 6 months, particularly, and we found that 50 percent of the individual women who were utilizing the shelter component of our services had found alternative living arrangements in an independent fashion. That is to say, they were living independently away from the abusive situation.

I believe this was out of 23 women in the month of May. We are speaking now of 23 women who utilized our shelter. Eleven of them found alternative or independent living arrangements. Three were still in shelters. So we were not able to determine yet what their status would be. Four returned home to the husband, the home of origin, two of those with change, and we think this is very important. That is to say, the husband came in, acknowledged the abusive situation. With the intervention of our counseling staff, the couple went home, coming back to the center for ongoing marital counseling. We think that is a tremendous effort.

Mr. KRAMER. How long a period of time are you talking about?

Ms. ANDERSON. I was just using those figures from the period of May of this year.

Mr. KRAMER. You have been established since 1977, is that correct?

Ms. ANDERSON. We have been operational since January of 1977. We have not had a full component of services, however, until about this time last year. We have been developing right along. We have had full counseling capacity for about a year now.

Mr. KRAMER. Have you been tracking those initial people who came in? In other words, have you been auditing your results from those initial persons served?

Ms. ANDERSON. Doing long-term evaluations?

Mr. KRAMER. Yes.

Ms. ANDERSON. We have been following the cases because they are in ongoing counseling. We consider counseling as a 6-month period

of time, our average caseload. Lise has more direct experience working with those families. Would you like to address that, Lise?

Ms. MOULTON. I would also like to say in our program the philosophy is to try to improve family health. We are not a program trying to help women get away as the solution. We feel that the men, the abusers, need help as much as the family does and the women and the children.

So our goal is if at all possible we want to involve the abuser to help him learn better control of his behavior. So we have both the option of giving the woman an alternative to staying and participating in the abuse, as either coming to shelter and not going home, or of making that grand statement to her husband that this is not tolerable behavior.

We feel that that statement, especially when talking about just temporary removal from the environment, has had a very powerful impact on the male. Oftentimes these are very entrenched relationships for many years, 10, 20-year relationships of marriage where the woman has endured the abuse all along. And when she leaves her home and says I will not tolerate this and I will only come back if you acknowledge the fact that this is not tolerable behavior, the fact that there is a whole system that the woman enter that agrees with her that this is not tolerable is a statement to the man. We have seen, frankly, again and again, where the husband has a chance to reassess what he is doing in his own family to his wife and children, and that in itself is very powerful, in addition to the fact that we do offer the counseling services.

I have worked with a number of families which have been able to stay together and the abuse has stopped through counseling.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to thank Congressman Barnes, Ms. Anderson and Ms. Moulton for their statements. The last statement may be the most beneficial statement in terms of the legislation because too frequently, for those people who have not taken the time to read the legislation or understand the problem, they assume we are establishing an underground railroad, if you will, for wives and children to leave the family.

I think your statement based upon your experience will go a long way toward showing them that that is not the case; that first of all, it is unacceptable to leave behind an abuser who may enter into another marital relationship and continue the activity; but also it is unacceptable to see the family, if at all possible to be put back together, to see it pulled apart at the center.

And I think from my experience in working with this legislation and working with people in drafting it, many times you will find the simple hotline or counseling center, where the wife never leaves the home but finds out that she is not crazy and she is not the only one who is undergoing this, allows her to reassert herself in the family and change the dynamics of that family and have impact on the frequency of abuse and the change of dynamics in the family.

So I appreciate very much your testimony. I think that kind of experience relayed to Members of Congress will cause them to understand that we are not talking about intervention at all; we are talk-

ing about support, we are talking about resources when things have already gone wrong. I mean what the hell else can go wrong after they have blown out your teeth and knocked out your eyes? That is intervention.

And I think they will find that this legislation is designed to try to shore up and call upon some of the strengths of individuals and family members.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. I want to thank the panel but I have no questions.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Stack.

Mr. STACK. I would like to comment on Mr. Miller's last statement. There are ways of approaching this which may not have occurred to him. In my county we have just had a very much-publicized murder case where, after a period of 20 years of abuse, the woman got herself a gun and killed the gentleman in question. That is an ultimate solution, I may point out. [Laughter.]

Mr. STACK. But not necessarily one to be recommended.

Coming to Congressman Kramer's comment on the success ratio, success ratios have to be comparable in terms of the particular type of problem that you encounter in dealing with domestic violence. We are addressing not only the violence that is encountered upon the spouse, whether it be the woman or the man. Of course, the abuse of men by woman has become rather—at least, let me say, we are discovering a great deal more of it. It has probably been going on for years and we didn't know about it. But women are not the only victims. Sometimes the men are victims.

But seriously and more importantly, we were also dealing with child abuse, and obviously, again, the matter of child abuse is one which is a very deep-seated psychological problem. Certainly all of us are aware of the fact that child abusers tend to be children of child abusers. This chain goes on ad infinitum, as it were, and obviously we have to get in at some point and break this chain.

I think the same thing is true to a large extent of the domestic violence between spouses. One of the things that I think you must have encountered is the importance of drug and alcohol abuse in this context. That is probably an area where one can demonstrate perhaps a greater ratio of success. If you are able to get a spouse-abuser into a treatment program for alcohol or drug abuse, that is an effective way to go, one which certainly I am sure you have been using; whereas, the more deep-seated psychological problems are more difficult to deal with and it is much more difficult to deal with success ratios.

I don't think the recidivism, the return of the woman to your shelter, is necessarily an index of success. I think it is more important that we become aware as a nation of the necessity for getting into this very large area of a social problem of great magnitude. I commend you for going forward. Montgomery County has led the way in so many social programs, and again here, you are a leader. I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. SIMON. Ms. Mikulski.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have some comments. I would like to compliment Congressman Barnes for his vigorous activity in this, and if we could ask Phyllis Schaffley not to talk so loudly—I was referring to those vibrations through the room. [Laughter.]

I would like to compliment the Congressman on what he is doing. I am very familiar with the work the Montgomery County people have been doing. It is truly outstanding.

I would like the committee to take note particularly of the population we are talking about when we discuss Montgomery County. Though not everyone in Montgomery County is rich, it is one of the most affluent counties in the United States. And very often the myth surrounding the profile of the domestic violence victim is that he or she tends to be a person who lives in the inner city, of very poor background, who is victimized solely because of an economic situation. I think we can see how broad-based and deep the problem is by the depth and breadth of the issues you are dealing with.

So I have no questions.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. If the chairman would yield, I would also like to thank Congressman Hyde for coming and testifying on this legislation. As many people in this room know, Congressman Hyde and I have had many, many differences on a number of issues, but I think his support of this legislation and his recognition of the very real seriousness and the magnitude of the problem that has taken place inside the American home is going to be of great benefit to seeing this legislation passed.

I think it also speaks well of the kind of coalition that has been formed behind this legislation, and to a great extent because of Representative Mikulski who, many times when I thought I would lay down and die on this issue, kept prodding me along and saying: No, no, there is another way, there is another door, another avenue.

I think to get people like Congressman Hyde and others to recognize the seriousness of the problem is a great achievement and hopefully will lead to the passage of this legislation.

On a second point, Congressman Stack talked about sort of the ultimate solution. I can remember when I was first considering drafting this legislation and interviewing victims in various shelters around the country, I kept raising the issue of spousal abuse in terms of husbands. And the answer was very often a shrug of the shoulders. I kept trying to get statistics, and certain people said: Well, I'm sorry but I just don't have any commitment. If you want to pursue that you can pursue it, but the problem with women is much greater.

There was a continual shrugging of the shoulders until one night, very late, in the District of Columbia, a young woman about 22 or 23 was severely battered. I posed the question to her, we were sitting around, and she very quietly said that I was probably looking in the wrong place to get my statistics. Naively, I asked her what she meant, and she suggested I look in the morgue because she felt when women make the decision to retaliate, they have got to make sure that it is, in fact, the final solution because of the fear that takes place.

I think that the Congress ought to understand that there is violence that radiates from the situation that many times is not associated with it in terms of cause but it does in fact take place. You need only read the papers on Sunday mornings to find out who is shooting who in America on Saturday night.

So I think as terrible as that sounds, it also points out that hopefully this legislation will deal with ramifications that spin off the abuse of spouses in this country.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Representative Barnes and your two guests

Mr. BARNES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. We now call on one of the dynamic chief sponsors of this legislation, our colleague from Maryland, Barbara Mikulski.

STATEMENT OF HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may, I would like to just be able to summarize the remarks.

Mr. SIMON. We will enter your statement in the record and we welcome your summary.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Barbara Mikulski follows:]

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSWOMAN BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I thank you for holding these hearings and I appreciate the opportunity to testify. Enactment of legislation to aid victims of domestic violence is a top priority for me, as well as for the Congresswoman's Caucus.

When I began working on this legislation last year, I knew that domestic violence was a serious problem in American society. As a former child abuse worker, I have witnessed examples of terrible cruelty within the American family. From talking with women's groups, I knew that battered wives could be found in every economic class and social group. I honestly thought I understood the problem.

But since then, I have learned that the situation is even more serious than I thought a year ago. Victims of domestic violence are beginning to speak out publicly. "Respectable" wives are no longer ashamed to admit that they are battered spouses. Because of my own interest in the subject, women have begun to share their own private experiences with me—and their experiences are heart-breaking. Violence in the American home is a quiet epidemic and it is getting worse as our economic situation worsens.

American society is today increasingly complex, difficult—and scary. People are afraid that they won't have enough gas to get to work; or that they will lose their jobs because the economy is so uncertain. They are worried about whether they'll be able to pay their home heating bills; and when they go to the grocery store, they find they can't even afford hamburger anymore. We should not be surprised that these tensions and frustrations are being taken out at home—at the expense of anyone who is weaker and/or dependent.

And once violence begins in the home, it escalates dramatically. Once a husband has hit his wife for the first time and nothing happens—it is easier to hit her for the second and third time until severe beatings become a way of life, reverberating throughout the entire family. Children who see violence become batterers themselves, because they have learned that hitting is an acceptable form of behavior.

One woman told me that she left her husband after eight years of severe beatings only when she saw her 8-year-old son beat his 5-year-old sister because she didn't turn on the TV when he ordered her to. What disturbed the mother the most was that her son's face was innocent and self-righteous and her daughter's wretched with guilt. Neither child thought that she or he had done anything out of the ordinary.

This violence starting in the home has repercussions throughout society. A recent survey of juvenile offenders indicated that a large percentage of them had either been victims or witnesses of violence in the home. Children who are powerless when they are beaten by their parents will retaliate by brutalizing the old lady next door.

For too long we have refused to admit that this kind of behavior could really happen in our idealized American home. Wife beating was something to be joked about; while the real victims, who knew it wasn't funny, have been too ashamed to speak out. Police officers did not want to treat domestic violence as a crime; the court system has deliberately made it difficult for women to press charges.

Hospital emergency rooms have ignored the real causes of injury and accepted obviously false explanations that let everyone off the hook. Traditional social services were not responsive, because this was a problem that made everyone uncomfortable.

But the problem was too severe to be ignored forever. Support and help from battered women has been developed in a variety of community based shelters, primarily started by volunteers and operating on shoe string budgets. We have never asked the Air Force to hold a bake sale to build the B-1 Bomber; and we don't think that researchers into esoteric diseases should support their own laboratories by running thrift shops; but that is the advice we have given to women trying to save the lives and health of other women. It is time we provided some short term support—both technical and financial—to enable these local programs to reach economic self sufficiency. The battered wife who flees her house in the middle of the night because she is in terror of her life should not have to worry about whether the shelter will be open this week; or get to the door with her children to find that the doors have been closed because there was no money to pay the rent.

A shelter is a place where a woman can catch her breath—both physically and psychologically, with the help and support of the staff and other women at the shelter, she realizes that violence is not her fault; and that she doesn't have to submit to it forever. She can get information about community resources that are available to her, and what options she has to change.

A shelter is not a place to stay forever—or even for very long. A woman who has been brutally beaten should not also have to abandon all her belongings, flee her neighborhood and disrupt her children's schooling for an indefinite period. By its very nature, the shelter is an intermediate solution—but an essential one. In supporting shelters for the victims of domestic violence, we are literally offering refuge to save the lives and health of hundreds of thousands of battered spouses. There can be no more important priority for government than this.

In the long run, we must make substantive changes in our attitude toward domestic violence. We must stop making jokes about wife beatings and start doing something about it. We have to admit that we have a problem so we can take action to solve it.

An important beginning has been made as more people are willing to discuss this issue more openly. I am submitting for inclusion into the record of these hearings an excellent article on this subject which appeared in the Baltimore Jewish Times last week entitled "Battered Wives."

But open discussion and volunteer activity alone can not do the job. State and local governments must become more sensitive and get involved. Traditional social service agencies need to be more interested in domestic violence. They should follow the lead of these police departments which have become really active. The courts and the criminal justice system need to develop more effective response, and the federal government must be the catalyst for action.

The domestic violence prevention services Act, H.R. 2977 include provisions for both the long term and short term approach to this serious problem. It provides limited technical and financial assistance to community based programs that give direct assistance to the victims of domestic violence. It requires states to develop a long term plan which will include changing the criminal justice system, social service delivery and public education.

I believe that passage of this legislation is essential to begin a genuine national commitment to a serious national problem. It is urgently needed; and I hope that the committee will agree with us that it is needed quickly.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to thank you for holding these hearings once again on the issue of family violence, and I would just like to be able to amplify, if I could, Mr. Miller's comments about the broad-based coalition that truly supports this legislation. I think it will be exemplified through the hearings that you will be observing over the next few days. But the bill not only has wide congressional support that is both bipartisan and not partial to a particular philosophical or ideological position in the Congress; it is supported by people who are really concerned about family life in this country and the preservation of life.

Second, when you look at the broad-based types of groups that you have, they include every type from very strong feminist organizations to the International Police Chiefs Association. One out of four police officers who are slain in this country every year are slain at the scene of a domestic violence. The police officer comes in, and unlike when coming upon a burglar or a thug, when he would be defensive and he would have his gun out, his first impulse is to break up the fight. Whoever has a weapon turns, and that is the end of Police Officer So-and-So. So I just wanted you to be aware of that.

For those of you who are new to the committee, perhaps you know me in my congressional hat, but I wasn't always making 57 grand a year reading the Federal Register.

There was a time when I spent probably the first 15 years of my professional career out of college as a social worker. I have a degree in the field. Child welfare and community organization have been my specialty and I have been a child abuse and child neglect worker and a worker in the field of family violence. So I do know a little bit about what I am talking about.

When we introduced this legislation 1 year ago, I knew it was needed, but it is now needed more than ever. I am absolutely convinced that this issue is reaching almost an epidemic proportion in this country. We know that the American economic situation is getting worse. Some people are being called to destiny. Some people are being called to the mountaintop to invent new and creative solutions.

But we have here before us today something that is specific, achievable, and humane. While we are trying to solve the grand picture, we know that American society is becoming increasingly complex and difficult. People are afraid they won't get enough gas to go to work. They are afraid of losing their jobs. And when they go to the grocery store, they find that hamburger has become a gourmet food.

Within this particular climate, we find that family tensions intensify and exacerbate, and what was once simply a family situation of short tempers and impatience explodes into physical violence and even gross brutality. And once it starts, it tends to escalate. And once it escalates, children tend to imitate the behavior of their parents.

So where they see mom and dad beating the heck out of one another, then junior and sissy start beating each other. One of the things also we know from LEAA and other statistics is the victim of child abuse, while he is being beaten when he is 7, at age 17 will turn around and beat the old lady next door. That is the kind of escalation we see.

Now, for too long we have realized that, as Congresswoman Ferraro said, to admit that this kind of behavior could really happen in America—we are the country of the "Run, Puff, Run" readers where dad went to work with a briefcase and everyone was named Dick and Jane and lived happily ever after. Wife beating was something to be joked about, while the real victims who knew it wasn't funny were too ashamed to speak out.

Police officers didn't want to treat family violence as a crime. The court system made it difficult for women to press their charges, and hospital emergency rooms found it more convenient to ignore the real causes of injury and accept obviously false explanations that let everyone off the hook because it was easier. She came in

battered, bruised, and beaten. They were more willing to listen to her say "I ran into my ironing board" than to face up to the horrible conditions in her home because they didn't know what to do with it and they didn't have the resources.

In my own background, my own social services were very often not responsive because this was a problem that made everyone feel uncomfortable. The problem was too severe to be ignored forever. Support and help came from battered women, developed from a variety of community-based shelters. As has been stated earlier, it started with volunteers operating on shoestring budgets.

Members of the committee, you know, when we talk about national security, when we talk about saving lives, we never ask the Air Force to hold a bake sale to build a B-1 bomber, and we don't ask researchers in esoteric diseases to support their own laboratories by running thrift shops. Yet that is the advice we give American women trying to save the lives and health of other women.

I feel it is time we provided some short-term support, both technical and financial, to enable these local programs to reach economic self-sufficiency. That is a key component to our legislation: Federal activity is catalytic so that local communities can move to economic self-sufficiency.

The battered wife who flees her house in the middle of the night because she is in terror should not have to worry about the shelter being open or about where her children are going to be able to survive.

To just further amplify what questions were raised about a shelter, a shelter is a place where a woman can catch her breath, both physically and psychologically, with the help and support of the staff and other people at the shelter. She realizes the violence is not her fault and that she doesn't have to submit to it. She can get information about how to change her life and what options are available.

A shelter is not a place to stay forever or for even very long. A woman who has been brutally beaten should not also have to abandon her belongings or get out of her neighborhood or disrupt her children's schooling, but it is essential that the shelter be an intermediate solution.

In supporting shelters for victims of domestic violence, we are literally offering refuge to have the lives and health of hundreds of thousands of battered spouses. I don't think there can be any more important priority for this government than this. In the long run we would make substantive changes in our attitudes toward domestic violence. We must stop making jokes about wife-beating and start doing something about it.

We have to admit that we have a problem and that we can take action to solve it. Many articles are being written on this subject. My own local magazine, the Baltimore Jewish Times, has an extensive article which I submit for the record. But really, we find that open discussion and volunteer activity cannot just do the job. State and local governments must become sensitive and get involved. Social agencies need to become more involved.

The Federal Government must be the catalytic factor. The legislation offered by Boggs, Miller, and myself includes provision for long-term and short-term approach and provides limited technical and

financial assistance to community-based programs, but it is the first step, I think, in dealing with a very serious problem.

In conclusion, I would hope that the committee is aware that in dealing with this problem today, not only will we save lives but we really, I think, will give people, and not only the adult victims of battering, the right to a future. If we can intervene in some type of solid, ongoing way that brings about change, I think that we are going to see a lot less violence in the next generation.

So I hope you found my insights helpful and I will be happy to answer any questions you have. I look forward to your unanimous vote from the subcommittee.

Mr. SIMON. While that applause technically violated the rules of the House, I think it speaks for the subcommittee and our appreciation of your leadership on this.

I have no questions. Mr. Beard.

Mr. BEARD. (Nods negatively.)

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Kramer.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Barbara, my experience is not in this area. However, I have had some experience with LEAA. I have seen some of the same problems that LEAA has had with regard to moving into this type of program, if it is established. Much of LEAA, apparently, for purposes of equipment and the like has been siphoned off to other programs. As a result LEAA has never really been able to meet the general challenge of solving the problem of rampant crime in our country, for which it was established.

One of the frequent comments I heard when I was a State legislator was that the Federal Government provides the seed money and thereby gets the State on the hook. When Uncle Sam pulls out, then there is no solid source of funding left. Many of these programs, therefore, last 3 years and then die. Then someone starts up another one where new Federal grant funds are available and it lasts for 3 years before it then dies.

Do you see any similar problems in the way in which this bill is structured? I notice that it reads that you can get up to 50 percent the first year, and then the Federal contribution drops to 25 percent. Then there is a total pullout after 3 years. In light of the background I discussed, both in terms of what LEAA was set up to do originally and what they have, in effect, really done, and also in terms of the 3-year phaseout, do you see any of the same problems arising if this seed program were to be created?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Kramer, I share your concerns. When the three architects of this legislation drafted this, we tried to take this into consideration. Let me outline the difference. No. 1, the money goes to community-based groups. It does not go to big agencies who want to siphon off our bucks to pay for their own administrative costs, and that is one of the things I have seen. Very often Federal funds were used as a closet way of paying for city and county programs.

And second, I too saw the hardware acquisition of the law enforcement system. They were buying tanks and helicopters and all that other kind of stuff. In this way, the emphasis is not on the Government buying, building, and constructing their own shelters but in maximiz-

ing the resources in our own community by providing the bucks for programs and not necessarily by building.

So examples would be like this. Rather than the city of Baltimore building its own shelter, it could through community development block grant money get the facility another way. It could, for example, have a consortium of services where the Catholic charities in a local community could donate a no longer used convent, while the bucks from this program could be used for staff.

So it moves from the acquisition of buildings and into the providing of services.

Second, in terms of States, not only is the time factor built in but we are talking about two things: One, that you need a State plan, which means you begin to identify the resources within your State to do that; second, when LEAA was created in the days of the great society, the Federal Government had all the bucks and the States were poor.

My reading of today's economic situation shows that the States are loaded while we have a deficit. My own State has a \$200 million surplus that it wasn't quite sure how to distribute in a way that would meet the needs of Maryland. So I think the States have the money, and the discipline of developing the plan, I think, has shifted. But I think you are going to need a combined series of support.

I believe in voluntary fundraising, but it should not be the sole source. That is why I made my comments about the thrift shop. I think a partnership between Government, the United Fund Agencies and then aggressive fundraising on the part of the services themselves would meet the need.

I don't know if that answers your question.

Mr. KRAMER. I have one more question. In light of your statement about the Federal and State situation. Conceptually do we want to get, from a pure economic standpoint, the Federal Government involved in the subject area of domestic violence? Would it not better be handled at the State and local level if financing is made available from the States to groups such as have appeared before us today. Would it not be better for these groups to go to the State legislatures and explain their problems or to local governmental entities to explain their problems and request funding rather than setting in operation a whole new Federal apparatus to deal with what appears to me to be a State issue?

Ms. MIKULSKI. First of all, there are two ways that initiatives get started in this country: One through mass-based social movements, and that is really what the Coalition of Battered Women is all about. It is truly a mass-based movement. It is not something Lindy Boggs, George Miller, and Barbara Mikulski thought up. I am not criticizing your view.

It is out of this that in effect they have turned to where the traditional leadership has begun to be a catalyst nationwide, and that is the Federal Government. What we find is that some States have been very aggressive, very responsive, and others have been quite lackluster.

So I think we have had a historic role, No. 1. But the other thing about this legislation is we leave it free to the local community to design the kind of program that it best needs itself. We are not coming up with a shelter franchise program for Holiday Inn to go into.

What we are talking about is where grassroot groups design their own program.

Congressman Kramer, the kind of program you would run in affluent Montgomery County is one type. It is suburban. It has public transportation. There are easy opportunities for anonymity. That would be very different from a program you would run in a barrio in south Texas or in the hollows of Appalachia or in the inner city of Baltimore.

So we want local communities to be able to design those kinds of programs which best meet their needs, through the creativity of the local community. We provide a few bucks as a catalytic factor, and then through the State plan, hopefully they will then be more responsive at that level.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you for your support and your leadership. Let me make that clear. It is not a supporting role; it is a role of leadership in keeping this issue before the Congress. I guess the sad thing about today is that we are still talking about implementation rather than some kind of aggressive oversight to see how the program is working, but hopefully that will end with this Congress when this legislation is passed. And the credit clearly must go to you.

I just want to join with what you have said. We can argue about whether this is a local responsibility or a Federal responsibility, and I have never found that there is any clear prescription for either one. It generally goes to whether or not the local Congressman who is getting heat can generate a solution or whether it is only a solution that can be generated at the local level.

I think in this case we are. We are trying to provide the catalyst. We heard testimony last year from people who were trying to start these programs in communities where there was simply no support because of the nature of the community, the closeness of the community, that almost the community felt ashamed to admit that this was a problem in their setting.

I think that what we are providing here, hopefully, is the ability to bring together other resources, whether it is to draw upon CETA placements, whether it is to draw upon charitable moneys, the coordination of other programs to meet what is clearly a local problem but also is clearly national in scope because it is in every community. It is from Bethesda to the poorest communities in my district. It is in every economic strata of this country, as members of this committee will hear today and tomorrow.

It is a problem of national scope, and the numbers alone dictate that the Federal Government provide some assistance. I go back, and I guess we all have favorites. Henry Hyde mentioned programs he thinks we are spending too much on. Mr. Kramer has his. Barbara, you have yours. But for six cases of swine flu, in 2 hours we found \$300 million, and now we are incurring billions of dollars in lawsuits.

I think the question is, after 3 years of rather judicious hearings on this matter, whether or not we can find an almost embarrassingly small amount to try to help a limited number of communities with an overwhelming problem and to try to address it.

So I think we ought not to get sidetracked on the question of Federal problems versus local problems. The testimony today, I think,

will bear out exactly what you have said. This is the offer of somewhat of a helping hand to those people who are interested enough in their own community and the people in their community and the families to try to address a serious problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous consent that I could insert, at a point after Congresswoman Mikulski's testimony, my opening statement for the record.

Mr. SIMON. It will be entered in the record.

[The prepared statement of Hon. George Miller follows:]

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE MILLER

I would like to thank the chairman for providing this opportunity to consider domestic violence legislation, including my bill, H.R. 2977, and his subcommittee staff for their efforts in putting together a hearing on this critical but generally ignored issue. I only regret that rather than playing our appropriate oversight function on already enacted legislation, we find ourselves renewing our efforts to provide Federal support for victims of spousal abuse, a problem which has tragically invaded millions of American families, a problem which continues to go unreported or underreported, a problem which leaves many people without shelter or protection, and without any means of financial support.

Last year's legislation and hearings drew national attention to one of the most prevalent social problems in our country. Most Members of Congress were startled to learn the extremely disturbing facts about the level of domestic violence. However, while we have successfully illuminated the extent of the problem and stimulated activity at all levels of government, unfortunately, we have failed in our leadership role to respond to the grave and immediate needs of the millions of families who are victims.

The results of Congress inaction are costly in terms of physical and emotional stability of families, fatalities among those who are abused as well as among police who come to their aid, and inappropriate and consequently costly placement and treatment of victims. A number of social service providers will testify today to the currently ineffective and inefficient use of human and monetary resources and, on the other hand, stimulate our thinking on ways to respond sensitively. We will also have the opportunity to hear from various representatives of the administration concerning initiatives they have taken to learn more about the problems related to spousal abuse.

Let me take a moment to retrace our steps. As many of you may remember, last year I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 12299, the Domestic Violence Assistance Act. It was cosponsored by many of my subcommittee colleagues and by my colleagues from Louisiana and Maryland, Lindy Boggs and Barbara Mikulski. Throughout the development of this legislation, this bill enjoyed strong bipartisan support. Because the legislation responded so well to the particular needs of the estimated 1.8 million battered spouses annually, it received enormous grassroots support. A diverse coalition of professional organizations—including the American Bar Association, the International Association of Police Chiefs, the International Brotherhood of Policemen, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the National League of Cities, and the United Auto Workers—also endorsed our legislation.

H.R. 12299 failed under suspension of the rules in May of last year. Nevertheless, pressure from local communities and interest groups throughout the country, led to the House Rules Committee considering my legislation. Late in September 1978 the committee granted a rule, clearing the way for floor consideration.

Since this mounting interest had also successfully gained the passage of a companion measure in the Senate, it is regrettable that the House did not have time to consider the bill before the close of the 95th Congress.

In response to concerns raised about my legislation, I have made some modifications in the components of this year's bill, H.R. 2977, which has already been cosponsored by 80 House Members. This year's bill provides a role for the States in planning and conducting programs. We have continued to stress limited Federal support of community based programs. Throughout the legislation, an emphasis has been placed on minimizing Federal intervention and retaining control of the program in the hands of the local people. At this point, I would like to insert for the record a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 2977. This analysis

describes in detail the State and Federal grant programs which the bill authorizes.

Since I introduced H.R. 2977, the President has established an administrative mechanism in HEW which could play a pivotal role in the implementation of the domestic violence prevention and services act. I believe the actions taken by the administration are an encouraging first step. However, this is not enough.

It is essential that Congress take the second step in fashioning a coordinated and effective response to the problems of spousal abuse. For despite laudatory efforts initiated at the State and local level, violence among family members continues unabated. Even where assistance is available, the demand for emergency care as well as longer-term preventive services far exceeds the supply. Enactment of H.R. 2977 would be a fiscally wise investment in the American family.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to thank the distinguished colleague for her blunt and perceptive testimony. It was very helpful.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Sheriff?

Mr. STACK. Blunt? The gentle lady, when she began her testimony, made reference to going to the top of her mountain. I would say, in the context of her testimony and the problem we are addressing here today, she has been to the mountain. She demonstrates this by her very perceptive and broad view that she has given us here of the problem.

I congratulate her and the other authors, who she has clearly intimidated. [General laughter.]

I would say that I would support the legislation.

I will support the legislation fully. I thank you and I have to leave at this point.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Congressman Stack. It is just my feeling that if we can provide Camp David as a shelter for battered Presidents, we can provide shelter for battered women. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. STACK. Right on, Barbara.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you for your testimony.

Our next witness is Dr. Jeanie Meyer, Research Associate of the Kansas City Police Department.

We are happy to have you with us, Dr. Meyer, and if you wish to enter your statement in the record and summarize it, we can proceed in that way or in whatever way you wish.

Ms. MEYER. I would just like to summarize my statement.

Mr. SIMON. All right. It will be entered into the record.

[The prepared statement of Jeanie Keeny Meyer follows:]

TESTIMONY OF JEANIE KEENY MEYER, KANSAS CITY, MO., POLICE DEPARTMENT

INTRODUCTION

I am speaking today from two perspectives: first, as a researcher for the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department, I would like to reiterate the results of research we have conducted in the area of domestic disturbances; secondly, I would like to briefly share information (and frustration) about the obstacles to developing a program in Kansas City to address the domestic violence problem of the scope, both in terms of numbers and complexity, which our research has documented.

The Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department has been engaged in research on domestic violence since 1972, initially with support from the Police Foundation and most recently with grant support (R01MH 27918) from the National Institute of Mental Health. The results of this research, which have been widely cited, are startling both in terms of the pervasiveness of the problem and the level of violence endemic in family dispute situations.

VOLUME OF DISTURBANCE CALLS AS A POLICE PROBLEM

Looking first at domestic violence incidents as they come to the attention of the police, we find that disturbance calls¹ to which Kansas City, Missouri, Police responded in 1975, numbered approximately 64,000 or 12 percent of the total number of calls received. These disturbances (of which 40,000 were "founded," that is a disturbance was still in progress when officers arrived) consumed an average of 41 minutes each—which means that, since two officers are required to respond to each disturbance, a total of 43,733 law enforcement hours or \$524,799 (i.e., 43,733 hours × 2 officers × \$6.00 an hour) were expended.

REPEAT POLICE CALLS TO THE SAME DISTURBANCE LOCATION

Much has been written about the inadequacy of the police response to family violence situations. While the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department's policy is to respond to all calls, training, attitude and resource deficiencies of police response, as documented elsewhere, are indeed recurrent problems. A look at the number of times to which officers make repeat calls to the same disturbance address is one quantifiable manifestation of police difficulty in dealing with such situations.

Within the 1976, calendar year, the police had been at the address of an assault previously for disturbance calls in 33 percent of the cases (607 of 1,832) at least once and in 19 percent of the cases (349 of 1,832) two or more times. Police had been at the address of a homicide previously for disturbance calls in 29 percent of the cases (19 of 66)² at least once and in 17 percent of the cases (11 of 66) two or more times.

These computations about the number of repeat calls to disturbance scenes further support our earlier Kansas City, findings that:

In 27 percent of the homicides and 37 percent of the aggravated assaults one of the participants had been arrested for disturbance or assault in the preceding two years.

In the two years prior to the domestic assault or homicide, the police had been at the address of the incident for disturbance calls in 85 percent of the cases at least once and in 54 percent of the cases, five or more times.

OBSTACLES TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The research evidence I have cited today is significant both in terms of the gravity of the problem it describes and in terms of the potential it suggests for an "early warning system" for family violence. That is, at least for that portion of family violence which is reported to police, there are a sizable number of disturbance calls which precede, and therefore should alert us to the potential for greater violence in the future at that same location.

The Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department, recognizing the importance of these findings, has been working to try to develop programs which can address the needs identified. In collaboration with a newly developed shelter for battered women in Kansas City, Rose Brooks Center, Inc., efforts are underway to forge an alliance between police and much-needed crisis intervention, emergency shelter and extended social services.

I would like to share with you some of the difficulties in trying to develop resources and programs for battered women. These are some of the problems encountered by Rose Brooks Center, Inc., which other community-based shelters as well report as constraints and obstacles to the task of "networking" the range of services needed to respond to victims of violence and their dependents.

1. *Food Stamp Program—Department of Agriculture.*—In some jurisdiction food stamp programs are restricted to persons living in single-family dwelling units. This excludes the use of such stamps by abused women who are in a group housing situation in an emergency shelter where they take refuge.

¹ At the time police cars are sent to the scene of a call, the dispatcher assigns calls to a classification. The number cited here includes calls either originally assigned the classification of disturbance or reclassified as disturbance by the officer after arrival at the scene. It is impossible to positively determine from this data set precisely just which of these disturbances were domestic, i.e. occurred in a residence or between family members. The dispatcher sub-categories of disturbance here assumed to encompass domestic disturbances were: "disturbance" (general, "investigative trouble," "mental" and "noise."

² The numbers of incidents given the dispatch call classification of homicide does not correspond exactly to the number of incidents reported as UCR homicide offenses.

2. *Hot Breakfast/Lunch Program—Department of Agriculture.*—At the present time, emergency shelters provide housing and care for the children of abuse victims, but as yet the shelters are not recognized as eligible institutions to receive reimbursement for a hot breakfast and lunch program.

3. *Department of Housing and Urban Development.*—Eligibility for admittance into public housing is confined to families. While a battered woman with kids, may be admitted under these guidelines, the battered woman without children is excluded. Moreover, some jurisdictions will consider the husband's income as an eligibility criterion even if the woman applying is separated, fleeing from an abusive spouse and without financial support.

4. *Legal Aid—Legal Services Corporation; Community Mental Health Centers—NIMH.*—The issue of eligibility is again a restricting factor in obtaining services from these agencies, since a husband's income is considered even when the applicant is a battered woman, from an abusive spouse, who has limited or no financial resource of her own.

5. *Domestic Violence Program—Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.*—While a comprehensive domestic violence program model emphasizing prosecution is being supported by discretionary LEAA funding, it appears that the evolution of such program models should recognize the need for phased service development. Right now, so few cities have put together an adequate service delivery system for family violence victims, that battered women, for example, do not have sufficient access to resources and support to enable them to persevere in their intent to prosecute a violent spouse, especially where shelter, counseling, and financial independence from the man being prosecuted, are absent. Realistically, jurisdictions need to have criminal justice and social service training and services in place before an increase in the rate of domestic assault prosecution can be expected.

SUMMARY OVERVIEW

What we have learned from the research and early program development efforts in the area of domestic violence can tell us much about future domestic violence intervention programming design.

We know that the needs of domestic violence victims and their dependents cut across a wide spectrum of existing criminal justice and social service providers. We also know that the nature and complexity of family violence and its origins have only recently begun to be recognized. While agencies and services relevant to the violence victim often already exist, as in law enforcement, counseling, food, housing and jobs, frequently these services as structured now are either ineffective, due to lack of understanding or training or unavailable to the violence victim particularly the battered woman, due to inappropriate eligibility requirements.

Seed money for domestic violence programming can stimulate the development of programs which can eventually be institutionalized in their communities, if the special service coordination, training and eligibility of the client population are recognized.

STATEMENT OF JEANIE KEENY MEYER, POLICE DEPARTMENT, KANSAS CITY, MO.

Ms. MEYER. I am speaking today from two different kinds of perspectives, first of all as a researcher for the Kansas City (Mo.) police department. I would like to share with you some of the research that we have been conducting in the area of domestic violence.

I would also like to share with you some information and also some frustration about the obstacles of developing a domestic violence shelter program within the Kansas City area. Looking first at the disturbance call, which is the form in which family violence comes to the attention of the police officer, we find that disturbance calls really consume a tremendous amount of officer time and, as has also been said earlier, is a very dangerous kind of situation.

In terms of time, in 1975 there were 40,000 disturbances within the Kansas City area and these represent about 12 percent of the total

number of calls police officers make. In terms of money, averaging about 40 minutes for each call. This comes to about a half million dollars just in terms of response to disturbance calls.

There has also been a lot written about the inadequacy of police response to family violence situations, and while the Kansas City (Mo.) police department's policy is to respond to all calls, training, attitude, and resource deficiencies of police response is an ongoing and recurrent problem.

Look at the number of times which officers make repeat calls to the same disturbance address. I think that is one way of seeing very tangibly the lack of resources and the inadequacies of the response, and also the violence of those situations. I would like to quote some of the findings that we have with regard to disturbances.

In 27 percent of the homicides and 37 percent of the aggravated assaults, one of the participants had been arrested for disturbance or assault in the preceding two years. In the two years prior to the domestic assault or homicide, the police had been at the address of the incidence for disturbance calls, in 85 percent of the cases, at least once, and in 54 percent of the cases, five or more times.

So I think you can see the linkage between the disturbance and violence and also why violence is perceived as a problem for police officers, both in terms of danger to themselves and also in terms of the inadequacy of their own training, background and resources.

I would like to also share with you some of the difficulties in trying to develop resources and programs for battered women. These are some of the problems which have been encountered by a new shelter in Kansas City, Rosebrook Center, but they are also shared, I think, by other community-based shelters who report these kinds of constraints and obstacles in developing resources and networking resources for the very complex kinds of problems which shelters have to deal with.

I am going to just share with you a couple of examples of programs which look in terms of their target area, which is very relevant to the needs of victims of family violence but which, for one reason or another at this point do not seem to be coordinated in order to make those reasonable resources.

First of all, in terms of the food stamp program, in some jurisdictions food stamp programs are restricted to persons living in single family dwelling units. This excludes the use of such stamps by abused women who are in a group housing situation in an emergency shelter where they take refuge. The hot breakfast and lunch program of the Department of Agriculture is, I think, another example where at the present time emergency shelters provide housing and care for the children of abuse victims; but as yet, the shelters are not recognized as eligible institutions to receive reimbursement for a hot breakfast and lunch program.

At HUD, eligibility for admittance into public housing is confined to families. While a battered woman with kids may be admitted under these guidelines, the battered woman without children is excluded. Moreover, some jurisdictions will consider the husband's income as an eligibility criterion even if the woman applying is separated or fleeing from an abusive spouse and is without financial support.

Legal Aid, and also community mental health centers. The issue of eligibility is also a restricting factor in obtaining services from these

agencies since the husband's income is considered even when the applicant is a battered woman who has limited or no financial resources of her own.

In terms of LEAA's domestic violence program, this is a comprehensive model which emphasizes prosecution, being currently funded by discretionary LEAA funding. But it appears that the evolution of such program models should recognize the need for phased service development. By that I mean that right now there are very few cities who have put together an adequate, comprehensive service delivery system for family violence victims.

In many cases the battered women, for example, do not have sufficient access to resources and support in order to enable them to persevere in their intent to prosecute a violent spouse, especially where shelter, counseling and financial independence from the man being prosecuted are absent.

Realistically, I think jurisdictions need to have criminal justice and social service training and services in place before we can really begin to see an increase in the rate of domestic assault prosecution. I think what we have learned from the research and early program development efforts in the area of domestic violence can tell us a great deal about future domestic violence programming design.

We know that the needs of domestic violence victims and their dependents cut across a wide spectrum of existing criminal justice and social services. We also know that the nature and complexity of family violence and its origins have only recently begun to be recognized, while agencies and services relevant to the violence victim often already exist, as in law enforcement, counseling, food, housing and jobs.

Frequently these services as structured now are either ineffective due to lack of understanding or training, or unavailable to the violence victim, particularly the battered women, due to inappropriate eligibility requirements. I think seed money which is represented in House bill 2977 for domestic violence programming can stimulate the development of programs which can eventually be institutionalized into their communities, and I think that can only happen if the special service coordination, training, and eligibility of the client population are recognized.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you for your statement and for the impressive statistics. I have one question. You cite these problem areas. On point one, the food stamp program, the hot breakfast and lunch program, number two, and number four, particularly the legal aid portion there, do you happen to know if the restrictions there are statutory or regulatory?

Ms. MEYER. I really cannot tell you. I know in some cases those things vary in terms of State policies.

Mr. SIMON. Tom, if I could ask the staff, let's check that out. I think that is something which is not directly related to the bill at hand, but I think it is an important point which you have made where there obviously ought to be some changes made which could be of substantial assistance.

Another reason for moving in this area is that these kinds of inconsistencies in statutes or regulations can be modified.

Ms. MEYER. I think that is one reason why the coordinating element of the bill would be important in terms of these kinds of issues.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Meyer, I want to thank you for coming and sharing your experience and research with us. I think the two points which you point out which are very helpful to us as we make a decision are, first, that a long time before an individual comes to a shelter and comes to court, as Ms. Ferraro testified to earlier, there has been an involvement and an expenditure of money and services with that individual and with that situation, really, for a long-time prior to their seeking out this kind of help. Your testimony seems to bear that out in terms of Kansas City when you recite how many times the police have been to that address or that living situation prior to the filing of charges or the leaving of home.

I think it is very important that we understand that as we talk about this legislation in terms of prevention.

The other one is, when you cite the obstacles, that is something that we started to become aware of as we addressed this legislation. The administration has scrambled to try to put together some coordinate Federal front on a proposal to coordinate these services, and we have tried to address some of the questions within title XX.

It is somewhat of a leading question, but on page 4 where you talk about the services being available—and I think sometimes this is what we equate with a local problem here, that they are already there, they can already get this help. I guess if you persevere, the county hospital is there so you can always end up in the county hospital, and the jail is there so the husband can always end up in jail. The services are there.

Let me ask you. Is this your own opinion or is this the result of some of the studies that you have done in terms of shelters leading to a coordination of State and local services for victims?

Ms. MEYER. This is a result of some of the collaborative effort the Kansas City Police Department has been engaged in trying to develop a shelter program in Kansas City. And I think it also points out, in addition to Federal regulations in terms of administration of programs, also the very real need to do some education and training for professional workers who really are not familiar with the complexity of working with battered women and some of the very special needs that they have. So I think the training issue is also very relevant.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Kramer.

Mr. KRAMER. Dr. Meyer, do you have any involvement in this area other than involvement in the statistical analysis?

Ms. MEYER. I am also on the board of the shelter in Kansas City.

Mr. KRAMER. I mean, in terms of your association with the Kansas City Police Department?

Ms. MEYER. I am the researcher there.

Mr. KRAMER. Do you get into this area in detail, or is this one of the areas you cover in compiling other statistics for the department?

Ms. MEYER. We have been involved in a couple of research projects. One was funded by the police foundation, and most recently one funded by NIMH.

Mr. KRAMER. Were you yourself involved in those research projects?
[Ms. Meyer nods affirmatively.]

Mr. KRAMER. What, in your judgment, would this legislation do that is not presently available to you now in some form in Kansas City, for example?

Ms. MEYER. One of the major problems in terms of establishing credibility for a new kind of program, particularly a program like this in the area of domestic violence, which does make a lot of people nervous and is not very well understood, is, first of all, getting community acceptance for the issue, credibility for the issue; and second of all, in terms of approaching private contributors.

It is like going to a bank. You have to have money to get money. So that they like to know that there is some stability, there is some core kind of funding. That, again, is one of the problems in terms of attracting money or contributions to a program.

Mr. KRAMER. In terms of the scope of the problem itself, and your own experience, you cited some examples in terms of percentages. I see, for example, your statistics on disturbances here. Does that mean domestic disturbance?

Ms. MEYER. Yes. And the data collection is difficult because it is not a pure just domestic disturbances. There is some bias in the data in terms of classification, but other types of disturbances other than residential disturbances have been paired off out of that.

Mr. KRAMER. Do you have any specific statistics on domestic disturbances per se?

Ms. MEYER. These are domestic disturbances. But what I am saying is they may not always be solely confined to family members because we don't have that data for this information.

Mr. KRAMER. So you don't break these down at all into what is a husband or a wife battering incident.

Ms. MEYER. Or what is a husband and children or grandchildren. No; not with these statistics. These are based upon all of the calls that officers make during a year's period of time.

Mr. KRAMER. Do you have any statistics of that type?

Ms. MEYER. Yes; we do, although I don't have them with me today.

Mr. KRAMER. You mean you do have statistics of a type limited solely to an analysis of the spousal relationship or things of that sort?

Ms. MEYER. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRAMER. Could you provide those? Quite frankly, I think that they would be more meaningful than perhaps these might be. Would you be able to do that?

Ms. MEYER. I don't have them with me but I can, sure.

Mr. KRAMER. I would appreciate having these statistics in a reasonably short time frame so that we could have them for our own informational purposes when we go through this bill.

Ms. MEYER. Sure.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Ms. Mikulski.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Meyer, I would like to compliment you on the research. I have been sharply critical of NIMH because I have said for years

they sit around and study the victim and do not want to help the victim. I have referred to a lot of Government agencies as being grant junkies and wondered whatever happened to the money. But I can see your money was put to good use even though we may not have the numerical data Congressman Kramer is asking for.

Have you developed any kind of profiles of disturbance situations? Is there a profile that emerges in Kansas City that most of the victims are women or men or where there is battering of spouse there is usually battering of children, or have you put together any kind of a profile?

Ms. MEYER. We really don't have that kind of data specifically in terms of profiles.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Tell me from your own experience. You might not be able to tell me what your computer tells me, but what do you know from your observations in working with the data?

Ms. MEYER. Generally in terms of working with the problem we very much see a pattern between family members living together. I guess one of the things that has been surprising to me is to see again the number of times in which the children are actually involved, particularly, as I worked with a case last week where there was an older boy who was very much intimidated by the father and picked on by the father and was very much torn at the time when the mother was leaving the home with her children, fleeing from the home when the husband had gotten angry and was waving around a gun, and seeing the elder boy scared, really, to leave the father because he had been abused by him before.

In this case the woman had gone back to him because she had tried to make it on her own and didn't have enough resources, so she had left the home with this older son and had gone back and he was abused again and, I suppose, punished for leaving with her. So it is that kind of a situation.

Ms. MIKULSKI. But it is your observation, though, that where there is abuse in the family, it is not usually one person upon another but is of a multiple type?

Ms. MEYER. In many cases it is.

Ms. MIKULSKI. You raise some other interesting issues in your testimony, one of which is how Federal policy in itself mitigates against delivering an effective social service program. As you know, our legislation calls for a national clearinghouse for the purpose of collecting information, reviewing Federal, State, and local programs, et cetera, to see how this works.

Do you think that would be an important tool: one, a clearinghouse where you could go for help, and second, where we have to sit around in the same room and make sure we are getting service to the people who need it?

Ms. MEYER. Absolutely, especially in terms of those are resources that are already there but right now they are not accessible to the clients of shelters. So I think that is definitely an important element of the bill.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So to summarize what you are saying, we must place a great deal of emphasis on the shelter aspect, but you feel a clearinghouse is critical?

Ms. MEYER. (Nods affirmatively.)

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No further questions.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you, Dr. Meyer.

I might mention to Dr. Meyer and to any of the other witnesses that if you have any suggestions as you look over the legislation as to how it might be modified, if you have suggestions for the future, the hope of the Chair is that immediately after the Labor Day recess, we will mark up legislation and move ahead, so any suggestions ought to be in by that time.

Thank you, Dr. Meyer.

Our next witness is Dr. Saul Edelstein, director of emergency services, George Washington University Hospital.

Dr. Edelstein, we welcome you here and you can proceed as you wish.

We can enter your statement in the record and you can summarize it, or however you wish to proceed.

STATEMENT OF DR. SAUL EDELSTEIN, DIRECTOR, EMERGENCY SERVICES, GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL

Dr. EDELSTEIN. My prepared statement is not ready today, unfortunately, because of some local secretarial problems, which are not uncommon in our institution. But I do have some comments to make in that when I received a call from your staff asking me to make some testimony here today, I realized how ignorant I was of the problem.

Being rather active in local and national circles in emergency medicine, I contacted several directors, both locally and throughout the country. Frankly, I couldn't find anyone who knew anything about this problem.

My second step was to go to the library, as all academics want to do, and run a search through the National Medical Library related to the battered spouse syndrome. I brought that with me because I thought it was remarkably deplete. You will find that if you run this search for English literature articles, a total of 26 articles will appear, only one of which, and that comes out of the British Medical Journal, relates to the incidence, prevalence, and numbers of battered spouses. That article was done in 1977.

So 2 years ago it was recognized by someone and there has been no single piece of research in the American literature, the American medical literature, that I am aware of that relates to this particular problem.

So I went to the next step, which was to review our own records in our emergency room. We are a very busy, active downtown Washington, D.C. emergency room. We see approximately 40,000 patients a year. And in the first 6 months of this year, which would be 20,000 patient visits, I was able to identify from the record three cases of battered spouses.

That seemed remarkably low to me, but I didn't know. I thought maybe the problem is much more exaggerated than actually exists, and maybe exaggerated in the lay literature. So I then began to query my staff, primarily the nursing staff, and asked them if indeed this problem exists; and indeed, it does.

It breaks out into three types of patients who come to the emergency room. When they come to the emergency room, we are usually seeing the end result. We are in that case, I think, the place of last

resort. The three types are: the patient who presents with a life-threatening injury, who has no choice but to come to the emergency room, either by ambulance or other conveyance. And I would like to cite an example that occurred here in Washington about a year ago, a little over a year ago during the winter months.

It was a 22-year-old white female who was brought to our emergency room on a cold night by the ambulance, who had jumped out of a second story just north of Dupont Circle on Connecticut Avenue, which, as you also know, is a very busy thoroughfare. She was totally nude at the time. She had jumped because she had been stabbed by her husband multiple times and that didn't stop him.

He then cut all her hair off and poured gasoline on her and tried to burn her. He was unable to ignite the gasoline and, as a last resort, he tried to strangle her. After all of these insults, she finally made the decision to break free. She went through the second story window onto Connecticut Avenue.

She came to us. She required operative management and further intensive care. In fact, while she was in our institution she cost a minimum of \$700 a day in our intensive care unit. Now, we get two or three of these type of females a year, but I have to agree with Representative Miller's comment that the males who come are severely battered.

They are not the ones who get punched. They are not the ones who get clubbed with a chair. Their male egos or what have you prevent them from coming. It is the ones who have been stabbed or shot or the ones who are dead. There are very rarely numbers on those.

The fact of the matter is I believe that severe battered spouses probably rank equally in the male category. And again, there is no research that I am aware of to support any of this data. There is no data. But I would suggest that the committee—I have not seen the legislation—think about developing appropriate data.

The second type of patient is the patient who comes in with a mild injury, if you will, one which is not life threatening, and who claims that she has indeed been beaten by herself, or he has been beaten by his spouse. We had an example about 3 weeks ago of an elderly male about 70 years old who was getting away from his spouse who was beating him and tried to enter into the emergency room treatment area to continue to beat him.

These patients are low in number, though. It is rare the battered spouse will come in and say to the clerk: I am here because someone is beating me up.

The third group of patients, which is the vast majority, are females who have come in with a bruising, a fracture, something of that nature, who claim to have fallen in the bathtub, fallen down the stairs the day before or the night before, rarely at the time of the incident. They make this complaint, they come in, and when the nurse is in the room, the nurse will often confront them and ask them directly whether or not they have indeed fallen down the stairwell or have been beaten.

Most of the time they will admit on direct inquiry by the nurse—rarely to the physician, I must add, maybe because of the male-female syndrome or what have you—that yes, they indeed have been beaten. Would they like to press charges? No, they would not like to press charges. Where are they going to go? Well, they will figure it out.

In talking with our social worker, who I think is superb, I queried her in depth about the number of patients she has had to send out or was not able to locate or get an appropriate disposition for. At least from the emergency room setting, it does not happen very often. It may be our inability or our lack of identifying these patients, which I think is a critical factor, frankly, but when we do identify them, there do seem to be resources within the community.

I would also like to point out that since we are a downtown hospital and we are close to a well-known corridor on 14th Street, that there are a group of women who are maintaining relationships with males—I don't know how you classify them—but obviously who are in some sort of unusual relationship, primarily prostitutes who come in and are often severely beaten, who are often dead on arrival. And I am not sure whether your legislation—I don't know that it is intended to, but from my point of view, no one pays any attention to these women.

We had one Saturday night, a young female, who was stabbed in the chest and who was stabbed so severely in the head that she required neurosurgical treatment. I think that is a group of women who, though not in the traditional nuclear family, this committee ought to consider.

If I have any suggestions to make to the committee, I would suggest that there be adequate funds or what have you to insure that data is compiled. I don't really think, at least from the medical community, that we know what we are talking about. I would be glad to look at the literature if it exists, but it does not.

Finally, I think you need to educate the health professionals. The sensitivity to this syndrome in our emergency room, I think, is not very high. As I queried around the country, I don't think it is high in other emergency rooms.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. SIMON. You have said it very well and we appreciate that testimony. It was interesting.

If I may make an observation here, back when I was in the legislature in the State of Illinois, I sponsored a bill to outlaw professional boxing. I discovered there was all kinds of medical research on what happens to the brains of boxers, and, I think, properly so because it is the one sport where we reward people for literally doing damage to someone else's brain. "Punch drunk" is, in fact, probably the only medical term which has become a part of the common language, or one of the few.

But it is amazing that there is not that kind of medical data on what is obviously a much more common problem, which you have just touched on. I think you have given us a couple of excellent suggestions.

Let me ask two questions. No. 1, as you went through medical school, do you ever recall this kind of problem being discussed at all?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Medical school, residency, what have you; no, it is not discussed now. It is not discussed in our medical school.

Mr. SIMON. Then you mentioned that the nurses say that the women do admit that they have been beaten. Do the nurses at that point recommend counseling? How is that handled?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Our nurses are a fairly tough breed, and the first thing they recommend is police action, which universally is denied. Then we try to hook them up with our social worker if it is during the

daylight hours. If it is during the evening hours, I think it is characteristic of most hospitals that it is a hassle to find a social worker, and it just becomes that we give them a source of referral to the local agencies here and pretty much leave it at that.

I can tell you we have absolutely no follow-up. I know that. We do not know what happens to these women when they leave our doors.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

I am a little bit confused by your testimony. Is the situation that you don't know whether or not you are receiving the victims of family violence, domestic violence, or that you are not receiving them?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. No; I think the situation is—

Mr. MILLER. When I say "you" don't know, I mean the hospital, because of the manner in which the fact sheet would be written up?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. That is correct. They are not identified.

Mr. MILLER. A crush injury is a crush injury, and your concern is not how the arm got broken but in setting it and getting on to the next patient.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. So your testimony is that if other major hospitals are like your hospitals, you would not really know the number of people who are coming to you as a result of family violence.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. You may have a little better idea with males because you may know, either through emergency room gossip or the ambulance attendants or something else, that he was shot by his wife.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Correct.

Mr. MILLER. But again, it is not a matter of keeping rational information.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. No.

Mr. MILLER. For a moment I thought your testimony was hopeful, that maybe it wasn't getting that bad that we were calling upon the local hospitals, but it doesn't appear that that is the case. Given the Kansas City situation of 40,000 disturbances in progress, I was assuming that maybe we were intercepting some of these before they got to the hospital, but the answer is we don't know that yet.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. The difficulty, I think, is that oftentimes the victims do not want this information on their chart. The clearest example, I think, in this town is we have had instances of congressional wives who have been beaten, who will admit that to the nurse but only upon an agreement that this will not be written on the chart, obviously because if it ever became public it would harm the individual's livelihood or what have you.

Mr. MILLER. I think the chairman points out an important point. Apparently there is no sensitivity during your educational process in becoming a doctor as to this issue. You know the problem. Some States have mandatory laws requiring physicians to report child abuse, and we know there is a great deal of trouble in getting physicians to do that. But in this case there was nothing in terms of your medical background?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. I think the problem goes back to data. There is no data. You cannot ask someone who is trained in a scientific fashion to discuss something on which there is no data.

Mr. MILLER. You are drawing a distinction between medical literature and what is termed "lay" literature?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I think in drafting this legislation, we have been presented with numerous studies as to numbers but they are not necessarily carried out in the confines of medical literature. I understand the argument of persuasion, that doctors only listen to doctors and lawyers only listen to lawyers and we never listen to one another.

[General laughter.]

But my concern is that I just want to make the record clear that you are not testifying that there is not any literature. You are testifying there is not any medical literature. You are not testifying there are not any victims of family violence in major hospitals, but that you don't know whether or not there are. I think that is important in terms of the clarification of the record. That is all I am saying.

I appreciate your testimony. I think it is very, very important because, again, the problem may radiate to other violent situations which we have not even yet come to appreciate. I think that is the value of your testimony. It is very important. In fact, emergency rooms may be the point of last resort for an awful lot of these people.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. SIMON. If I may, I don't mean to speak for the witness here, but if I can just make one slight correction, I think that the witness is not saying that he does not know that it occurs. In fact, he knows from talking to nurses that it does occur and it occurs frequently. But it is not on the record.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Right. They are not identifiable. That is the problem.

Mr. MILLER. That is better stated.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Kramer.

Mr. KRAMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Doctor, maybe I am inferring something from your testimony that is not there, but it appears to me that you are saying that there is no way that you as an emergency room physician from your own experiences can really give us any insight into the magnitude of this problem. Is that correct?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. That is correct.

Mr. KRAMER. That a very small percentage of those people, in your judgment, that are abused are willing to come forward and acknowledge that fact.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. At least in our setting.

Mr. KRAMER. If you, or perhaps anyone else who is associated with this bill, perhaps could give us a perspective, if that indeed be the case, aren't you saying to some extent that the person who is a victim or to whom this happened has got to, at least in the first instance, act on their own behalf, if nothing other than to seek out a remedy to their particular situation? And if that indeed is the case, wouldn't the same problems exist with the shelters and the other apparatus that this bill potentially might provide for as a means of helping these people?

In other words, what I am saying is I am fearful only a small percentage would come forward.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. When they come to our emergency room, in a sense that is a remedy they are seeking for an immediate problem for themselves. The fact that they do not identify themselves, at least in an up-front manner, although they often do in a subtle manner,

may say something about societal approaches to the entire problem. And if there is a better way for persons of this nature to identify themselves, I think your bill ought to address that.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Congressman Kramer, will you yield for a second?

Mr. KRAMER. Certainly.

Ms. MIKULSKI. If I could just share an experience. I think what the physician is saying is important. They might not reveal it in that situation because the very climate of an accident room during the physical trauma is not one where you usually sit down and share your personal experiences or even feel comfortable with them.

What very often happens to women is that they are in a battering situation and then they will find out, either through someone else in that situation or through a public service announcement on TV about some of the programs that are available, and then they will go where the social service is available. Then they usually are much more open and revealing in terms of their situation, or they will tell it to the police officer when he responds: That SOB just beat the hell out of me.

But if they are coming into the accident room, that is not usually the place where they will talk about their need for social services. Am I right in outlining that?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Yes, they usually do not. But again, I think the problem is they don't, for whatever reason, being embarrassed or fearful of what could happen to their spouse and their own income because they are in a Catch-22 if their spouse's income is somehow destroyed because of this incident. Their income may be destroyed. They simply are afraid of making this public knowledge, and they somehow view the accident room, if you will, as public knowledge.

Mr. KRAMER. Doctor, you also said that in your judgment, once you were in those cases able to identify a person as being a victim of domestic violence, that there were then adequate resources in the community to take care of the problem. Do I understand you to have said that or not?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. At least in our institution where we sit in Washington, those limited—and I must stress very limited—individuals who do seek help beyond our emergency room are able to find placement for. We have not been refused placement, to anyone's knowledge, in my emergency room.

Mr. KRAMER. I guess that that, Mr. Chairman, in my mind raises the question—and I would certainly be happy to hear comments on it—does this legislation get at that problem? In other words, is the problem really one of inadequate resources being available to help people in this situation? Or is the problem really some unwillingness or inability on the part of the victims themselves to come forward to be able to have a willingness to put this in the public light?

Ms. MIKULSKI. If I may follow this up and have a colloquy with our friend from the emergency room, where do you refer the people?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. We use the Women's Legal Defense Fund. The House of Ruth is one source.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Are you aware of the House of Ruth's financial situation?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Recently, yes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. And when you refer, does your staff feel a certain security that it will be open?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. We rarely have been denied for any reason admission, if you will, to the House of Ruth.

Ms. MIKULSKI. What other services do you turn to? That is the Defense Fund and the House of Ruth.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. That is primarily it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. What other comprehensive services are available to the women of the District of Columbia? You have talked about one shelter run by almost a secular nun who exists on very meager donations, and some legal services. Are there mental health services, followup physician services, programs for the displaced homemakers, job counseling, babysitting services while she looks for a job or takes training programs? What about those, Doctor?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. I am not conversant with all of this.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Kramer, those are the services that our legislation would provide, and the shelters would not be quite as shaky or financially fragile. The House of Ruth in Washington is something which I think you would really like to see. It has been one of the pioneer efforts. And it is truly run in an atmosphere of unusual sacrifice on the part of the director, and they really do not turn people away.

But when you go into it, you will see it is not like you are going into the Holiday Inn. It is sparse, austere, and overcrowded. It is run on a lot of love and very little money. So that although George Washington has never been turned away, it is not really adequate. That one shelter is not adequate.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. I am not making a case for adequacy or inadequacy of facilities. All I am making a case for is that really the incidence, at least the identifiable incidence, is so low vis-a-vis the emergency room that we do not tax other services very much.

Ms. MIKULSKI. But what Congressman Kramer was asking was the availability of services. There was a certain idea conveyed in your remarks that implied that there were comprehensive services available to all.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. As I stated before, we have no followup. I don't know what happens to these people and neither does anyone in my shop, if you will, once we send them out the door. We send them to someplace, period.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I don't want to use Mr. Kramer's time, but I will have questions on followup myself.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much, Doctor. We appreciate your testimony and your making the effort to be here. You have made a contribution.

Our next witness is Judge——

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am sorry. I was on Mr. Kramer's time. I didn't get my own. May I?

Mr. SIMON. I am sorry. Yes, you certainly may, Ms. Mikulski. You are not dismissed yet, Doctor.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Dr. Edelstein, please understand the tone in which I am going to be asking you these questions. They are not directed at you personally, but rather at you as a kind of symbol. I find that the

comments and observations that you shared with the committee could indeed be shocking. That indeed in the whole field of medical literature, with 10 years of study by the National Institute of Mental Health, etc., on this particular issue, to find nothing written about it, I find horrifying.

At the same time, there has been a tremendous amount of articles written on the subject in the so-called popular press, the pencil press, the electronic media. My question therefore is: When these things arise—and I am just asking about something called the culture of medicine because your testimony reinforces the need for our bill. One of the points that we make is that traditional institutions designed to serve “victims” are not responsive.

Now, when all of this fury has been going on around whether these articles have been written in popular journals and whatever, why didn't anyone ask for the data? You see, I think the reason there is no data there is simply because no one thought it was important enough to ask.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. You are probably right. I can relate my own experiences, being here almost 2 years at our institution now. Frankly, no one does ask. It becomes an incident like the one I cited before, very dramatic, very exciting, and so forth. But once it leaves our doors, that is it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I will come back to that in a second, Doctor. But let's just say I came into your accident room, I had a ruptured appendix or a broken leg, I fell off my moped, I truly did and no one pushed me. Would you followup or would you just give me emergency treatment and send me home? Would I get a followup appointment somewhere?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Absolutely.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Then why don't you do it for this?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Because the followup is not within our realm or our institution. We send the followup, if you will, to a public agency. We do not follow up alcoholics who we send to the alcoholic center in the District of Columbia.

Ms. MIKULSKI. OK. Let me ask you something else. How do you handle the issue of rape in your emergency room?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Rape has a very high sensitivity in our institution. My former head nurse was on the D.C. Rape Council. Everybody in our institution is exquisitely sensitive to it, 13 out of 14 nurses are female, and it is followed up. The social workers are gotten out of bed in the middle of the night to come in and see the rape victim, and so forth.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I think that is terrific, but why is there not the sensitivity to the next level?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. I can't answer a why. I don't believe there is at the spouse situation.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I don't want to prolong the committee's time, but it is really important for me and, I think, others to know. Someone comes in and they are bruised and they say: I walked into the ironing board. Is there any sensitivity to probe that a little bit further. I am not talking about when someone is coming in and they have a knife sticking in their thoracic cavity. You didn't say then how did you feel

about your mother and did you have unresolved oedipal problems. [General laughter.]

Dr. EDELSTEIN. There is and there isn't. It is very dependent upon the professional who is seeing the patient. You know, I think part of the problem is—

Ms. MIKULSKI. What about the doctor? He sees the patient, too. Do you have a sensitive staff?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. We believe we have a competent, intelligent, sensitive staff. And as you know, we are a training institution.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I know. That is why I am asking this. What the hell are you training for?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. I think your criticism may be justified, but I am not sure how, in terms of historical perspective—you know, the battered child syndrome was only first reported in about 1962. The battered spouse syndrome has not really come into vogue, if you will, at least in both the lay and professional literature, until very, very recently. It may have been going on for 100 years, but it has only become a syndrome—

Ms. MIKULSKI. Two thousand years.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. Well I don't know. Four thousand, maybe.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Well, I do know. If you will look at the history of what has happened to women in the world, you can see that violence has always been perpetuated against women in a variety of forms.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. I am not arguing that point, but I am just saying as a syndrome, as a clearly defined syndrome, it is a recent phenomenon.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I have no further questions and I am sure that when we get to the health manpower programs in my House subcommittee, I will be very much interested in the residency and training programs that we have on the family life we all espouse.

Thank you. And please don't misunderstand me. That is not directed to you, although I hope perhaps this conversation has been a consciousness raising one.

Dr. EDELSTEIN. It has been for my emergency room the last 2 weeks.

Mr. MILLER. How many cases have you had in the last week?

Dr. EDELSTEIN. You know, it is very odd, but we—

Ms. MIKULSKI. There were 432. [General laughter.]

Dr. EDELSTEIN. I must tell you that until the prior 6 months of this year, there were very few, as I said, about three or four. In the last week, we had two, which was extraordinary for us.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much again, Doctor. We appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, if I might, I would like at this point also, as one of the authors of the legislation, to respond to the concerns of Mr. Kramer, and that is this. I think, yes, there is a two-fold problem. One, you can state that there are existing services in the community; and two, you can say if these women would just get their act together and change their living situation and change their lifestyle, that would be that.

But I think clearly the test will be, as you look at the statistics of where minimal services have been established under the name of dealing with the problem of domestic violence, whether it is a hotline, whether it is a counseling group, whether it is a full blown shelter with all the attendant services, and even the cooperation of the police, that

immediately you will start receiving hundreds of calls a month from women across that community expressing an interest in services, pleading for services or walking in the front door.

I would ask that members of this committee, if they have time while they are in the District, to go spend an evening at the House of Ruth. There used to be another place in Arlington. There is a place in Bethesda. Go spend an evening there and listen to one end of the phone conversation as they tell women in desperate situations that they cannot take them, that they are sorry, they don't know where to refer them, or listen to women who plead to them that they have been through all the social service establishments and have not found an answer to the problem because what they need is a place to get away, a place of shelter that offers anonymity to the victim.

So there is no question that there are services and that they can be better utilized, better coordinated. And there is no question that if all women in America could somehow change their situation when they run into this violence in their home, that we would not need this.

But if you will talk to the victim and if you talk to the counselors and if you talk to the people who have been involved in this, you will learn time and again, in areas of half a million people there are three beds; in areas of two million people there are no beds. There are 15 beds for 750,000 people.

The caseload is just overwhelming the services where identified for these purposes. They may not overwhelm the emergency room. They may not overwhelm the referrals from the emergency room to the House of Ruth. But, my God, you are talking about someone who has been stabbed, has had their arm broken, has been thrown out of a window, and they are saying can you give her a room for the night? I suspect you could call almost anyone and get that service.

But when you have a voice on the other end of the phone saying, "I have just been beaten, can I bring my three children down," and they say, "I'm sorry, we are full." I think that is the issue you have got to pit the legislation against. I think with cursory looking in any community in America, you will find an overwhelming need. That need is a tragic statement of many, many problems in our society, but the need is real.

I think that it is too easy to suggest that it is easy for people. I have many friends who are going through divorces and separations and all of the various phases you go through, and one of the very interesting demands is the husband insists that the wife not express any of this to any of her friends, not tell anybody else that they are going through this problem.

Now, escalate that to the battering and see what the husband's threats in that case are. So it is not quite so easy. Time and again you will have victims who tell you they went to their friend's house and so did the husband about 10 minutes later, and he took on everybody in that family.

So I think the situation we are talking about here, and maybe, more importantly, the fact that it can be anonymous, that you don't end up in a social welfare record, that you don't end up in the county hospital records as to your problems, but you can sit down with some anonymity and talk to people who understand is the attractiveness and magnetism of this service.

Clearly, the statistics point out that where it is established and where the number becomes known, when the little ad flashes on the TV late at night here for the House of Ruth, their phone rings. I think that is the kind of data you are going to have to deal with in terms of considering this legislation.

Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Our next witness is Judge George Herbert Goodrich of the Superior Court, the Family Division.

Judge Goodrich, we welcome you.

[Prepared statement of Judge Goodrich follows:]

STATEMENT OF JUDGE GEORGE HERBERT GOODRICH, FAMILY DIVISION HEAD,
SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of being presented this morning to address a few words to the subcommittee regarding domestic violence, as viewed from the perspective of the judicial system.

The courts in the District of Columbia presently encounter these domestic violence cases in two ways:

1. As criminal prosecutions initiated by the United States Attorney's Office.
 2. As petitions for civil protection orders brought by the Corporation Counsel.
- Formerly, the United States Attorney's Office would "paper" only one or two cases every six months; currently they process one or two a week. There has been some question raised concerning the alleged reluctance of the United States Attorney's Office to prosecute these cases. The United States Attorney's Office maintains that it prosecutes all cases which merit prosecution; historically, the prosecutors have found that many complaining witnesses "sign off" on these cases, refusing to go forward with the prosecution.

Instances of domestic violence come to the attention of the United States Attorney's Office as a result of the arrest of the attacker or through referral from the Citizen's Complaint Center. The Center is an intake and referral service which has been in operation since the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970. The Center indicates that they process some 9,000 domestic violence complaints a year. Employees of the United States Attorney's Office and of the District of Columbia city government staff the Center which makes community referrals for shelter and counseling, referrals to the United States Attorney's Office for criminal prosecution, and referrals to the Corporation Counsel, representing the District of Columbia, for petitions seeking civil protection orders. The Citizen's Complaint Center also arranges informal hearings with attorneys or paralegals from the United States Attorney's Office at which the parties can express their grievances.

The number of petitions filed by the Corporation Counsel for civil protection orders has declined in recent years—818 in 1976, 815 in 1977, and 698 in 1978. This decline is not indicative of a decrease in domestic violence however, but of staff shortages in the office of the Corporation Counsel and of other logistical problems in the processing of petitions, that is, backlogs in court and at the Citizen's Complaint Center. Other problems regarding the civil protection orders include the length of the court process required to obtain them, three or four weeks, and the fact that they are not enforceable by the police. The Corporation Counsel actually issues more warning letters than petitions for civil protection orders.

These procedures are receiving much needed attention as the community, as a whole, is becoming more aware of this problem of domestic violence. It is my feeling that, as this attention increases, it will cause the various organizations involved to re-examine their procedures. For example, the police have instituted a Family Disturbance Intervention Program which they believe will protect their officers from injury or death while responding to family disturbance calls as well as improving their service to the victims of domestic violence.

Underlying the problem is the additional difficulty of acquiring meaningful statistics since it is believed that only a small percentage of beating cases are reported. This fact notwithstanding however, it is very clear that there is a great need for shelter homes for these unfortunate victims and/or their children.

Regardless of which proposed bill is favored, it is necessary to consider the availability of shelter care for a three to four week period, rather than the

present one week to ten days average in the District of Columbia. Counseling and therapy for these victims are requisites.

Facilities should include appropriate accommodations and services for any children who might accompany their mother. In many cases the children's needs will be as severe as the mother's since they may have been involved in the abuse as well, emotionally and/or physically.

Shelter homes should provide some form of security to protect the wife from further abuse by the husband while she resides therein.

The courts encounter examples of domestic violence in two other areas, that is, child abuse or neglect cases, and in some contested divorce cases. Again, there is reason to believe that not all instances of violence are reported. Shelter homes might well be utilized in these cases as well.

It is heartening indeed to note the committee's work in this critical area, and I am grateful to have had a chance to appear before you this morning. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE HERBERT GOODRICH, ASSOCIATE
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
HEAD OF THE FAMILY DIVISION**

Judge GOODRICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity of being present this morning to address a few words to the subcommittee regarding domestic violence as viewed from the perspective of the judicial system.

Courts in the District of Columbia presently encounter these domestic violence cases in two ways: as a criminal prosecution initiated by the U.S. Attorney's Office; and second, as petitions for civil protection orders brought by the Corporation Counsel. Formerly the U.S. Attorney's Office would pay for only one or two cases every 6 months. Currently they process one or two a week.

There has been some question raised concerning the alleged reluctance of the U.S. Attorney's Office to prosecute these cases. The U.S. Attorney's Office maintains that it prosecutes all cases which merit prosecution. Historically the prosecutors have found that many complaining witnesses sign off on these cases, refusing to go forward with the prosecution.

Instances of domestic violence come to the attention of the U.S. Attorney's Office as a result of the arrest of the attacker or through referral from the Citizen's Complaint Center. The center has an intake and referral service which has been in operation since the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970.

The center indicates that they process some 9,000 domestic violence complaints a year. Employees of the U.S. Attorney's Office and of the District of Columbia city government staff the center, which makes community referrals for shelter and counseling, referrals to the U.S. Attorney's Office for criminal prosecution, and referrals to the Corporation Counsel's Office representing the District of Columbia for petitions seeking civil protection orders.

The Civil Complaint Center also arranges informal hearings with attorneys or paralegals from the U.S. Attorney's Office, at which the parties can express their grievances. The number of petitions filed by the Corporation Counsel for civil protection orders has declined in recent years. There were 818 in 1976, 815 in 1977, and 693 in 1978.

This decline is not indicative of a decrease in domestic violence, however, but of staff shortages in the offices of the Corporation Counsel and

of other logistical problems in the processing of petitions such as backlogs in court and at the Citizen's Complaint Center.

Other problems regarding the civil protection orders include the length of the court process required to obtain them, 3 to 4 weeks, and the fact that they are not enforceable by the police. The Corporation Counsel actually issues more warning letters than petitions for civil protection orders. These procedures are receiving much-needed attention as the community as a whole is becoming more aware of this problem of domestic violence.

It is my feeling that as this attention increases it will cause the various organizations involved to reexamine their procedures. For example, the police have instituted a family disturbance intervention program which they believe will protect their officers from injury or death while responding to family disturbance calls, as well as improving their service to the victims of domestic violence.

Underlying the problem is an additional difficulty of acquiring meaningful statistics, since it is believed that only a small percentage of beating cases are reported. This fact notwithstanding, however, it is very clear that there is a great need for shelter homes for these unfortunate victims and/or their children.

Regardless of which proposed bill is favored, it is necessary, it seems to me, to consider the availability of shelter care for a 3- to 4-week period rather than the present 1-week to 10-day average stay in the District of Columbia at this time.

Counseling and therapy for these victims are requisites. Facilities should include appropriate accommodations and services for any children who might accompany their mother. In many cases the children's needs will be as severe as the mother's since they may have been involved in the abuse as well, emotionally or physically.

Shelter homes should provide some form of security to protect the wife from further abuse from the husband while she resides therein.

Finally, courts encounter additional examples of domestic violence in two other areas: child abuse and neglect cases and in some contested divorce cases. Again, there is reason to believe that not all instances of violence are reported. Shelter homes might well be utilized in these cases as well.

It is heartening, indeed, to note the committee's work in this critical area, and I am grateful to have had a chance to make this statement to the committee at this time.

Mr. MILLER (presiding). Thank you very much for your statement.

You have said a couple of times in your statement that there is some question as to the number of cases which are actually reported, and it is believed that the instance is underreported.

Judge GOODRICH. Right.

Mr. MILLER. I assume that you have handled cases that have actually gone to the full prosecution.

Judge GOODRICH. In two ways, yes, sir. Civil protection orders are sought by the battered wife through the court. You rule on those, you listen to her statement of what happened, and then you issue them or not, depending if they follow through to that point of having such a civil protection order issued, they are serious about it and remain

so. Sometimes the cases do not even get to court. They may have been filed but they have not been granted a hearing and they wash out.

We see it also in a different area, and that is the area of child abuse. The statistics indicate there were 502 cases of child abuse and/or neglect in 1978 in the District of Columbia. There is a very subtle difference between these two. Abuse, of course, would be physical violence to the child. It could be psychological and psychiatric, whereas neglect is the failure to produce needed services or to take care of the child in that way.

That is a long answer to your question.

Mr. MILLER. No, it is not. It is important.

Let me ask you. First of all, in the civil protection orders, before that order is issued, it comes before you or another member of the Family Division, at which time you listen to the evidence on which the order should be issued.

Judge GOODRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask you something about that evidence. Again we are sort of looking for that profile. Is it a large number of cases in which the testimony is this is a first time and it is unacceptable, or is it the testimony that this has happened repeatedly but this time I want protection?

My concern is: Is the victim whom you now have before the bench testifying as to a long history of beatings and abuse, or is this a first-time case?

Judge GOODRICH. My experience has been that in almost three-quarters or seven-eighths of the circumstances that appear, it is a continuous situation. It is not a one-time situation. Very rarely do they come in after one beating. And they describe that this has gone on before.

Mr. MILLER. Have they described that they have sought out other methods to mitigate the situation?

Judge GOODRICH. Not as a rule. This comes before the court in a written report claim, and it gives a basic, almost medical report of the alleged degree of beating and what happened as a result of it and so forth and so on. Sometimes there may be reference to the fact that it was necessary the victim be hospitalized and receive so many stitches and things of that nature.

Mr. MILLER. But has the victim moved out of the house previously? Has the victim tried to stay at a friend's house? Is that a part of this in determining whether or not—

Judge GOODRICH. As a rule, that may or may not be gone into. Generally I would say it is not because you are dealing with a given situation in front of you. You are making a ruling as to whether or not to issue an order directing that he cease and desist that particular type of conduct.

Mr. MILLER. In the situation where the case goes to criminal prosecution, you would not necessarily handle that. You would not handle that?

Judge GOODRICH. Our court does handle that.

Mr. MILLER. It does handle that. What is the situation there in terms of the average testimony as to previous occurrences of abuse and length of time staying in the abusive situation?

Judge GOODRICH. In that situation, those facts would be gone into to develop the history and background situation and to show what efforts the abused person had undertaken in an effort to handle the problem by herself or himself.

Mr. MILLER. What do you find? Have they made those efforts?

Judge GOODRICH. They have tried to.

Mr. MILLER. Has the abuse reoccurred over a period of years prior to this time?

Judge GOODRICH. Generally, yes.

Mr. MILLER. In the case, now, you have mentioned you also see it come up in the question of child abuse cases. There are you talking about, again, in the prosecution for child abuse or for a protection order, or both?

Judge GOODRICH. Probably both. When I refer to child abuse cases, I was talking about those cases which come in on an allegation of child abuse alone. Sometimes that develops.

Mr. MILLER. That is what I am saying. In the testimony around the prosecution for child abuse or in the seeking of a civil protection order, does the testimony in some instances also relate there is abuse of other members of that family, whether it is other children or a spouse?

Judge GOODRICH. Yes, sir. Yes, sir, that would come out.

Mr. MILLER. I am just trying to determine because you have access, unlike the doctor who may not have access, to the background of the incident. You have access because obviously there has to be some explanation why you want to invoke either the civil or criminal law.

My concern is, in garnering evidence which would lead us to want to pass this legislation, it is my belief—and I am asking whether it is borne out—that by the time a person comes to court or ends up in the operating room or comes to a shelter, that there is a history there; that this is not someone who is simply mad at their husband or wife. There is a history. There is also an endurance factor that is beyond me, but it is there in terms of living with that situation.

I am trying to develop whether that is true. It may be my belief and it may not be valid.

Judge GOODRICH. Yes, that is true. In cases of child abuse, oftentimes the report you will be handed indicates there have been previous beatings, that there has been another court case involving the child's older brother or sister also having been abused.

This does flow forward. I think my experience is such that it would buttress the position you have just outlined, which is this is not a one-time "I am mad at you" type of thing and "I will dash down to court," and that whatever efforts and facilities might have been available will have been tried, whether it is to urge another family member to try to counsel the beater, whether it is to attempt to get marriage counseling, whether it is seeing the minister or clergy. I think in many cases, much of that will have been done prior to it getting to us.

In many respects we, as I view it, are kind of the last stop on this line too, as the doctor referred to the fact that when it gets to him, that is the end point of the violence. When it gets to court, our experience has been that they will have tried other things, vainly perhaps, but in an effort.

Mr. MILLER. So you would say that it is a fair assumption that by the time people get into civil prosecution, criminal prosecution, that they have made an effort.

Judge GOODRICH. I would think so, yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. To change their circumstance to some degree.

Judge GOODRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. However they have done that.

In the case where it is cross-referenced as a child abuse case and then you learn of the battering of another individual in the family, whether it is another child or a spouse, is there testimony as to whether or not the defendant has been a battered individual or not? Is that brought out in terms of court reports or is that just speculation?

Judge GOODRICH. There may be some bearing.

Mr. MILLER. We know it from other studies, but do you see it in your courtroom, is what I am asking.

Judge GOODRICH. During the trial of criminal charges against a batterer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Judge GOODRICH. The government would attempt to bring out the fact that other people in the family had been battered. Now, whether or not that gets into the record, the defense attorney may say, well, we are just talking about this situation here. But the social reports on the children would include reference to other situations as a part of developing a profile.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask you this. Again, since you have more access in terms of verbal testimony and background testimony before you issue a civil protection order or criminal prosecution, how would you define the person pressing the charges, the victim? Are they reluctant? What is their situation when they are in your court? Police officers many times will tell you—I think this is changing to some degree, but they will say they don't want to write up the report because the woman will never show up in court anyway, that she will never be there on Monday morning when it is time to press charges, so it is wasted time. That is obviously changing in some areas now.

But again, you see the victim at a point when they have made a clear-cut decision to go ahead with either civil protection or criminal prosecution, and I just wondered about the state of mind of that witness in terms of fear or reluctance or what have you, if you feel competent to testify.

Judge GOODRICH. I can make several comments about this. Obviously, this is a very uncomfortable position for the complainant to be in. It is very uncomfortable for many reasons. It can be a threat economically. It can result in additional physical threats, perhaps. So that it takes a good deal of stick-to-itiveness to, having made the complaint, follow through with it.

Cases that go that way are built upon determination by the victim to see it through. Some do drop by the wayside for various reasons. In the child abuse cases, it is not unusual to have the parent who has done the abusing to then buy candy or toys for the child and say: Look, you know, it really wasn't as serious as it seemed. They attempt to win the child over.

Those are difficult cases because many times they succeed. A child will not take the stand and describe what has happened to him or her. It is a little difficult to give a straight out answer.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, I understand. Thank you very much.

Mr. KRAMER.

Mr. KRAMER. I have no questions.

Mr. MILLER. Barbara.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Judge Goodrich, I would like to thank you for your supporting testimony to our efforts. In your testimony you comment about the need for shelters, which we appreciate. Our legislation would also talk about more comprehensive services, either the direct provision or the referral to other services, one of which would be those who would help women to be much more economically self-supporting.

Judge GOODRICH. Yes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Do you see that as an important thing; not only a place to catch a breath, but also the availability of other services, sir?

Judge GOODRICH. I certainly do. Otherwise, it becomes a very much needed temporary place that they can go and receive a period of peace while they attempt to pull themselves together. But it seems to me they will need professional help and counseling and therapy in doing that, and I think that is a very vital part of what you have proposed. So I would be very much in favor of it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you. I always thought Federal judges wore powdered wigs.

Judge GOODRICH. Not in Washington in the summer. [General laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Judge GOODRICH. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Next we will hear from a panel of Capt. Patricia Halsey, from the Marine Corps in Camp Pendleton, Calif., and Lt. Serge Doucette, who is from Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for the Navy, and the head of the Family Advocacy Branch.

[Prepared statement of Lt. (jg.) Serge R. Doucette, Jr., follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LT. (JG.) SERGE R. DOUCETTE, JR., MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS, U.S. NAVY RESERVE, HEAD, FAMILY ADVOCACY PROGRAM, BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

I am Lt. jg.) Serge R. Doucette Jr., Medical Service Corps, United States Navy Reserve, Head, Family Advocacy Program, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Navy Medical Department's Family Advocacy Program.

In keeping with its mission of supporting the operational forces, one of the Navy Medical Department's objectives is to promote an environment and develop methods that enhance the maintenance of healthy individuals and families, and, when identified, eliminate dysfunction and restore to health those individuals and families experiencing the symptoms associated with abuse, neglect, sexual assault, or rape. The Family Advocacy Program is geared toward the "Preservation and Promotion of Our Most Important 'Natural Resource'—People."

Family Advocacy is an outgrowth of the Navy Medical Department's spouse abuse reporting and child advocacy programs.

In 1977, the Federal Register was revised to reflect the Spouse Abuse Program and the new title of Family Advocacy. This revision also changed the Central Child Abuse and Neglect Registry to a Central Family Advocacy Registry, incorporating all forms of abuse and neglect. Although the program was renamed, impact at the local level was minimal.

Each command, in the absence of a combined instruction, continued to manage its Child and Spouse Abuse Programs separately. This was anticipated, and following the Federal Register revision, a Pilot Family Advocacy Program was established at Naval Regional Medical Centers San Diego, CA; Camp Pendleton, CA; Camp Lejeune, NC; and Portsmouth, VA. The objective of the pilot program was to develop methods necessary to formulate a comprehensive program that would become applicable to all Navy Medical Department activities. The existing and pilot programs were monitored and modified in a continual effort to meet the needs of our military members and families. Military and civilian resources, along with research and statistical data were utilized to develop a combined effort pertaining to child abuse and neglect, spouse abuse and neglect, sexual assault, and rape.

Many factors must be considered in the formation of any program. The following is only a partial accounting of the factors considered in the formation of the Navy's Family Advocacy Programs:

(1) There is specific state and federal legislation pertaining to child abuse and neglect.

(2) There is no federal legislation specifically addressing spouse abuse and neglect.

(3) Child abuse and neglect legislation excludes all abuse, neglect, and assault that is not perpetrated by a parent, guardian or other individual or agency charged with the care of the child.

(4) There are no national standards applicable to child or spouse abuse and neglect at this time.

(5) There are few programs designed for the sensitive handling or treatment of those sexually assaulted or raped.

(6) There is a high correlation between spouse and child abuse and neglect.

(7) A program based solely on the concept of "domestic violence" would exclude nonmarried or nonfamily members.

(8) There are inadequate numbers of civilian treatment facilities or "shelters" necessary to provide crisis assistance.

(9) There is a high correlation between drug and alcohol abuse and domestic violence, sexual assault, and rape.

(10) It is known that not all cases of child or spouse abuse and neglect, sexual assault, or rape are reported. Consequently, the extent of these incidents suggested by actual reports underrepresent the actual incidence.

(11) Etiological factors and incident rate are basically the same in the military and civilian communities. However, there are psychological, environmental, and occupational factors which are unique in military families (e.g., unanticipated and frequent separations, isolated military stations, adaptation to foreign countries, etc.) that are contributing to the overall military problem.

(12) Abuse, neglect, sexual assault, and rape are observed to cross socio-economic boundaries and military hierarchies.

Recognition of these and other factors, together with the knowledge gained from the child, spouse, and related pilot programs have resulted in the current Navy Family Advocacy Program. The program elements and format of the Family Advocacy Program are available for your information.

Continuing to strive for program improvement, the Navy Medical Department has supported the Tri-service Child Advocacy Committee. The Navy's program manager for Family Advocacy is investigating, with the other services, methods, and procedures which will result in the reduction of individual and family problems. This committee is currently tasked with the development of a draft Department of Defense Family Advocacy Directive.

The Family Advocacy Program interfaces with all applicable military and civilian agencies, as evidenced by current activity with: the Tri-service Child Advocacy Committee; the President's Committee on Domestic Violence; the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect; the newly formed Navy Family Services Program; the Navy Judge Advocate General; the Navy's Substance Abuse Program; and the Office of Naval Research.

It has been the knowledge obtained from the Child Advocacy, Spouse Abuse, and related pilot programs that has led to the development of a comprehensive Family Advocacy Program, including all aspects of: abuse, neglect, sexual assault, and rape. Nonmarried service members are considered to be a part of an extended Navy family, requiring the same concern and support as married service members and their dependents who comprise the more traditional view of family. The etiology of abuse, neglect, sexual assault and rape is multifaceted, as are the

factors that support the maintenance of, or recurrence of, such behavior. These acts are interpersonal and as such are viewed as occurring in dynamic systems requiring intervention of all concerned. This form of behavior, and its consequences must be treated from within the system in which it operates, whether it be the traditional family unit, or the extended Navy family, and it must encompass the larger system, society. Our program is designed to be a functional part of an overall individual and family services program (military and civilian). The Navy Medical Department's Family Advocacy Program is designed to accomplish its objectives through a comprehensive prevention, identification, intervention, treatment and follow-up program. It is being partially implemented at local command levels within the constraints of military and civilian resources. A need for additional resources to fully implement the program is recognized. Coordination with existing and future military and civilian resources is the foundation for local implementation of the Family Advocacy Program at this time.

As this program becomes fully operational, it can be expected that increased numbers of individuals and families that require some form of treatment, support, or intervention will be identified. Effective implementation of the program will continue to increase the burden on existing military and civilian resources. The Navy Medical Department is endeavoring to obtain additional fiscal and staffing support for the Family Advocacy Program through the formal budgetary process. The civilian communities as well must be prepared to respond with any additional requisite support. The Family Advocacy implementing instruction, including a detailed procedure manual, is in final stages of review prior to the Surgeon General's signature. Prompt distribution of the instruction, after signature, is expected to result in the initial implementation of the program in a minimal time.

This concludes my statement. I appreciate your time and interest. I stand ready to respond to your questions.

FAMILY ADVOCACY: PROGRAM ELEMENTS AND FORMAT

PROGRAM ELEMENTS

1: Identification:

(a) Identification of abused, neglected, sexually assaulted, or raped individuals.

(b) Identification of abuser/neglector

(c) Gathering of information regarding a suspected incident of child or spouse abuse/neglect in order to confirm or deny diagnosis of maltreatment.

(d) Identification of "high risk" individuals and families.

2. Physical protection of the abused/neglected

3. Medical and emotional treatment of the abused, neglected, sexually assaulted, or raped individual, as well as the perpetrator and all others directly concerned in the incident.

4. Interfacing with military and civilian resources, resulting in the obtaining for the patient, and all concerned, necessary support or ancillary intervention which is required in abuse, neglect, sexual assault, or rape cases.

5. Maintenance of a Central Registry for the following reasons:

(a) Case management, incident rate analysis, system monitoring.

(b) Sharing of information in accordance with provisions of the Federal Register:

(1) With other armed services medical departments;

(2) With other military agencies for control of detailing to insure adequate treatment facilities are available at proposed duty stations; and

(3) With military and civilian child protection/welfare agencies.

(c) Identification and ameliorating services to individuals and families (this may involve decisions regarding transfers, duty assignments, humanitarian discharges, etc.).

PROGRAM FORMAT

The medical model of primary, secondary, and tertiary levels of intervention is a useful model for conceptualizing treatment and prevention programs. Family Advocacy incorporates all three levels in the following outline:

1. Tertiary intervention

Tertiary is after-the-fact intervention directed to individuals and families in which abuse, neglect, sexual assault, or rape has occurred.

(a) *Actions*.—Representatives of the Family Advocacy Program develop a working knowledge of the full range of available treatment resources throughout the military and civilian community and this is utilized to maximize their efforts in providing or securing support and treatment services for military members and families experiencing the effects of abuse, neglect, sexual assault, or rape.

(b) *Rationale*.—The precursors to, and the effects of, abuse, neglect, sexual assault or rape are multifaceted and intervention in such instances requires a carefully-developed treatment plan that addresses all of the identified problems. For example, in cases of familial abuse or neglect, it may be determined that the abuse/neglect is secondary to other problems and that intervention should focus on the primary problems while assuring the protection and safety of the victim.

2. Secondary intervention

Secondary intervention (prevention) programs are directed to individuals and families that have been identified as "high risk," but have not yet experienced abusive or neglecting behavior. Services and programs are geared toward assisting these individuals and families to overcome areas of dysfunction which place them into a "high risk" category.

(a) *Action*.—Secondary intervention (prevention) programs are continually developing methods which lead to the identification of "high risk" individuals and families. Once identified, every effort is used to administer or obtain required assistance for the individual or family in order to eliminate the factors which place them at risk.

(b) *Rationale*.—Progress which succeeded in returning individuals and families to adequate levels of functioning before they experience abuse or neglect, increase the availability of resources to the community by avoiding the requirement of using extensive resources to intervene after crisis.

3. Primary intervention

Primary intervention (prevention) programs are directed to the general population with the intent of assisting individuals and families to maintain adequate levels of functioning.

(a) *Action*.—Family Advocacy Representatives identify target groups and work collaboratively with civilian and military Family Services Programs in the development and implementation of a full range of education programs.

(b) *Rationals*.—It costs less and is more effective to keep people well than to help them to get better. Additionally, there is immeasurable loss to society in every respect when an individual or family drops from adequate levels of functioning. Primary intervention helps to preserve and promote our most important "national resource"—People.

STATEMENT OF CAPT. PATRICIA HALSEY, U.S. MARINE CORPS; AND LT. (jg.) SERGE R. DOUCETTE, JR., BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY FOR THE NAVY, HEAD OF FAMILY ADVOCACY PRO- GRAM

Mr. MILLER. Your statements will be entered in the record in their entirety, and you are free to proceed in any manner in which you would like. You may either summarize them or put them in.

Captain HALSEY. Mr. Miller, the two of us will be presenting the Navy and Marine Corps combined effort in this, and we will begin with Lieutenant Doucette explaining the Navy's participation through the medical field.

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. I have a statement which I will read from.

I am Lt. (jg.) Serge R. Doucette, Jr., Medical Service Corps, U.S. Navy Reserve, Head, family advocacy program, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Navy Medical Department's family advocacy program.

In keeping with its mission of supporting the operational forces, one of the Navy Medical Department's objectives is to promote an environment and develop methods that enhance the maintenance of healthy individuals and families, and, when identified, eliminate dysfunction and restore to health those individuals and families experiencing the symptoms associated with abuse, neglect, sexual assault, or rape.

The family advocacy program is geared toward the preservation and promotion of our most important natural resource, people. Family advocacy is an outgrowth of the Navy Medical Department's spouse abuse reporting and child advocacy programs.

In 1977, the Federal Register was revised to reflect the spouse abuse program and the new title of Family Advocacy. This revision also changed the Central Child Abuse and Neglect Registry to a Central Family Advocacy Registry, incorporating all forms of abuse and neglect.

Although the program was renamed, impact at the local level was minimal. Each command, in the absence of a combined instruction, continued to manage its child and spouse abuse programs separately. This was anticipated, and following the Federal Register revision, a pilot family advocacy program was established at Naval Regional Medical Centers, San Diego, Calif., Camp Pendleton, Calif., Camp Lejeune, N.C., and Portsmouth, Va.

The objective of the pilot program was to develop methods necessary to formulate a comprehensive program that would become applicable to all Navy Medical Department activities. The existing and pilot programs were monitored and modified in a continual effort to meet the needs of our military members and families.

Military and civilian resources, along with research and statistical data, were utilized to develop a combined effort pertaining to child abuse and neglect, spouse abuse and neglect, sexual assault, and rape.

Many factors must be considered in the formation of any program. The following is only a partial accounting of the factors considered in the formation of the Navy's family advocacy program.

(1) There is specific State and Federal legislation pertaining to child abuse and neglect.

(2) There is no Federal legislation specifically addressing spouse abuse and neglect.

(3) Child abuse and neglect legislation excludes all abuse, neglect, and assault that is not perpetrated by a parent, guardian, or other individual or agency charged with the care of the child.

(4) There are no national standards applicable to child or spouse abuse and neglect at this time.

(5) There are few programs designed for the sensitive handling or treatment of those sexually assaulted or raped.

(6) There is a high correlation between spouse and child abuse and neglect.

(7) A program based solely on the concept of "domestic violence" would exclude nonmarried or nonfamily members.

(8) There are inadequate numbers of civilian treatment facilities or shelters necessary to provide crisis assistance.

(9) There is a high correlation between drug and alcohol abuse and domestic violence, sexual assault, and rape.

(10) It is known that not all cases of child or spouse abuse and neglect, sexual assault or rape are reported. Consequently, the extent of these incidents suggested by actual reports underrepresent the actual incidence.

(11) Etiological factors and incident rate are basically the same in the military and civilian communities. However, there are psychological, environmental, and occupational factors which are unique in military families (e.g., unanticipated and frequent separations, isolated military stations, adaptation to foreign countries, et cetera) that are contributing to the overall military problem.

(12) Abuse, neglect, sexual assault, and rape are observed to cross socioeconomic boundaries and military hierarchies.

Recognition of these and other factors, together with the knowledge gained from the child, spouse, and related pilot programs, have resulted in the current Navy family advocacy program. The program elements and format of the family advocacy program are available for your information.

Continuing to strive for program improvement, the Navy Medical Department has supported the Tri-service Child Advocacy Committee. The Navy's program manager for family advocacy is investigating, with the other services, methods and procedures which will result in the reduction of individual and family problems. This committee is currently tasked with the development of a draft Department of Defense Family Advocacy Directive.

The family advocacy program interfaces with all applicable military and civilian agencies, as evidenced by current activity with the Tri-service Child Advocacy Committee, the President's Committee on Domestic Violence, the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, the newly-formed Navy family services program, the Navy Judge Advocate General, the Navy's substance abuse program, and the Office of Naval Research.

It has been the knowledge obtained from the child advocacy, spouse abuse, and related pilot programs that has led to the development of a comprehensive family advocacy program, including all aspects of abuse, neglect, sexual assault, and rape. Nonmarried service members are considered to be a part of an extended Navy family requiring the same concern and support as married service members and their dependents, who comprise the more traditional view of family.

The etiology of abuse, neglect, sexual assault, and rape is multifaceted, as are the factors that support the maintenance of or recurrence of such behavior. These acts are interpersonal and, as such, are viewed as occurring in dynamic systems requiring intervention of all concerned.

This form of behavior and its consequences must be treated from within the system in which it operates, whether it be the traditional family unit or the extended Navy family, and it must encompass the larger system, society. Our program is designed to be a functional part of an overall individual and family services program (military and civilian).

The Navy Medical Department's family advocacy program is designed to accomplish its objectives through a comprehensive prevention, identification, intervention, treatment and followup program.

It is being partially implemented at local command levels within the constraints of military and civilian resources.

A need for additional resources to fully implement the program is recognized. Coordination with existing and future military and civilian resources is the foundation for local implementation of the family advocacy program at this time.

As this program becomes fully operational, it can be expected that increased numbers of individuals and families that require some form of treatment, support or intervention will be identified. Effective implementation of the program will continue to increase the burden on existing military and civilian resources. The Navy Medical Department is endeavoring to obtain additional fiscal and staffing support for the family advocacy program through the formal budgetary process.

The civilian communities as well must be prepared to respond with any additional requisite support. The family advocacy implementing instruction, including a detailed procedure manual, is in final stages of review prior to the Surgeon General's signature. Prompt distribution of the instruction, after signature, is expected to result in the initial implementation of the program in a minimal time.

This concludes my statement. I appreciate your time and interest. I stand ready to respond to your questions.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much.

Captain HALSEY. I am Captain Patricia Halsey. I am a member of the State bar in California, and my interest in the subject and work in this subject has been as an attorney in Camp Pendleton, Calif., where I have had clients who are victims of domestic violence.

At Camp Pendleton it has come to our awareness that there is domestic violence in one of seven ways. If the victim and family live on the base, oftentimes the victim or a neighbor will call the Provost Marshall's office and the man will either be put in the barracks for the evening or the violent situation will have calmed down by the time the Provost Marshall arrives there.

Presently we have two investigators who are working in this area, and during the last 6 months they have responded to 188 calls in a population of 13,000. If the family lives off base, they oftentimes call the local police department. Again, the local police department has the same problem of separating the family, as they would in any civilian family.

The victim may seek medical attention. Lieutenant Doucette told you that we have a reporting system through the medical system, the naval hospitals. In 1978 there were 943 cases reported to all naval hospitals throughout the world on spouse abuse specifically. The victim may seek the aid of a chaplain. At that point, the chaplain gives pastoral counseling if that is desired, or helps with the problem to the extent he can.

The victim may come to legal assistance. That is where I have been involved. Oftentimes the victims are saying what can I do legally. California has a statute where a restraining order can be issued against the man without filing for a dissolution. That oftentimes is a problem. The victim may be coming to me to file for dissolution or separation.

Another way is going to a local shelter. Some of our victims who live out of town and on board base will contact the local shelter know-

ing this is the area of expertise they can assist the victim in. And sometimes the victims will go directly to the commanding officer, hoping that the commanding officer can help in some way with solving the problem at home, counseling her husband, perhaps changing a situation that may be causing the problem.

One of the main problems we encountered as I began working in this area was finding out the reporting of the situation. The primary hindrance is that if the command finds out about the problem, it will dampen the reporting. That is because if there is a crime committed, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the command will be the one prosecuting the crime. If there is a character behavior disorder, there is a possibility of an administrative discharge.

So knowing this and knowing this is preventing reporting of the crime or problem, we began working from the area of increased awareness: how do we solve the problem without going to the criminal and discharge system?

To do this, we got combined support from the State Attorney's General Office Preventive Crime Unit which specializes in areas of child abuse, spouse abuse currently, and had been putting on conferences throughout the State, and also the Woman's Resource Center, which is a local shelter in town, came on board base and helped coordinate this conference.

The base Human Affairs Office, which has cognizance of the family situation, went together. So the three agencies together provided a conference, inviting local support groups from the community and representatives from the different areas of the command. So that their awareness of the problem was increased, and the coordination of the different sources working in the area was increased.

Further, as a followup to the conference that we had, we have worked out a rough area on how to handle it. This is the order the Navy is implementing right now. We have been working along the same constraints that the order will be regulating officially as soon as it is signed. We continue with our education program. We are trying to get together some films. We are going out to the commands to educate not only the commanding officers but the personnel as to the extent of the problem and what can be done to assist.

So there is an awareness that the advocates have to be worked on to solve the problem. It is not necessarily a criminal problem. It is not necessarily a military problem. It is a social problem.

Assisting the victim in a domestic violence situation is not a unique problem in the military. It is perhaps more complex because she is more complex because she is a transient person. She has been transplanted from her home. She may not have any friends or relatives in the area.

Normally, if you are in a situation there may be a friend or relative, your mother, you can call, some place within a 100-mile circumference. But in the military this is often not the case. The family is transplanted. They may or may not even have enough money to call home to ask what can I do, I have this kind of a problem.

So this makes helping the victim a much more difficult situation in the military. She may be afraid of State laws. A common problem I have had is California has no laws against desertion; however, other States do. A woman will come and say "I can't leave my husband" because she has implanted in her head that that is desertion. There-

fore, she will lose her children and any blame in the whole situation will lie on her.

So that is an educational process that has to be brought to the victims in this situation.

Because of these factors, women in the military, families in the military need to be advised of the alternatives as soon as possible to be assisted in making their decisions of alternatives provided in support. Currently at Camp Pendleton we have what is called a family advocacy representative, which is a trained social worker. She gets approximately 40 cases a month in. She presents to either the victim or the family as a whole what the alternatives are for them.

If there is counseling desired, they can be referred to a psychiatrist, a psychologist, or county mental health. If there are fees involved, the military health plan will pay for those fees. So this is the way we have been handling it at Camp Pendleton.

I would like to point out that Mrs. Robert Barrows, who is the wife of the commandant of the Marine Corps, and Mrs. Kenneth McClennan, who is the wife of the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, have both been present throughout these entire hearings to show the interest and the concern for the family that the Marine Corps has. It has been working quite well at Pendleton with the combined support of the community and the military.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much.

Barbara.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Captain, what happens on the military personnel's record if this is reported to the commanding officer?

Captain HALSEY. If it is just a spouse abuse case, which has not risen to criminal charges, as you know, prosecution is discretionary. And if you haven't got a viable witness, you don't want to prosecute. This is traditionally the problem in the civilian sector as well as the military. If the wife doesn't want to prosecute, it will not be prosecuted. At that point it is up to her as to what she would like to do.

A commander that finds out about it could prosecute.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The reason behind my question is this: In conferring with Congresswoman Schroeder, who serves on the Armed Services Committee, about this particular issue, she brought to our attention that one of the reasons that domestic violence is not brought forward in military family situations is that the spouse, the wife, is afraid that, quite frankly, once it is on the record, he can be thrown out and that somehow or another the reaction is so—not exaggerated, but it then destroys the source of the income, so you don't want to go that far. She wants help. She wants to get it worked out.

Along the lines you indicated, is there a wide discretion? Or if she turns to help within the military framework, is the record so permanently damaged that there is no hope for a military career?

Captain HALSEY. We found that the wife's concern about the command's finding out about it has led to the suppression of reporting. As I said, the way we have found to get around that is to educate those commanders who would have the discretion to the fact that it is not a problem that should be handled legally, necessarily, unless there is an indication that it needs to be handled. Every case is unique and needs to be researched.

The family advocacy representative is the one who is involved in the research in that case. Our committee right now is trying to get a liaison between each of the commanding officers who have the discretion of what to do to the man into the committee, and hopefully that will be the chaplain, who will have insights into the situation and relate that back to the command with a suggestion as to how the command can best handle it.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So you are trying to develop some kind of a threshold there. If a wife says, for instance, my husband is abusing me, they go to counseling or to some of the support programs. She might even leave him temporarily. But they work it out and she goes back. You see, I happen to believe that rehabilitation, counseling, psychotherapy, all of that does work. However, if it is then left as a permanent stigma on your record, there is no hope for family reconciliation.

Captain. HALSEY. Right. The new order that is coming out, I believe, lends guidance to the commander saying this should not affect promotion and retention in the service, but it should be considered when making reassignments. So there is written authority for a commanding authority not to enter that into the career perspective of a man's life.

Ms. MIKULSKI. One other question for you, Captain. If the man is a severe abuser of both his children and his wife, and she reports that, what protection does she get other than what might be available in the community?

Captain HALSEY. Do you mean protection from her husband?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Yes, for her own safety.

Captain HALSEY. If she desires shelter at Camp Pendleton, we can find shelter for her at Camp Pendleton now.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Lieutenant, one question for you. It seems you have developed a comprehensive program and you know what to do, but I gather it is only being partially implemented. How partial is partial? I mean, are you doing it at just one military base?

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. No. What we were referring to in a partial implementation is that when signed, the family advocacy program is going to be applicable to all naval medical centers and hospitals. There will be coordination worked out with all dispensaries.

In other words, we are talking about a program that will address all Navy medical facilities. Partial implementation means that we recognize that there are no significant or, in some cases, any services available in the local community to provide the assistance that we also need. Quite often the military has to rely on civilian resources, and in some communities these resources are not available. That is why we say a partial implementation.

Additionally, it is partial because there is a recognition that additional staffing and fiscal support are required which is being investigated now. To be fully implemented in any program would be addressing all the identified needs and making some provision for the future. So that is why it is a partial implementation at this time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I have no further questions.

I would like to just compliment the military witnesses on their thorough approach to the program. I am sorry that the doctor from GWU didn't run into you.

[General laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask you—in terms of Camp Pendleton, do you have any idea what number of military wives would seek services off the base?

Captain HALSEY. In an 8-month period beginning in October, the Women's Resource Center processed 734 cases. That is hotline calls, shelter, counseling, temporary counseling. One-fifth of those were military cases. That statistic is not totally valid, in that answering a hotline call, you don't always ask if the wife is military. So it may be higher.

There is a further statistic breaking it down citywide. The city of Oceanside has the largest Marine Corps population in it, and one-half of the services extended in the city of Oceanside were to the military. So it is a large amount of the services they extend.

Mr. MILLER. Why do people use those services as opposed to your services on the base?

Captain HALSEY. There are people who live out of town and it is closer for them.

Mr. MILLER. As a matter of convenience?

Captain HALSEY. Yes. Also the concern about the command finding out about it. It is easier to go to a civilian agency where you know it will be purely confidential.

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask you this, Lieutenant. In your statement you say that the family advocacy program is an outgrowth of the Navy Medical Department's spouse abuse reporting and child advocacy program. Is the reporting going to be a component of the family advocacy program?

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. The reason it was put in that manner is the regional spouse abuse program was just a reporting program, of which, for statistical reasons, on a fully anonymous form, we received data from the medical centers.

What we have now in the new instruction is the fact that spouse abuse will be treated in the same manner child abuse and neglect has been, in that when a case becomes identified, from whatever means, whether it be the emergency room or the outpatient clinic or a referral, the family advocacy representative will be gathering information pertinent to that situation, take all of that information to a committee, and that committee, which meets at a minimum once a month, will review the facts of the case and insure that an investigation has been done.

We will then formulate no difference between child or spouse abuse and neglect, meaning there will be either an unfounded diagnosis, a suspected diagnosis, or an established diagnosis. And to further address what you were talking about, the difficulties in reporting, we have found that as we educate the providers and recipients of the care, that we are getting increased numbers of reporting. When we educate people as to the purpose of the central registry for case management and assistance, then we have been getting much more cooperation from all levels.

We are getting cooperation from the hospitals, from the base commands, and we expect that there may be some additional problems regarding spouse abuse because there is no specific legislation. But

currently we are going to treat it just like we have been for child abuse and neglect.

Mr. SIMON. Would you expect, from your history of watching this program progress to going into the new family advocacy program, that you would see your caseload rise?

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. As was brought out, and I don't have the figures in front of me, I believe 948 was mentioned for last year. There are some who believe the reporting will decrease because they will be identified as cases of established maltreatment.

There are others who say that reporting will probably increase as long as we stress that prevention and treatment are the primary interventions of choice and that we have the means to provide them.

As was mentioned in much other testimony, it is one thing to say come and tell me about it and another thing to have the resources to start to deal with it. And this is what we need in a combined military-civilian endeavor.

Mr. MILLER. How soon do you expect this program to be in place? You mentioned Camp Pendleton in San Diego, North Carolina and Virginia.

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. Those programs were started over a year ago.

Mr. MILLER. Those are in place, those pilot programs?

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. Yes, they are in place now, and they have provided the basis, along with our other programs and the information from our civilian community, for the present program for which we are awaiting signature.

Mr. MILLER. Was reporting there done on an anonymous basis in the pilot program?

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. Yes, it was in the case of spouse abuse. In reporting child abuse and neglect, it was done in the same manner, except that in established cases, the abuser was identified, and in suspected cases the alleged abuser was anonymous.

Mr. MILLER. If the authorities are called on base to a family at Camp Pendleton because you have a family disturbance, do they have the ability to refer the wife and children, or whatever the aggrieved party is, to immediate services and/or shelter as is necessary?

Captain HALSEY. When I started working the area approximately a year ago, we had difficulty finding shelter because of the combined calls to this women's resource center. Homes in the community were offered as shelter, and currently the city of Oceanside has given us \$100,000—has given the women's resource center \$100,000 to set up a shelter. So, hopefully, by January there will be a shelter available to anyone to refer to.

There is no limit on our community resources right now as to whether you have to be a civilian or military. They are accepting our military personnel.

Mr. MILLER. All right. Thank you.

Mr. KRAMER?

Mr. KRAMER. I have no questions.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much for coming and sharing your testimony with us. I too would like to compliment the service on this because it appears that you are running a little ahead of the rest of us. You are to be congratulated for the recognition of the need to do that.

Captain HALSEY. Thank you.

Lieutenant DOUCETTE. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Next, if I might, I would like to reverse the order in which the next panels would testify because my understanding is that two witnesses on the last panel, Clara Allen and Ellen Pence, have some transportation problems. So if it is all right, I would like to afford them an opportunity to come forward so that they can make a plane connection.

If you will identify yourself for the reporter, we will hear from Ms. Allen first.

STATEMENT OF CLARA L. ALLEN, DIRECTOR, NEW JERSEY DIVISION ON WOMEN, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, TRENTON, N.J.

Ms. ALLEN. First I would like to very much thank the committee for the courtesy in extending cooperation with my travel arrangements. I do appreciate it very much.

I would also like to preface my remarks by saying while sitting here today I have really scratched out most of my testimony because it seemed to me in listening both to the committee's questions of the witnesses, to the witnesses, and so forth, that the subject has been very well searched.

In addition to that, there is evidence of the committee's real knowledge of the depth of the problem.

Mr. MILLER. If I could interrupt you there, what may be very helpful to us, since New Jersey obviously is in the forefront of making an effort in terms of statutory changes and law, and also in terms of services, if you could—without directing your testimony—if you could tell us how you see, whether this legislation would be helpful or whether it is surplus in light of what the State has done when it has made a commitment like New Jersey—if you could give us your reaction to the legislation in light of your State experience, I think it would be very helpful to all of us.

The definition of the problem is clear. The question is the appropriateness of our response. We won't go into dollar amounts, but—

Ms. ALLEN. Thank you. I will attempt to do all of that with the remaining portion of the oral testimony I was going to refer to, and I know you have already received our direct statement.

As you indicated. I am the director of the New Jersey Division on Women, and I would like to thank the committee for providing me the opportunity to talk with you, to share our experiences and needs in shelter programs that will serve the needs of the victims of domestic violence in New Jersey.

I think first you ought to know that the division on women is a permanent agency located in the State department of community affairs and mandated by law to identify the needs of New Jersey women and to develop and recommend appropriate programs and legislation.

The division serves as the central agency for the coordination of programs and services for women in the State and offers technical assistance to individuals, groups, and organizations in their efforts to strengthen the role of women in our society.

The division also acts as a clearinghouse, to publish and disseminate information, and has established a liaison with all other governmental

departments and agencies involved with the programs affecting the status of women. I believe that the division is in the unique position to testify on the problem of domestic violence in New Jersey due to the fact that it has been collecting information and facilitating and coordinating an intergovernmental response to this problem for the last 3 years.

The establishment of shelters and the formalization of service programs for victims is very, very necessary and very apparent to the division. However, the lack of sufficient funding is the major obstacle to the realization of such programing efforts.

The division first became aware of the problem and the need to provide services when analyzing information collected by our statewide, toll-free, 24-hour-a-day hotline. In the first month of 1979, the hotline has received approximately 1,500 calls from victims requesting such information.

The magnitude of the problem of domestic violence can be illustrated by the great demand for information regarding services available to victims. The division has distributed close to 40,000 of its "Battered Women's Guide," which I believe you have now in your possession, in the past 6 months, and distributes to local and county government officials, social service, and law enforcement agencies, a wide range of organizations and groups.

In February 1978, the first fully funded shelter program in New Jersey opened its doors, and within several days it was filled to capacity. Today there are 13 shelter programs operating throughout the State, all experiencing the same demand for services.

Eight other programs exist in New Jersey which offer emergency shelter in private homes and counseling services to victims. These programs are staffed by volunteers and have very little, if any, funding.

I might note that there were questions raised this morning concerning statistics that would be available from some of the shelters about the recovery rates and that kind of thing—by Mr. Kramer, as I recall. I think that the reason you will find so many people not able to provide such statistics is the fact that this was a volunteer effort for a long period of time in most places. These people were not trained in the kind of statistics that would be necessary to respond.

This is changing as they are receiving funding. The overwhelming demand for shelter and the social services provided by this group of community-based programs has far outpaced the capacity of these existing facilities. For example, 1,708 women were referred to the first 5 programs to become fully operational during the period March 1978 through January 1979; 643 of these were women, along with 971 children.

When housed at the programs, they received housing and other direct services. One thousand sixty-five women were not housed due to the lack of bed space or professional staff. That would be the kind of thing where maybe there were not sufficient volunteers on duty to be able to respond to a request, and I think it is unfortunate to say that we too have experienced deaths as a result of the fact that people were not able to be housed.

Denying these women and their children the safe harbor they so desperately sought has been rather sad. All five shelter programs discussed here have been operating at full capacity since shortly after

their doors opened. The search for funding sources has plagued existing shelter programs and groups working to establish such programs since the first shelter in North America opened its doors in Hackensack, N.J., 9 years ago.

That shelter only gained full funding status in the past year. The division on women, with its small budget, each year allocates certain amounts of its funds to be of assistance to the shelters that do exist, for such things as fire escapes, where needed, such things as the fencing in of areas so children can have free access during the play hours.

The program's desperate search for replacement funds forces them into constant financial crisis. Too much staff time is devoted to searching for funds rather than concentrating on improving the delivery of service and assisting victims. The search for replacement funds must be answered by a cooperative giving on the part of local, State and Federal governments if the shelter programs are to survive and establish credibility in their community.

I think it would be a rather harmful thing to establish shelters with no chance of survival, and that might be a part of the problem to date.

We know about H.R. 2977. We know that we believe it effectively addresses the problem and the need for such measures to permit financial help. We know about the victims and we know that the abuser is just as much a victim sometimes as the abused. We applaud the provision in H.R. 2977 that primary consideration for funding be given to grassroots organizations which have been successful in the establishment of community-based shelter programs. They are making significant inroads in the areas of criminal justice proceedings, agency proceedings, and general community understanding of the nature of domestic violence.

While the Division wholeheartedly supports the establishment of a Federal intra-agency council, we would like to see some changes in its composition. We have offered you some suggested changes. We believe that section 4 of H.R. 3921, which is before this committee, better addresses the need for full intergovernmental and community-based organization operation.

This section states that the council be composed of not less than five members of the general public who have been victims of domestic violence or who are experienced in the operation of community-based shelters or service programs, but who are not employees of government, and representatives, with expertise in the area of prevention and treatment of domestic violence, from Federal agencies.

In addition, the council should include representatives of State and local governments who are also recognizing their responsibilities to the growing problem of domestic violence. All three levels of government need to develop long-term plans and commitments to combat the problem.

The language should also include the provision that the non-Federal members appointed to this council shall at all times constitute a majority of the members of the council.

We would also like to offer an amendment to section 11 of H.R. 2977. We feel that the language defining the term "domestic violence" contained in section 10 of H.R. 3921 better describes the victims of battering, while the definition under section 11 of H.R. 2977 requires

that a victim and the abuser have been, or are, related specifically as husband and wife.

There is no mention of the fact that victims of domestic abuse are often not related to the abuser. A clearer and more precise definition must take this fact into account.

In line with the Federal legislation, the New Jersey State legislature has taken action on several pieces of domestic violence legislation this year. Two of these bills are attached to your material for your information. The New Jersey Senate bill 807 was approved by the senate last month and is awaiting assembly action. This bill authorizes the State to provide services to those public and private agencies which meet the standards set forth in the bill to operate the shelters for victims of domestic violence and their children.

The bill also establishes again an advisory council which will be responsible for providing technical assistance to help the public and private agencies to qualify as operators of the shelters and to obtain State and Federal funds for the establishment and maintenance of the shelters.

New Jersey Senate bill 3244, a companion to 807, is scheduled to be voted on by the full senate this fall. This bill would amend the State's municipal land use law and provide relief to the majority of shelter programs now operating in New Jersey.

In addition, it would offer groups working to establish programs more flexibility with regard to choosing the location of a shelter site. Too often a community's local zoning ordinance has proved to be an obstacle to the establishment of a shelter facility in an area conducive to the healing process, both physical and psychological, necessary for victims and their children.

In conclusion, we urge the Congress to adopt this legislation, and I thank you very, very much for the opportunity to express these views.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

We will hear from Ms. Pence, and then we will ask questions of both of you.

[The prepared statement of Clara L. Allen follows:]



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

JOSEPH A. LEFANTE
COMMISSIONER

363 WEST STATE STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 2768
TRENTON, N.J. 08625

TESTIMONY

BY

CLARA L. ALLEN, DIRECTOR

DIVISION ON WOMEN

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE LEGISLATION

JULY 10, 1979

WASHINGTON, D.C.

New Jersey Is An Equal Opportunity Employer

I am Clara Allen, Director of the New Jersey State Division on Women, an agency located in the State Department of Community Affairs. The Division is mandated under State law to expand the rights and opportunities of all women in New Jersey, to serve as the central agency for the coordination of programs and services for women in the State, to evaluate the effectiveness of such programs and to develop new ones, and to establish a liaison with all other governmental departments and agencies involved with programs affecting the status of women.

The Division also offers technical assistance to individuals, groups and organizations in their efforts to strengthen the role of women in society, acts as a clearinghouse to publish and disseminate information, and serves in an advocacy capacity regarding the development and recommendation of appropriate pieces of legislation both on the Federal and State levels.

Meeting the needs of New Jersey women, as well as women throughout the country, in the 1980's will require real dedication to the special concerns of women and the cooperation of all levels of government- local, State and Federal. Shaping policy with regard to the development of the nation's human resources will also require flexibility to respond to new challenges and issues as they arise.

I believe that the Division is in a unique position to testify on the problem of domestic violence in New Jersey due to the fact that as a statewide agency, it has been collecting information and facilitating and coordinating an intergovernmental response to this problem for the past three years. The Division testified before this Subcommittee in

March of 1978, when hearings were held on domestic violence legislation HR 7927 and HR 8948.

It is apparent to the Division that the widespread and alarming occurrence of domestic violence on all socioeconomic levels is not being sufficiently addressed by local, State and Federal government. As a result, its victims are not receiving the support from social service, law enforcement and legal agencies which would be given to other victims of criminal assault. Clearly, the need is for the establishment of shelters and the formalization of service programs for victims. However, the lack of sufficient funding is the major obstacle to the realization of such programming efforts.

The Division first became aware of the problem and the need to provide relevant services to the victims of domestic violence when analyzing resource information collected by Women's Referral Central, the Division's statewide, toll-free 24-hour hotline. In addition to identifying existing volunteer programs, it was discovered that many social service agencies were being called upon to provide assistance to victims of battering but were having difficulty meeting the need. In the first six months of 1979, the hotline has received approximately 1,500 calls from victims requesting service information.

In early 1977, the Division held a statewide conference designed to call attention to the problem and to provide an information exchange geared to alternative responses to the needs of victims. This conference, which was planned for 300 people, attracted over 750 participants including representatives of the medical, legal, law enforcement, social service and other professions, as well as women providing volunteer assistance

and interested individuals. The interest in and the reaction to the conference clearly indicated the need to establish shelters and to formalize service programs for victims.

Another more recent illustration of the magnitude of the problem of domestic violence and the great demand for information regarding services available to victims is the fact that the Division has distributed close to 40 thousand copies of its Battered Women's Guide in the past six months to local and county government officials, social service and law enforcement agencies and a wide range of organizations, groups and individuals.

This guide, which is now in its fourth printing, lists by county all shelters presently operating in New Jersey and includes a brief narrative describing the services that are available to victims.

In February of 1978, the first fully-funded shelter program in New Jersey opened its doors, and within several days was filled to capacity. Today there are thirteen shelter programs operating throughout the State--all experiencing the same increasing demand for services. One more shelter program is scheduled to go into operation in August. In addition, there are eight other programs existing in New Jersey which offer emergency shelter in private homes and counseling services to victims. These programs are staffed by volunteers and have very little, if any, funding.

The overwhelming demand for shelter and the social services provided by this group of community-based programs has far outpaced the capacity of these existing facilities. According to data gathered on the first five programs to become fully operational during the period March 1978 through January 1979, 1,708 women were referred by various sources to

the programs.¹ Of these, 643, along with 971 children, were housed at the program shelters or received other direct services. An additional 1,065 women who contacted these programs were not housed due to the lack of bed space and/or professional staff or inappropriate referrals. Many of these such women often find shelter at the home of a friend or relative. However, women contacting the shelters are always referred to other social service agencies which should be able to help them even if the shelter program cannot.

Shelter staff try hard not to turn away any woman requiring emergency shelter, but admit that over-crowding and the lack of other available emergency shelter facilities to serve all the women and children who need them often results in denying women and children the safe harbor they so desperately seek. All five shelter programs discussed here have been operating at full capacity since shortly after opening their doors.

To further illustrate this rapid emergence of domestic violence victims and their growing demand for services, I refer you to the attached discussion of the experience of the Atlantic County Abuse Center, an organization which had been serving victims on a volunteer basis since its incorporation in October 1974 and which, in February 1978, was the first shelter in New Jersey to be granted Title XX funding.

¹
Of the 1,708 women who were serviced by the five programs during the report period, 24% were self-referred, 14% were referred by friends and relatives, 10% were referred by county welfare agencies, 3% were referred by the Division of Youth & Family Services, NJ Department of Human Services, 8% were referred by the police, 4% were referred by the court system, 1% were referred by the schools, and the remaining 31% were referred by sources such as hospitals, other shelters, social service agencies and newspapers.

The Division is currently working with the New Jersey Department of Human Services, Division of Youth & Family Services, and the New Jersey Coalition for Battered Women² to coordinate all existing programs, provide technical assistance for the establishment of new programs in areas of the State where such services are now lacking, and search for reliable funding sources.

This search for funding sources has plagued existing shelter programs and groups working to establish such programs since the first shelter in North America opened its doors in Hackensack, New Jersey nine years ago. That shelter- Shelter Our Sisters (SOS)- gained full funding status only in the past year.

Since 1978, some federal financial assistance has been available through Title XX Protective Services funds,³ the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), the Community Development Block Grant program of HUD, in addition to assistance from state and county welfare emergency assistance funds,

2

The New Jersey Coalition for Battered Women is composed of 30 shelter programs and auxiliary services for victims of domestic violence and their children, as well as 450 concerned individuals, and represents the estimated 150,000 abused women in New Jersey.

3

Nine shelter programs in New Jersey are presently being funded primarily under Title XX through contracts with the NJ Department of Human Services. The FY78 Social Services State Plan allocated \$300,000 in Title XX protective services funds for shelters. This amount, matched by \$100,000 from public and private sources within the community, was to have funded 4 regional programs at a total cost of \$400,000. However, by January of 1979, with added funds, the total value of the contracts reached \$650,000. This was accomplished by stretching the allocation as far as possible and by the resourcefulness of the local program sponsors in seeking out additional public and private funding sources to meet their budgetary requirements, which are now in excess of \$1.1 million for the nine programs. NOTE: the annual operating budget of an average shelter program is approximately \$200,000.

county and local governments, and other public and private sources within each community. Even the New Jersey Division on Women, with its annual budget of only \$148,000, has granted a total of \$14,333 in FY79 monies to five shelter programs located throughout the State for such funding needs as staff, transportation and building renovation.⁴

While it is agreed that the problems of domestic violence must be addressed by all levels of government, this present "patchwork" funding of shelters forces them into constant financial crises. Too much staff time is devoted to searching for replacement funds rather than concentrating on improving the delivery of services to victims. Furthermore, as discussed previously, when shelters and services are established in communities, and as victims become aware of them, the demand for services rises rapidly.

The viability of these existing, successful, grassroots shelter programs is dependent upon an intergovernmental response to their financial plight. In order to ensure this viability, the programs' desperate search for replacement funds must be answered by a cooperative giving on the part of local, state and federal governments. This cooperation is absolutely necessary if these successful shelter programs are to survive.

These community-based programs have, in the past several years, developed successful and innovative service delivery techniques, but they need financial and technical assistance, especially in the areas of fund raising and good management. They don't want total federal or state

4			
	Atlantic County Abuse Center	\$4,308.00	transportation
	Battered Women's Project, Burlington County	3,921.00	bldg. improvement
	Jersey Battered Women's Service, Morris County	1,300.00	bldg. improvement
	Providence House, Burlington County	2,304.00	transportation
	Women Helping Women, Middlesex County	2,500.00	staff

intervention- what they need is short-term, limited federal funding to establish their credibility in the community and to gain the strength to solicit and receive greater local and state financial support. They recognize that the end result is to become economically self-sufficient.

HR 2977, the "Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act," introduced by Congressman Miller and co-sponsored by 58 Representatives including Congressmen Forsythe, Patten and Thompson of New Jersey, effectively addresses this problem of funding by providing short-term funding over a period of three years. In addition, this legislation focuses on the need to coordinate existing national, state, county, and local government and private efforts aimed at long-range solutions as well as emergency measures.

It's time we recognized that domestic violence is not a narrow problem in isolation from the rest of society. It is related to a variety of issues already being addressed by many local, state and federal programs, including prevention of child abuse, community mental health services, job counseling, training and placement.

Problems stemming from domestic violence show up in the criminal justice, juvenile justice, welfare, educational and health care systems. Clearly, an interdisciplinary, multi-faceted approach is necessary for the prevention and treatment of domestic abuse.

Without shelter programs and the necessary preventative services which they provide designed to break the cycle of violence in the home, the federal government is now and will continue to pick up the tab for the increased use of services which aid in picking up the pieces left by this problem: foster care, hospitalization, institutionalization,

judicial and penal system, public assistance, among others.

We have the choice of providing some limited funding for preventative and emergency measures or of expending far greater amounts of money on mandated social services when those families caught in the web of domestic violence finally come to a decisive end to this problem, be it legal action in the form of separation, divorce, or indictment and/or conviction and incarceration of the abuser on assault and battery charges or worse, to the grave injury to or death of the abused.

The Division also applauds the provision in HR2977 that primary consideration for funding be given to grassroots organizations which have been successful in the establishment of community-based shelter programs. These organizations have acquired a body of knowledge and expertise which is often sought out by professionals in social service agencies interested in helping abused or abusive persons. In addition, they are making significant inroads in the area of criminal justice proceedings, agency procedures and general community understanding of the nature of domestic violence. Such organizations also provide guidance in the establishment of new programs, research and data collection and staff training.

In analyzing the provisions of HR 2977, the Division would like to make two specific recommendations concerning Section 10, Coordination of Federal Programs, and Section 11, Definitions.

While the Division wholeheartedly supports the establishment of a council charged with the coordination of federal level programs for the prevention of domestic violence and the provision of shelter and other services to victims and their dependents, we would like to see some changes in the composition of such a council. Specifically, we feel that

the language regarding the composition of a Federal Council on Domestic Violence, contained in Section 4 of HR 3921, the "Domestic Violence Assistance Act of 1978"- which is also before this Subcommittee- better addresses the need for full intergovernmental and community-based organization cooperation.

The language we would prefer states that the council be composed of not less than five members of the general public who have been victims of domestic violence or who are experienced in the operation of community-based shelters or service programs, but who are not employees of government; and representatives with expertise in the area of the prevention and treatment of domestic violence from such federal agencies as are listed in Section 10 of HR 2977 and including the Office of Children, Youth & Families, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

In addition, the council should include representatives of State or local governments, for although the Federal government now provides the primary financial assistance for many shelter programs, the State and local governments are recognizing their responsibilities to the growing problem of domestic violence. All three levels of government need to develop long-term plans to combat the problem, including changes in the criminal justice system, social service delivery and public education.

And finally, the language should include the provision that the non-Federal members appointed to this council shall at all times constitute a majority of the members of the council.

This amended version of Section 10, HR 2977 is attached for your information.

the establishment and maintenance of shelters, recommend innovative strategies regarding the prevention of domestic violence, foster cooperation and communication among the providers of services to victims, and provide guidelines for the training and use of volunteers in the delivery of services. This council will be composed of ten members, including the Director of the Division on Women, representatives from state departments and agencies which offer or should offer programs or services for victims, and representatives from viable, successful grassroots shelter programs.

The bill emphasizes the need for cooperation among existing service delivery agencies and recognizes the need for bilingual assistance. A copy of this legislation is attached for your information.

New Jersey Senate Bill 3244, amending the State's Municipal Land Use Law, was reported favorably from Senate Committee in June of 1979 and is scheduled to be voted on by the full Senate in the fall.

This bill, which is intended as a companion measure to S. 807, would permit the location of shelters for victims of domestic violence and their children within the provisions of the law. S. 3244 would require that any such shelter be approved and certified by the Department of Human Services pursuant to the provisions of S. 807, which provides standards for the establishment and operation of shelters.

The passage of S. 3244 will provide relief to the majority of shelter programs now operating in New Jersey, in addition to offering groups working to establish programs more flexibility with regard to choosing the location of the site. Too often a community's local zoning ordinance has proved to be an obstacle to the establishment of a shelter facility

The Division would also like to offer an amendment to Section 11 of HR 2977, regarding the definitions of certain terms as used in the legislation.

Again, we feel that the language defining the term "domestic violence" as contained in Section 10 of HR 3921 better describes the victims of battering. While the definition under Section 11 of HR 2977 requires that a victim and the abuser have been or are related, specifically as husband and wife, there is no mention of the fact that victims of domestic abuse are often not related to the abuser. A clearer and more precise definition must take into account this fact.

The amended version of Section 11 is also attached for your information.

In line with proposed Federal legislation on domestic violence, the New Jersey State Legislature has taken preliminary action on several pieces of domestic violence legislation this year. The Division has been instrumental in the drafting of these bills and has worked for nearly two years on a lobbying effort to promote their passage.

New Jersey Senate Bill 807, the "Shelters for Victims of Domestic Violence Act," was approved by the Senate on June 21, 1979 and is presently awaiting Assembly action scheduled for the fall. This legislation authorizes the Department of Human Services to provide services to those public and private agencies, which meet the standards set forth in the bill, to operate shelters for victims of domestic violence and their children. The legislation also establishes an Advisory Council which will be responsible for providing technical assistance to help public and private agencies to qualify as operators of shelters and to obtain State and Federal funds for

in an area conducive to the healing process, both physical and psychological, necessary for victims and often their children.

In conclusion, the Division hopes that domestic violence legislation is approved by the 96th Congress and that such legislation adequately addresses the needs of victims and the especially acute financial assistance needs of the community-based shelter programs. The problem of domestic violence is probably one of the most compelling social issues at this time, and a coordinated government response is critical.

BATTERED WOMEN'S GUIDE

State of New Jersey
Brendan Byrne, *Governor*

New Jersey Department of Community Affairs
Joseph A. LeFante, *Commissioner*

Division on Women
Clara Allen, *Director*

Division on Women
363 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
Telephone: (609) 292-8840



■

(

v

■

INTRODUCTION

If you are beaten or threatened by your husband or boyfriend there is help available. Although a battering problem is complex and every abused woman's situation is unique, there are many common problems: most women who are battered need physical safety, financial and legal help, and emotional security for themselves and often their children. This leaflet explains the type of help available and where to get it.

IF YOU HAVE AN EMERGENCY

You may need to leave your home in a hurry. If you have no place to go, there are shelters and other facilities available for you and your children. Your local battered women's group can help you locate them. Legally, it is not considered desertion to leave your home under extreme circumstances. Another option is to have the court order your husband to leave the home. You need a lawyer's assistance for this, because it is difficult to obtain. Welfare may be able to provide you with "emergency funding" and other forms of immediate financial assistance. In addition to helping you with the above, your local battered women's group can help you obtain emergency medical care and provide transportation.

If you have been beaten, and if for some reason you aren't willing or able to contact one of the battered women's organizations, we strongly urge you to immediately contact (preferably in person) a family member or friend and describe to him or her what has happened. If you wait too long after a battering incident to contact someone, you may lose this person as a witness.

PLAN AHEAD. . . . HOW YOU CAN PREPARE FOR AN EMERGENCY

— Financial and Legal Documents — Gather and Keep These in One Safe Place (Preferably At A Neighbor's If Possible).

- important papers such as marriage certificate, birth certificates, credit cards, bank books, insurance policies, etc.
- records of your husband's income (copy of his paycheck, W2 form, tax statement, etc.)
- records of household bills (mortgages, utilities, medical bills, insurance, food receipts, etc.)
- have bank accounts, stocks, bonds, etc. put in your name only, if possible
- save as much money as you can

— In Case of a Battering Incident — Save Evidence:

- take pictures of injuries (Polaroid photos are best)
- get the names of nurses and doctors who administered medical care (nurses are preferable since doctors are often excused from court)
- get the names of police officers with whom you have had contact
- get names and addresses of any witnesses
- get copies of medical reports

Also, try to set aside clothing for yourself and your children that can be picked up in an emergency. Most importantly, keep the phone number of a shelter or local battered women's group in a handy but secret place.

HELP IS ALSO AVAILABLE FOR LONG-RANGE PLANNING

Whether you want to leave your home or not, you can prepare for the future. Counseling and/or discussion groups with women in similar situations are useful for understanding your options. Many of the local battered women's groups offer these services and can also answer many questions you may have about your alternatives. You can receive help with:

- divorce, support and child custody problems
- welfare, food stamps and other forms of public assistance
- job hunting
- financial planning
- housing
- pressing criminal charges against your husband or boyfriend
- obtaining a lawyer

THIS LEAFLET IS ONLY A GUIDE. IT IS BEST TO SEEK ASSISTANCE FROM ONE OF THE CENTERS NEAR YOUR HOME.

TOLL FREE HOT LINE — 800-322-8092

WOMEN'S REFERRAL CENTRAL, Information and Referral Service serving New Jersey women 24 hours a day, Division on Women/Together, Inc.



*Free copies
 free press at
 state & court houses*

BATTERED WOMEN CENTERS

ATLANTIC ACWC Abuse Center
 (609) 645-6767
 Emergency shelter available

BERGEN Community Action Program
 (201) 487-8484
 Emergency shelter available

Shelter Our Sisters
 (201) 944-9600
 Emergency shelter available

BURLINGTON Providence House/Willingboro Shelter
 (609) 387-3151
 Emergency shelter available

CAMDEN Alternatives for Women Now
 (609) 964-8034

Camden County Crisis Center
 (609) 428-0505

Volunteers of America
 (609) 964-5100, ext. 39
 Shelter available

CUMBERLAND Cumberland Co. Guidance Center
 (609) 327-2222

ESSEX Essex County Family Violence Project
 (201) 484-4446
 Emergency shelter available

Essex Legal Psychological Shelter
 (201) 762-5208
 Emergency shelter available

HUNTERDON Women's Crisis Service
 (201) 782-HELP
 Emergency shelter available

HUDSON Hudson County Battered
 Women's Project
 (201) 333-5700
 Emergency shelter available

BATTERED WOMEN CENTERS

MERCER Womanspace, Inc.
 (609) 394-9000
 Shelter available

MIDDLESEX Women's Crisis Center
 (201) 828-7273
 Emergency shelter available

Women Helping Women
 (201) 968-0905
 Emergency shelter available

MONMOUTH Women's Resource and Survival
 Center
 (201) 264-4111
 Emergency shelter available

MORRIS Jersey Battered Women Service
 (201) 267-4763
 Emergency shelter available

OCEAN Western Center
 (201) 928-0014
 Emergency shelter available

PASSAIC Women's Haven
 (201) 881-1450

SOMERSET Women's Resource Center
 (201) 685-1122
 Shelter available

SUSSEX Battered Person's Resource Center
 (201) 875-7561 after 3 p.m.
 Emergency shelter available

UNION Battered Women Project
 (201) 355-HELP
 Emergency shelter available

FIRST PRINTING - OCTOBER, 1978
 SECOND PRINTING - FEBRUARY, 1979
 THIRD PRINTING - MARCH, 1979
 FOURTH PRINTING - MAY, 1979

ATLANTIC COUNTY ABUSE CENTERCOUNSELING, REFERRAL, AND SHELTER PROGRAM FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The Atlantic County Abuse Center serves a 7-county region in New Jersey known as the Southern Region and receives referrals not only from the other three regions in the State, but from Pennsylvania and Delaware as well. This organization has been serving victims of rape and domestic violence on a volunteer basis since its incorporation in October of 1974, and it was the first shelter in New Jersey to open under Title XX funding- receiving its grant in February of 1978.

With this organization's on-going collection of data, the following experiences can be reported:

1. the victims of domestic violence are the helpless, most often women and children;
2. the perpetrators of abuse are themselves victims, for having been abused themselves as children, or witness to abuse between their own parents, they in turn perpetuate this same learned behavior on their own children, thus continuing the cycle of violence;
3. over 85% of the center's clients report that they as well as their abusers were abused as children;
4. although women trapped in an abusive situation live in constant fear, they do not do so by choice for as shelters open they are immediately filled to capacity;
5. the center has operated at capacity (20 beds) 95% of the time during its first year; it turns away 35% to 50% of its capacity number monthly, and women who cannot accept outpatient services due to fear that

their husbands or lovers will find out go uncounted;

6. in the center's first year of operation, it provided shelter to 112 clients and more than 200 children, in addition to the provision of counseling and referral services to 113 other clients on an out-patient basis (2 of these clients were men);

7. as the center enters its second year of fully-funded operation, it sees the following needs as crucial to the continued success of the program and other similar programs:

a) funding must be provided to establish additional shelter programs. No client who has brought herself to the point where she finally asks for help should be turned away due to lack of space. The Federal government must take the lead in allocating funds for the establishment of an adequate number of shelters to meet the needs of these victims. The shelters now in existence have more than proved the need of such programs;

b) referral and on-going counseling for abusers must be part of the total shelter program service delivery plan. No program dealing with domestic violence is addressing the entire problem unless some provision is made for the abuser; and

c) any program dealing with domestic violence must have the means of providing services to the children involved. At present, the center provides day care, sporadic interim schooling, and security. The center has not, however, begun to address the specific problems of these children which require counseling, referral, and coordination of services with those agencies dealing in child abuse.

None of the needs and concerns discussed here can be adequately addressed, however, without the backing of enabling legislation. The Federal government must take an active role in establishing a legislative responsibility to prevent and treat the problem of domestic violence in this country. Legislation must be enacted to provide secure funding for programs to enable them to deal with domestic abuse on a scale that provides services not only to all victims who request them, but to the equally victimized perpetrators of the abuse.

Laws must also be enacted and enforced that reverse the accepted view of women as property. Until society and the law begin to truly grant women equal educational opportunity, equal job opportunities, and equal economic opportunities through the use of credit and access to housing, shelters will remain crisis intervention centers, unable to adequately provide long-range solutions to the problem. Until society and the law begin to view domestic violence as a crime, women and children will have no choice but to accept the fear with which they live.

July 10, 1979

NEW JERSEY DIVISION ON WOMEN

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO HR 297

SECTION 10 - COORDINATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

(a)(1) In order to assist the Director in coordinating at the Federal level programs for the prevention of domestic violence and the provision of immediate shelter and other assistance to victims and the dependents of victims of domestic violence, a Federal Domestic Violence Council is established. Such council shall be chaired by the Director and shall be composed of-

(A) not less than five members of the general public to be appointed by the Secretary who are individuals who have been victims of domestic violence or who are experienced in the operation of community-based shelters or service programs for victims of domestic violence and their children and in the delivery of services to such victims, but who are not employees of government; and

(B) representatives with expertise in the area of the prevention and treatment of domestic violence, from such agencies as-

(i) the Action Agency;

(ii) the Department of Agriculture (with respect to the food stamp program);

(iii) the Office of Children, Youth & Families, HEW;

(iv) the Community Services Administration;

(v) the Department of Defense;

(vi) the Department of Housing and Urban Renewal;

SECTION 10

(vii) the Department of Justice (including the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration);

(viii) the Legal Services Corporation;

(ix) the appropriate Institutes within the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration; and

(x) representatives of State and local governments: Provided however, That the non-Federal members appointed pursuant to subparagraph(A) of this section shall at all times constitute a majority of the members of the Council.

The remaining paragraphs of Section 10 remain as they are written in HR 2977.

July 10, 1979

NEW JERSEY DIVISION ON WOMEN

SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS HR 2977

SECTION 11 - DEFINITIONS

(1) "domestic violence" means any act or threatened act of violence, including any forceful detention of an individual, which results or threatens to result in physical injury; and is committed by a person against another person to whom such person is married or has been married or with whom such person is residing or has resided;

(2) "victim" means any individual threatened with or suffering injury or duress as a result of domestic violence, or the child under the age of eighteen of such individual.

The remaining definitions under Section 11 remain as they are written in HR 2977.

BARRED FROM MORRIS FAMILY'S HOME**Accused wife slayer defied court**

By NANCY JAFFER

A Morris County judge had ordered a factory worker to stay away from his family's Butler home less than a week before the man was accused of murdering his estranged wife and her mother.

Rita Asencio, 31, and her mother, Ruth LaMont, 61, were found dead in their two-story house by police about 1:10 a.m. Sunday. The authorities also discovered Mrs. Asencio's husband, Wilfredo, 32, unconscious near his wife's body with a self-inflicted wound in his left shoulder from a 12-gauge shotgun.

Asencio, who was charged with two counts of murder by Morris County authorities, is being guarded by sheriff's deputies in Chilton Memorial Hospital, Pompton Plains, where he is in the intensive care unit.

Court papers filed by Mrs. Asencio last week indicated a history of violent encounters with her husband, whom she

accused of beating her, kicking her in the head, throwing a knife in a bathroom door and forcing her to submit to his sexual attentions.

Last Monday, she sought and received a temporary restraining order from Morris County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court Judge Donald Colleston barring Asencio from coming to her parents' Butler home, where the couple lived with their two children. They were married 11 years.

A final hearing on a permanent order had been set for Friday. Asencio also was scheduled to appear in Butler Municipal Court later this month on an assault charge. Mrs. Asencio filed after she said he bit her upper lip and punched her in the upper cheek and nose.

The county court complaint noted Asencio "has several guns and has on numerous occasions threatened to use them." It added he made her "subservi-

ent and akin to being a slave," and that his actions had put the entire family "into a state of dehumanization."

Morris County prosecutor Peter Manahan said Asencio, who worked in the finishing department at the Boonton Molding Co., was living in Bloomingdale after separating from his wife.

He said Asencio apparently entered the house through a window. The victims were in their nightclothes, Manahan added.

Also in the house at the time were the Asencios' two children, Wilfredo Jr., 10, and Maria, 9; Mrs. Asencio's grandmother, Mrs. Lucy LaMont and Mrs. LaMont's husband Frank. They were not harmed, Manahan said.

He added Mrs. LaMont called the Butler police indicating Asencio was "breaking up the house." Authorities responded within minutes, according to

(Please turn to Page 12)

**Accused wife murderer
defied restraining order**

(Continued from Page One)

Butler Police Chief Earl Dean, only to discover the bodies.

Saturday night, hours before she died, Mrs. Asencio called Fran Potts, director of the New Jersey Battered Women's Service, pleading for a place to stay.

A shelter planned for Greystone Park State Hospital has not opened because of funding complications and Potts was unable to offer her refuge.

"We're really feeling just horrible," Potts said yesterday. "I can't help but think Rita might have been alive today if I had to been able to shelter her Saturday night."

She said Mrs. Asencio, who worked in a bank, had been seeking help from the organization since last spring.

"She was somebody you'd like to be friends with. She was a wonderful human being and she did try to do a lot for herself," Potts recalled.

Manahan said Asencio will be taken to the Morris County Jail in Morristown as soon as doctors say he can leave the hospital. Bail has been set at \$250,000.

A Mass will be offered for Mrs. Asencio and Mrs. LaMont tomorrow at 10 a.m. in St. Anthony's Church, Butler, with burial to follow in Mt. Calvary Cemetery.

Shelter for battered filled to capacity

By JOAN BABBAGE

The Jersey Battered Women's Service (JBWS) shelter on the grounds of Greystone Park State Psychiatric Hospital in Parsippany-Troy Hills has been filled to capacity since it opened last December, according to its director of women's services.

"The need is so great that we often have a waiting list, and we have had to turn women away, which we hate to do," said Frances Mercurio-Potts.

Mercurio-Potts noted the 13-room house, formerly utilized by the state hospital, can accommodate 20 adults and has cribs for three infants.

Administrator-director Jean Martorana, a former probation officer, said the shelter had served as a refuge for 30 women during its three-month existence.

"The oldest was 46 and the youngest was 19. Most of the women who come to us are in their late 20s or early 30s. We believe many older women need our services, but they may not be as mobile as the younger ones or have come to accept their plight as being hopeless," she said.

Mercurio-Potts said although the shelter provides communal living, which is difficult at best, there have been no serious problems or conflicts. She noted that the JBWS has guidelines for operation, including a three-day evaluation period and a sharing of household chores.

She said among the positive results is the fact a number of the women who met at the shelter have decided to share their homes and expenses and be mutually supportive after their departure.

Martorana said the JBWS does a followup on every woman who has been sheltered, and has found that they have proven to be very self-sufficient on their own.

"However, the ones who have returned to their husbands unfortunately have not fared as well," she added.

Mercurio-Potts said the JBWS has a speakers bureau to educate the public about their services. Members also do telephone counseling on a special hot line.

"Many men have told us that they are glad we are here, and just the other day we received a call from a man who asked if we could advise him how to stop abusing his wife," she said. "His spouse was not at the shelter, so that wasn't the reason for the call. We directed him to the Violence Clinic at the Veterans Hospital in East Orange."

Mercurio-Potts said another positive result was that local police departments have become more understanding of the problem of battered wives.

She said a tragedy which helped launch the shelter was the murder last October of Butler residents Rita Asencio and her mother, Mrs. Ruth LaMont. Mrs. Asencio's husband, Wilfredo, was charged with the crimes.

"Many of us who are now working at the shelter knew Rita very well, and her death has deeply affected

us," said Mercurio-Potts.

She said two Butler police officers, Dennis Passenti and Jerry Napoleone, who responded to the distress call made by Mrs. LaMont have personally raised \$3,000 to assist the shelter.

The facility, which almost didn't open because of financial problems, is being funded by the Junior League of Morristown, the State Division of Youth and Family Services, the Morris County Board of Freeholders and private donations.

Among the director's future dreams is to be able to increase the staff of four and to offer more services. She said there is a need for both men and women to serve as volunteers.

"We need people to provide transportation and to man our hotline. We also could use donations of food, clothing, furniture, housewares and a set of encyclopedias," she said.

Mercurio-Potts, believes the JBWS had been able to build up women's self-confidence and to bring out their potential.

"It is easy to get out of a marriage today. So why endure physical abuse? No one deserves to be beaten and no one likes it."

SENATE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR
SENATE, No. 807

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

ADOPTED JUNE 14, 1979

AN ACT concerning shelters for victims of domestic violence.

1 BE IT ENACTED *by the Senate and General Assembly of the State*
 2 *of New Jersey:*

1 1. The Legislature finds and declares that there is a present and
 2 growing need to develop services to protect victims of domestic
 3 violence. It is the purpose of this act to encourage the development
 4 of shelters for these victims and their children where they may
 5 obtain necessary services, including shelter, counseling and other
 6 social services.

1 2. This act shall be known and may be cited as the "Shelters for
 2 Victims of Domestic Violence Act."

1 3. The Department of Human Services shall provide services
 2 to those public or private agencies, which meet the standards set
 3 forth in this act, to operate shelters for victims of domestic vio-
 4 lence. Priority for the allocation of services shall be to viable,
 5 existing programs which have successfully performed the delivery
 6 of shelter and other services to victims of domestic violence prior
 7 to the effective date of this act.

1 4. There is created an Advisory Council on Shelters for Victims
 2 of Domestic Violence which shall consist of 10 members: the Di-
 3 rector of the Division on Women, the Director of the Division of
 4 Youth and Family Services, the Director of the Division of Public
 5 Welfare, the Commissioner of the Department of Education, the
 6 Executive Director of the State Law Enforcement Planning
 7 Agency, or their designees, and one representative of Legal Ser-
 8 vices of New Jersey, one former domestic violence shelter resident,
 9 and three representatives of shelters for domestic violence pro-
 10 grams to be appointed by the Governor, without regard to political
 11 affiliation.

1 5. The Commissioner of Human Services, in consultation with
 2 the advisory council, shall establish standards to be met by those
 3 shelters applying for services to assure the availability of special-
 4 ized personnel, resources and equipment necessary to enable such

5 shelters to carry out the purposes of this act. Upon establishment
6 of a program of services, the commissioner in consultation with the
7 advisory council shall periodically appraise its performance to
8 determine whether the purposes of this act are being met.

1 6. The Commissioner of Human Services, in consultation with
2 the advisory council, shall:

3 a. Provide technical assistance to help public and private agen-
4 cies to qualify as operators of shelters and to obtain State and
5 Federal funds for the establishment and maintenance of shelters.

6 b. Suggest the types of innovative strategies in services which
7 will ameliorate and reduce the problems of domestic violence.

8 c. Foster cooperation and communication among the providers
9 of services to victims of domestic violence to promote agreement
10 among providers concerning the treatment needs of those victims.

11 d. Provide guidelines for the training and use of volunteers in
12 the delivery of services.

1 7. A shelter shall provide a residential area which provides safe
2 refuge for victims of domestic violence. A shelter shall also pro-
3 vide a day program or drop-in center, located at the shelter site
4 or in a separate facility, which can assist victims of domestic vio-
5 lence who have not yet made the decision to leave their homes, or
6 who have found other shelter but who nevertheless have a need
7 for the services provided at the shelter.

1 8. A shelter shall arrange for the provision of the following
2 services to victims of domestic violence:

3 a. Emergency medical care.

4 b. Emergency legal assistance.

5 c. Marriage and family counseling and emergency psychological
6 support and counseling, as requested.

7 d. Information regarding education, job counseling and training
8 programs, housing, welfare and other available social services
9 accomplished, wherever possible, by referrals to appropriate au-
10 thorities or agencies.

1 9. The shelter staff shall advocate the delivery of services from
2 such agencies as county welfare departments and law enforcement
3 and legal services agencies to those served by the shelters.

1 10. To the extent feasible, one or more of the shelter personnel
2 shall be bilingual. An effort shall be made to recruit former vic-
3 tims of domestic assault as staff members.

1 11. The commissioner shall seek and make use of any funds which
2 are available from Federal or other sources in order to augment
3 any State funds appropriated for the purposes of this program.

1 12. Information which may reveal the identity or location of a

2 person seeking shelter services shall not be disclosed, except as
3 otherwise specifically required by law or with the consent of the
4 person seeking shelter services.

1 13. No shelter providing care for a minor who was in the actual
2 custody of a parent at the time the parent applied for shelter ser-
3 vices shall release the minor to any person, including the child's
4 other parent, without the consent of the parent who sought shelter,
5 except as may be otherwise required by court order.

1 14. This act shall take effect immediately.

STATEMENT

This bill, to be known as the "Shelters for Victims of Domestic Violence Act," authorizes the Department of Human Services to provide services to those public or private agencies, which meet the standards set forth in the act to operate shelters for victims of domestic violence.

The bill establishes an Advisory Council on Shelters for Victims of Domestic Violence. The Commissioner of Human Services, in consultation with the Advisory Council, shall establish standards for the operation of shelters.

This bill emphasizes the need for cooperation among the existing service delivery agencies and recognizes the need for bilingual assistance.

The Commissioner of Human Services is directed to seek and make use of any funds which are available from Federal and other sources in order to augment State funds available for the purposes of this program.

SENATE, No. 3244

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

INTRODUCED MAY 10, 1979

By Senators LIPMAN, YATES, PERSKIE, A. RUSSO, HERBERT
and ORECHIO

Referred to Committee on County and Municipal Government

AN ACT to amend the title of "An act concerning community residences for the developmentally disabled, and supplementing the 'Municipal Land Use Law,' approved January 12, 1976 (P. L. 1975, c. 291)," approved December 7, 1978 (P. L. 1978, c. 159, C. 40:55D-66.1 et seq.), so that the same shall read "An act concerning community residences for the developmentally disabled and community spousal assault shelters, and supplementing the 'Municipal Land Use Law,' approved January 14, 1976 (P. L. 1975, c. 291)," and to amend the body of said act.

1 BE IT ENACTED *by the Senate and General Assembly of the State*
2 *of New Jersey:*

1 1. The title of P. L. 1978, c. 159 (C. 40:55D-66.1 et seq.) is
2 amended to read as follows: An act concerning community resi-
3 dences for the developmentally disabled *and community spousal*
4 *assault shelters*, and supplementing the "Municipal Land Use
5 Law," approved January 14, 1976 (P. L. 1975, c. 291).

1 2. Section 1 of P. L. 1978, c. 159 (C. 40:55D-66.1) is amended
2 to read as follows:

3 1. Community residences for the developmentally disabled *and*
4 *community spousal assault shelters* shall be a permitted use in
5 all residential districts of a municipality, and the requirements
6 therefor shall be the same as for single family dwelling units
7 located within such districts; provided, however, that, in the case
8 of a community residence for the developmentally disabled *or*
9 *community spousal assault shelter* housing more than six persons,
10 excluding resident staff, a Zoning ordinance may require for the
11 use or conversion to use of a dwelling unit to such a community
12 residence *or shelter*, a conditional use permit in accordance with
13 section 54 of the act to which this act is a supplement

EXPLANATION—Matter enclosed in bold-faced brackets [thus] in the above bill
is not enacted and is intended to be omitted in the law.

14 (C. 40:55D-67). Any requirements imposed for the issuance of a
 15 conditional use permit shall be reasonably related to the health,
 16 safety and welfare of the residents of the district: provided, how-
 17 ever, that a municipality may deny such a permit to any proposed
 18 community residence for the developmentally disabled *or com-*
 19 *munity spousal assault shelter* which would be located within 1500
 20 feet of an existing such residence *or shelter*; provided further,
 21 however, that a municipality may deny the issuance of any addi-
 22 tional such permits if the number of [developmentally disabled
 23 and mentally ill] persons, *other than resident staff*, resident at
 24 existing such community residences *or community shelters* within
 25 the municipality exceeds 50 persons, or 0.5% of the population of
 26 the municipality, whichever is greater.

1 3. Section 2 of P. L. 1978, c. 159 (C. 40:55D-66.2) is amended
 2 to read as follows:

3 2. As used in this act[.]: a. "community residence for the de-
 4 velopmentally disabled" means any community residential facility
 5 licensed pursuant to P. L. 1977, c. 448 (C. 30:11B-1 et seq.) pro-
 6 viding food, shelter and personal guidance, under such supervision
 7 as required, to not more than 15 developmentally disabled or
 8 mentally ill persons, who require assistance, temporarily or perma-
 9 nently, in order to live in the community, and shall include, but not
 10 be limited to: group homes, half-way houses, intermediate care
 11 facilities, supervised apartment living arrangements, and hostels.
 12 Such a residence shall not be considered a health care facility within
 13 the meaning of the "Health Care Facilities Planning Act" (P. L.
 14 1971, c. 136; C. 26:2H-1 et seq.). In the case of such a community
 15 residence housing mentally ill persons, such residence shall have
 16 been approved for a purchase of service contract or an affiliation
 17 agreement pursuant to such procedures as shall be established by
 18 regulation of the Division of Mental Health and Hospitals of the
 19 Department of Human Services. As used in this act, "develop-
 20 mentally disabled person" means a person who is developmentally
 21 disabled as defined in section 2 of P. L. 1977, c. 448 (C. 30:11B-2),
 22 and "mentally ill person" means a person who is afflicted with a
 23 mental illness as defined in R. S. 30:4-23. but shall not include a
 24 person who has been committed after having been found not guilty
 25 of a criminal offense by reason of insanity or having been found
 26 unfit to be tried on a criminal charge.

27 b. "*Community spousal assault shelter*" means any shelter ap-
 28 proved for a purchase of service contract and certified pursuant to
 29 standards and procedures established by regulation of the Depart-
 30 ment of Human Services pursuant to P. L. . . . , c. . . .

31 (C.) (now pending before the Legislature as Senate
 32 No. 807), providing food, shelter, medical care, legal assistance,
 33 personal guidance, and other services to not more than 15 persons
 34 who have been victims of spousal assault, including any children
 35 of such victims, who temporarily require shelter and assistance in
 36 order to protect their physical or psychological welfare.

1 4. This act shall take effect immediately, but shall remain in-
 2 operative until the enactment of Senate No. 807 (now pending
 3 before the Legislature).

STATEMENT

This bill is intended as a companion measure to Senate Bill No. 807, the "Spousal Assault Shelter Act." The bill would amend the recently enacted legislation permitting the location of community residences for the developmentally disabled in residential districts of municipalities (P. L. 1978, c. 159; C. 40:55D-66.1 et seq.), to include community spousal assault shelters within the provisions of the law.

The bill would require that any such shelter be approved and certified by the Department of Human Services pursuant to the provisions of Senate Bill No. 807. The bill would take effect only upon enactment of Senate Bill No. 807, which provides standards for the establishment and operation of such shelters.

[Prepared statement of Ellen Pence follows:]

Mr. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE:

I AM ELLEN PENCE, THE STATE DIRECTOR OF MINNESOTA PROGRAMS FOR BATTERED WOMEN. I AM HERE TODAY TO TESTIFY ON H. R. 2977 RELATIVE TO THE ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAMS. IN 1977 - 78 THE MINNESOTA STATE LEGISLATURE PASSED LEGISLATION VERY SIMILAR TO THIS BILL IN PURPOSE. THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATION, ALLOCATING \$625,000, HAD FOUR MAJOR PROVISIONS:

1. THE LEGISLATION ALLOCATED MONIES TO FUND FOUR OR MORE SHELTERS IN BOTH URBAN AND RURAL AREAS IN THE STATE.
2. IT PROVIDED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN 18-MEMBER ADVISORY TASK FORCE OF PROFESSIONALS AND GRASSROOTS PEOPLE WITH EXPERIENCE IN WORKING WITH BATTERED WOMEN.
3. IT REQUIRED ALL SOCIAL SERVICE, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND MEDICAL PERSONNEL TO REPORT INCIDENCES OF BATTERING TO THE ADMINSTRATING STATE AGENCY FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING THE NEED FOR CONTINUED AND/OR EXPANDED STATE FUNDING.
4. AND FINALLY, IT PROVIDED FUNDS TO CONDUCT A STATEWIDE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM FOR BOTH PROFESSIONALS AND THE PUBLIC ON ISSUES RELATED TO BATTERING.

THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATION EXEMPLIFIES, ON A STATE LEVEL, THE POTENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERAL LEGISLATION SUCH AS H. R. 2977. PRIOR TO THE PASSAGE OF THE 1977 LEGISLATION THERE WERE ONLY TWO SHELTERS FOR BATTERED WOMEN IN THE STATE. BOTH WERE LOCATED IN THE MINNEAPOLIS/St. PAUL METROPOLITAN AREA. CURRENTLY THERE ARE SEVEN SHELTERS IN OPERATION. WITH THE SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN THE STATE'S COMMITMENT TO \$3 MILLION IN 1980 - 81, AN ADDITIONAL NINE SHELTERS WILL OPEN BY DECEMBER OF THIS YEAR.

STATE FUNDING HAS PROVIDED MANY GRASSROOTS VOLUNTEER GROUPS WITH THE CATALYST NECESSARY TO SOLICIT AND RECEIVE LOCAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT IN TOWNS ACROSS THE STATE. SEVERAL COMMUNITIES, ROCHESTER, HOPKINS, BURNSVILLE, MINNEAPOLIS, AND ST. CLOUD, FOR EXAMPLE, HAVE ALL COMMITTED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS TO PROVIDE FACILITIES TO SERVE AS SHELTERS. OTHER COMMUNITIES HAVE COMMITTED RURAL DEVELOPMENT FUNDS, CETA FUNDS, GENERAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS, MENTAL HEALTH FUNDS, AND TITLE XX MONIES. PRIVATE

FOUNDATIONS, CITIZEN GROUPS, UNITED WAY AGENCIES HAVE ALL JOINED IN THE EFFORT TO KEEP LOCALLY ESTABLISHED SHELTERS OPERATING. STATE FUNDS REPRESENT FROM ONE-FOURTH TO ONE-HALF OF A SHELTER'S OPERATING BUDGET IN MINNESOTA DEPENDING ON THE SHELTER SIZE AND LOCATION. THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT STATE FUNDS HAVE GENERATED MORE THAN DOUBLE THEIR AMOUNT IN LOCAL FINANCIAL COMMITMENTS TO A PROBLEM ONCE CONSIDERED A PRIVATE MATTER AND AN INAPPROPRIATE ARENA FOR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT.

WHILE SHELTERS NEITHER SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF BATTERING NOR GUARANTEE THE PROTECTION OF ALL VICTIMS OF PARTNER ASSAULT, THEY ARE SYMBOLS IN A COMMUNITY OF THE RIGHT OF ALL PEOPLE TO BE PHYSICALLY PROTECTED BY THE SOCIETY IN WHICH THEY LIVE. THEY ARE A CONSTANT REMINDER TO THE JUDICIAL, MEDICAL AND SOCIAL SERVICE SYSTEM OF THE NEED FOR CHANGE IN THE POLICY AND ATTITUDES OF THOSE SYSTEMS TOWARD THE VICTIMS OF ONE OF THIS SOCIETY'S MOST DEVASTATING AND ARCHAIC PRACTICES--WIFE-BEATING.

WITH FEW EXCEPTIONS, THE STATE FUNDING IS GRANTED TO LOCALLY-BASED GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS FOR THREE REASONS. FIRST, GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS CAN PROVIDE HOUSING AND ADVOCACY FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN AT A MUCH LOWER COST THAN TRADITIONAL AGENCIES. SECOND, A GRASSROOTS APPROACH MAXIMIZES THE USE OF EXISTING SOCIAL SERVICE AGENCIES AND PREVENTS DUPLICATION OF SERVICES. AND FINALLY, THIS APPROACH ENCOURAGES THE PARTICIPATION OF FORMER VICTIMS, THUS MAINTAINING A PERSPECTIVE THAT DOES NOT SLIP INTO BLAMING THE VICTIM FOR THE ABUSE HE OR SHE HAS EXPERIENCED.

THERE ARE OVER 40 GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS CURRENTLY EXISTING IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA WHICH PROVIDE INDIVIDUAL AND CLASS ADVOCACY FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN, EDUCATE COMMUNITIES ON ISSUES RELATED TO BATTERING, AND HOUSE, EITHER IN SECURED FACILITIES, SUCH AS SHELTERS OR SAFE HOME SYSTEMS, VICTIMS OF PARTNER ASSAULT. BY LIMITING THEIR ROLES TO HOUSING WOMEN AND CHILDREN AND PROVIDING ADVOCACY FOR WOMEN AND CHILDREN WITHIN THE SYSTEM WE HAVE SUCCESSFULLY AVOIDED DEVELOPING AN ALTERNATIVE SOCIAL SERVICE SYSTEM AND HOPEFULLY ARE DEVELOPING PERMANENT CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM TO EFFECTIVELY WORK WITH ALL VICTIMS OF FAMILY VIOLENCE, NOT JUST THOSE REFERRED THROUGH SHELTERS.

IN THE EFFORT TO BUILD WITHIN THE PRESENT SYSTEM AN AWARENESS OF HOW POLICY AND PRACTICE CAN PERPETUATE THE PROBLEM OF FAMILY VIOLENCE, MORE AND MORE WE FIND PROFES-

SIONALS AND THE COMMUNITY-AT-LARGE DEVELOPING THE SKILLS NECESSARY TO EFFECTIVELY WORK WITH INDIVIDUALS AND TOWARD ULTIMATE ELIMINATION OF SUCH VIOLENCE. MINNESOTA SHELTERS, FOR EXAMPLE, DO NOT PROVIDE DIRECT LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO RESIDENTS NOR MEDICAL CARE, NOR SPECIALIZED COUNSELING TO SHELTER RESIDENTS. IN THE PAST TWO YEARS THIS CLASS ADVOCACY APPROACH HAS RESULTED IN SIGNIFICANT CHANGES; HOSPITALS THROUGHOUT THE STATE HAVE DEVELOPED SPECIALIZED PROTOCOLS IN EMERGENCY ROOMS FOR VICTIMS OF PHYSICAL ASSAULT WITHIN FAMILIES. POLICE AND SHERIFF DEPARTMENTS HAVE SPONSORED WITH SHELTERS SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN HANDLING DOMESTIC CALLS. COUNSELORS AND THERAPISTS HAVE WORKED WITH SHELTER STAFFS AND RESIDENTS TO DEVELOP NEW METHODS OF COUNSELING BOTH THE VICTIMS AND THE ASSAILANTS OF FAMILY VIOLENCE, GRADUALLY CHANGING THE PREVAILING ATTITUDE THAT THE VICTIM SOMEHOW ENABLES THE BATTERER'S VIOLENT BEHAVIOR OR IS MERELY A PARTICIPANT IN THE SO-CALLED DYSFUNCTIONAL FAMILY. MAJOR LEGISLATION HAS BEEN PASSED GIVING BOTH THE POLICE AND COURTS MORE EFFECTIVE TOOLS TO WORK WITH WHEN FACING CASES INVOLVING FAMILY VIOLENCE.

THE SECOND PROVISION IN THE MINNESOTA LEGISLATION, WHICH IS SIMILAR TO THIS PROPOSED LEGISLATION, IS THE CREATION OF A STATEWIDE TASK FORCE TO ASSURE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LEGISLATION. THE 18-MEMBER TASK FORCE ESTABLISHED IN MINNESOTA HAS PROVIDED THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, THE STATE ADMINISTERING AGENCY— WITH ONLY TWO FULL-TIME STAFF POSITIONS—WITH THE EXPERTISE NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THIS LEGISLATION. FIFTY PERCENT OF THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS ARE FROM RURAL AREAS. ONE-THIRD OF THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS REPRESENT MINORITY COMMUNITIES. OVER ONE-THIRD ARE PEOPLE WHO HAVE PERSONALLY EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN THEIR FAMILIES. FIFTY PERCENT OF THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS ARE MEMBERS OF NON-PROFIT ADVOCACY OR SHELTER ORGANIZATIONS.

ONLY 5.5 PERCENT OF THE 1980 - 81 \$3-MILLION BUDGET FOR THE STATE PROGRAM IS ALLOCATED TO ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM. THAT LOW FIGURE IS ONLY POSSIBLE BECAUSE OF THE WORKING NATURE OF THE TASK FORCE WHICH IS ONLY REIMBURSED FOR DIRECT EXPENSES (TRAVEL, LODGING, AND FOOD). WHILE THE PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION DOES REQUIRE STATES TO "SET FORTH PROCEDURES TO ASSURE ACTIVE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION WITHIN THE STATE" IT DOES NOT REQUIRE THE INVOLVEMENT OF FORMER VICTIMS NOR PEOPLE OF DIVERSE ECONOMIC AND CULTURAL

BACKGROUNDS. BASED ON OUR EXPERIENCE IN WORKING WITH A TASK FORCE, BOTH OF THOSE REQUIREMENTS ARE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED. THEIR PARTICIPATION IS ALSO CRUCIAL IN THE CREATION OF ANY FEDERAL INTER-AGENCY COUNCIL. SUCH A COUNCIL, AS DEFINED IN SECTION 10 OF H. R. 2977, CAN BE EXTREMELY BENEFICIAL TO ORGANIZATIONS THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY IN THEIR EFFORTS TO EFFECT CHANGES IN FEDERAL POLICIES. LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITIES, SHELTERS, AND ORGANIZATIONS ACROSS THE COUNTRY SPENT OVER TWO YEARS AND MANY PEOPLE HOURS TO MAKE THE CHANGES IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT GUIDELINES TO ALLOW FOR THE USE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS TO PURCHASE AND REHABILITATE BUILDINGS FOR SHELTERS. THE EXISTENCE OF SUCH A COUNCIL AND THE NATIONAL CLEARINGHOUSE COULD HAVE GREATLY FACILITATED THAT EFFORT. CURRENT EFFORTS TO MAKE CHANGES IN SECTION 8 GUIDELINE, TITLE XX FUNDING, ACTION GUIDELINES COULD ALL BENEFIT FROM SUCH A COUNCIL.

IN RESPECT TO THE PROVISIONS RELATIVE TO THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS, I HAVE THREE COMMENTS. FIRST, I BELIEVE THAT SOME CHANGES COULD BE USEFUL IN SECTION 3, WHICH STATES THAT GRANTS CANNOT BE MADE IN EXCESS OF 25 PERCENT OF A PROGRAM'S ANNUAL BUDGET UNLESS THE PROGRAM IS IN EXISTANCE FOR LESS THAN ONE YEAR. IN OUR EXPERIENCE IN MINNESOTA, AND I BELIEVE THE SAME IS TRUE FOR PENNSYLVANIA, WE HAVE FOUND THAT, PARTICULARLY IN RURAL AREAS, SHELTERS OR ADVOCACY PROGRAMS TAKE A FULL YEAR OF OPERATION BEFORE THE COMMUNITY RECOGNIZES THE LEGITIMACY OF THE PROGRAMS AND BEGINS TO ACCEPT SOME FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEM. THERE IS STILL A VERY PREVALENT BELIEF THAT BATTERING DOES NOT HAPPEN IN RURAL AREAS AND THAT SHELTERS PROMOTE THE BREAKUP OF FAMILIES. IN MINNESOTA WE HAVE FOUND THAT AFTER 12 TO 18 MONTHS OF OPERATION, SEVERAL NON-URBAN SHELTERS OR ADVOCACY GROUPS ARE RECEIVING BROAD-BASED COMMUNITY SUPPORT AS PEOPLE RECOGNIZE THAT VIOLENCE NOT SHELTERS BREAK UP FAMILIES AND THAT VIOLENCE IS IN FACT A REALITY IN RURAL AREAS. WE WOULD SUGGEST THAT DURING THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF FUNDING THROUGH THIS LEGISLATION, ORGANIZATIONS BE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR UP TO 50 PERCENT OF THEIR ANNUAL BUDGETS. IT IS OUR ASSUMPTION THAT THE INTENT OF THE STATEMENT IN THIS SECTION, "THAT A GRANT AWARDED TO AN ENTITY WHICH HAS NOT BEEN IN OPERATION FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR MAY EQUAL UP TO 50 PERCENT", PAGE 9, LINES 3 AND 4, IS IN REFERENCE NOT TO THE EXISTENCE OF THE NON-PROFIT CORPORATION BUT THE DATE THAT THE PROGRAMING FOR WHICH FUNDING IS SOUGHT

BECAME FULLY OPERATIONAL. PERHAPS LANGUAGE CLARIFYING THIS POINT IS NECESSARY.

SECONDLY, AGAIN IN SECTION 3, PAGE 6, LINES 3 THROUGH 5, WE ARE PLEASED TO SEE THAT THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION ALLOWS THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF THE STATE TO SPECIFY WHICH STATE AGENCY HE OR SHE WILL CHOOSE TO ADMINISTER THE STATE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAM UNDER THIS ACT. AS YOU KNOW SEVERAL STATES HAVE PASSED LEGISLATION AND HAVE ALREADY DEVELOPED STATE PROGRAMS. EACH OF THOSE STATES HAVE IN THEIR LEGISLATION DESIGNATED ADMINISTERING STATE AGENCIES, AND FEDERAL LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD HAVE REQUIRED FUNDING TO BE ADMINISTERED THROUGH A PARTICULAR STATE AGENCY WOULD HAVE CREATED CONFUSION, DUPLICATION OF EFFORTS, AND COULD POTENTIALLY BE DISTRUPTIVE TO ESTABLISHED STATE PROGRAMS. WE SUPPORT THIS PROVISION REMAINING UNALTERED IN THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION REGARDLESS OF THE VEHICLE H. E. W. CHOOSES TO USE FOR ALLOCATING MONIES TO THE STATE.

FINALLY, MY LAST COMMENT IN TERMS OF THE ALLOCATION OF FUNDS ARE IN REGARDS TO THE PROPOSED AMOUNTS OF FEDERAL FUNDING. THE DATA COLLECTED THROUGH THE MINNESOTA PROGRAM DEMONSTRATED THE NEED FOR A MINIMUM OF 15 SHELTERS IN THE STATE. BASED ON REPORTS RECEIVED FORM LAW ENFORCBMENT, MEDICAL, AND SOCIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS, OVER AN 8-MONTH PERIOD, WE HAVE CONSERVATIVELY ESTIMATED THAT THERE WERE OVER 27,000 INCIDENCES OF ASSAULTS ON WOMEN BY THEIR PARTNERS IN MINNESOTA LAST YEAR. OVER 65 PERCENT OF THE VICTIMS HAVE BEEN EXPERIENCING CONTINUAL ASSAULT FOR OVER ONE YEAR. OVER 80 PERCENT OF THE VICTIMS HAD CHILDREN. ABUSE CROSSED ALL AGE, RACE, AND GEOGRAPHIC LINES, AND RANGED IN SEVERITY FROM BRUISES TO DEATH. DURING THE SAME TIME PERIOD, 79 PERCENT OF THE WOMEN SEEKING SHELTER WERE TURNED AWAY DUE TO LACK OF SPACE.

SUPPORTED BY DATA GATHERED OVER THE FIRST 18 MONTHS OF THE STATE PROGRAM, PROFESSIONALS FROM ALL FIELDS, AND COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN ALL REGIONS OF THE STATE, GOVERNOR ALBERT QUIE MADE THE EXPANSION OF THIS PROGRAM A TOP PRIORITY IN HIS LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS DURING THE 1979 SESSION. GOV. QUIE SUBMITTED A BUDGET FOR \$2.7 MILLION TO FUND A SHELTER IN EACH OF THE STATE'S 10 METRO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REGIONS AND FIVE METRO SHELTERS. HIS BUDGET ALSO EXPANDED THE STATE'S COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROGRAM AND CALLED FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMMING FOR THE VIOLENT PARTNER. THE LEGISLATURE RESPONDED THE THE GOVERNOR'S REQUEST FOR EXPANDED FUNDING BY APPROVING A TOTAL BUDGET OF \$3-MILLION.

THE GOVERNOR AND THE LEGISLATORS INTEND THIS \$3-MILLION COMMITMENT TO BE A LONG-TERM BUDGET ITEM.

LIKEWISE, WE ANTICIPATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WILL FIND THAT, IN A TIME WHEN OVER 40 PERCENT OF THE WOMEN AND 11 PERCENT OF THE MEN IN THIS COUNTRY THAT ARE MURDERED ARE KILLED BY THEIR PARTNERS, WHEN ONE IN EVERY FIVE MARRIAGES INVOLVES VIOLENCE, WHEN OVER ONE-HALF OF THE CHILDREN WHO GROW UP IN VIOLENT HOMES BECOME ABUSERS OR VICTIMS THEMSELVES IN ADULT RELATIONSHIPS, AND IN A TIME WHEN OUR JAILS AND PRISONS ARE FILLED WITH MEN AND WOMEN WHO GREW UP IN PHYSICALLY AND SEXUALLY ABUSIVE HOMES, FAMILY VIOLENCE CAN NO LONGER BE CONSIDERED A PRIVATE MATTER. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE THE LEAD IN PROVIDING FINANCIAL AID. STATE GOVERNMENTS MUST FOLLOW. AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES MUST TAKE THE ULTIMATE RESPONSIBILITY TO CREATE AN ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH THERE IS NO PLACE FOR VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND AGAINST FAMILY MEMBERS. VIOLENCE WITHIN FAMILIES IS A REFLECTION OF A LARGER SOCIETAL ATTITUDE THAT THE PHYSICALLY AND PSYCHOLOGICALLY VULNERABLE, PRIMARILY WOMEN AND CHILDREN, BUT ALSO MEN, CAN BE THE PUNCHING BAGS FOR THOSE SEEKING TO FIND CONTROL IN THEIR LIVES THROUGH PHYSICAL VIOLENCE.

WHILE THIS LEGISLATION PROVIDES MUCH OF THE INCENTIVE TO STATE AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY, IT IS ONLY THE BEGINNING OF THE FUNDING NEEDED TO EFFECTIVELY WORK TOWARD THE TREMENDOUS CHANGES THAT MUST OCCUR IN THIS NATION. IT'S EMPHASIS ON COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMMING, ON STATE INVOLVEMENT, ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION, ON NOT CREATING PROGRAMS WHICH ARE TOTALLY DEPENDENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING, ARE ALL EXCELLENT FEATURES OF THIS LEGISLATION.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE, I WOULD LIKE TO THANK YOU FOR THIS OPPORTUNITY TO TESTIFY TODAY AND MORE IMPORTANTLY, THANK YOU FOR YOUR EFFORTS TO CONFRONT WHAT FOR ALL OF US IS A PERSONALLY DIFFICULT ISSUE TO DEAL WITH THROUGH LEGISLATION.

STATEMENT OF ELLEN PENCE, STATE DIRECTOR OF BATTERED WOMEN'S PROGRAMS, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Ms. PENCE. My name is Ellen Pence. I am the State Director of Minnesota Programs for Battered Women. I, too, thank you for the opportunity today to testify before this committee.

In 1977 and 1978, the Minnesota State Legislature passed legislation very similar to this bill in its purpose. The Minnesota legislation, allocating \$625,000, had four major provisions.

First, the legislation allocated moneys to find four or more shelters in both urban and rural areas in the State.

Second, it provided for the establishment of an 18-member advisory task force of professionals and grassroots people with experience in working with battered women.

Third, it required all social service, law enforcement, and medical personnel to report incidences of battering to the administering State agency for the purpose of determining the need for continued and/or expanded State funding. I believe we are the only State that requires a systematic reporting of battering.

Fourth and finally, it provided funds to conduct a statewide educational program for both professionals and the public on issues related to battering.

The Minnesota legislation exemplifies, on a State level, the potential effectiveness of Federal legislation such as this. Prior to the passage of the 1977 legislation, there were only two shelters for battered women in the State. Both were located in the Minneapolis/St. Paul metropolitan area. Currently there are seven shelters in operation. With the substantial increase in the State's commitment during 1980-81 to \$3 million, an additional nine shelters will open by December of this year.

State funding has provided many grassroots volunteer groups with the catalyst necessary to solicit and receive local financial support in towns across the State. Several communities, Rochester, Hopkins, Burnsville, Minneapolis, and St. Cloud, for example, have all committed community development block grant funds to provide facilities to serve as shelters.

Other communities have committed rural development funds, CETA funds, general assistance funds, mental health funds, and title XX moneys. Private foundations, citizen groups, United Way agencies have all joined in the effort to keep locally established shelters operating.

State funds represent from one-fourth to one-half of a shelter's operating budget in Minnesota, depending on the shelter size and location. There is no doubt that State funds have generated more than double their amount in local financial commitments to a problem once considered a private matter and an inappropriate arena for community involvement.

While shelters neither solve the problem of battering nor guarantee the protection of all victims of partner assault, they are symbols in a community of the right of all people to be physically protected by the society in which they live. They are a constant reminder to the judicial, medical, and social service system of the need for change in the policy

and attitudes of those systems toward the victims of one of this society's most devastating crimes.

With few exceptions, the State funding is granted to locally based grassroots organizations for three reasons. First, grassroots organizations can provide housing and advocacy for women and children at a much lower cost than traditional agencies. Second, a grassroots approach maximizes the use of existing social service agencies. It serves to confront the inappropriate practices of these agencies.

Finally, this approach encourages the participation of former victims, thus maintaining a perspective that does not slip into blaming the victim for the abuse he or she has experienced.

In the past 3 years, the class advocacy approach of shelters has resulted in very significant changes in existing social services and law enforcement agencies around the State. Hospitals throughout the State have developed specialized protocols in emergency rooms for battered women. Police and sheriffs departments have sponsored with shelters specialized training in the handling of domestic calls.

Counselors and therapists have worked with shelter staffs and residents to develop new methods of counseling both victims and the assailants of battering, gradually changing the prevailing attitude that the victim somehow enables the batterer's violent behavior, or is merely a participant in the so-called dysfunctional family. Major legislation in Minnesota has been passed, giving both the police and the courts more effective tools to work with when facing cases involving battering.

The second provision in the Minnesota legislation, which is similar to this proposed legislation, is the creation of a statewide task force to assure citizen participation in the implementation of the legislation. The 18-member task force has provided the Department of Corrections, the State administering agency—with only two full-time staff provisions—with the expertise necessary to implement this legislation.

Fifty percent of the task force members are from rural areas. One-third of the task force members represent minority communities. Over one-third are people who have personally experienced family violence. Fifty percent of the task force members are members of nonprofit advocacy or shelter organizations.

While the proposed Federal legislation does require States to set forth procedures to assure active citizen participation, it does not require the involvement of former victims nor people of diverse economic and cultural backgrounds to be on those committees.

Based on our experience in working with a task force, both of those requirements are highly recommended. Their participation is also crucial in the creation of any Federal interagency council, such as defined in this legislation.

In respect to the provisions relative to the allocation of funds, I have three comments. First, I believe that some changes could be useful in section 3, which states that grants cannot be made in excess of 25 percent of a program's annual budget unless the program is in existence for not less than 1 year.

In our experience in Minnesota, and I believe the same is true for Pennsylvania and other States, we have found that, particularly in rural areas, shelters or advocacy programs take a full year of opera-

tion before the community recognizes the legitimacy of the program and begins to accept some financial responsibility for them.

There is still a very prevalent belief that battering does not happen in rural areas and that shelters promote the breakup of families. In Minnesota, we have found that after 12 to 18 months of operation, several nonurban shelters or advocacy groups are receiving broad-based community support as people recognize that violence, not shelters, break up families and that battering is, in fact, a reality in rural areas.

We would suggest that, during the first 2 years of funding through this legislation, organizations be eligible to apply for up to 50 percent of their annual budgets. It is our assumption that the intent of the statement in this section "that a grant awarded to an entity which has not been in operation for more than 1 year may equal up to 50 percent," page 9, lines 3 and 4, is in reference, not to the existence of the nonprofit corporation, but the date that the programming for which funding is sought became fully operational. Perhaps language clarifying this point is necessary.

Second, again in section 3, page 6, lines 3 through 5, we are pleased to see that the proposed legislation allows the chief executive of the State to specify which State agency he or she will choose to administer the State domestic violence program under this act.

As you know, several States have passed legislation and have already developed State programs. Each of those States have in their legislation designated administering State agencies, and Federal legislation which would have required funding to be administered through a particular State agency would have created confusion, duplication of efforts, and could potentially be disruptive to established State programs.

We support this provision remaining unaltered in the proposed legislation regardless of the vehicle HEW chooses to use for allocating money to the State. It is my understanding that HEW is considering putting some of this money through the title XX funding process, and we are particularly interested in keeping that part of the legislation which allows the executive of the State to choose which State agency to administer the body.

In Minnesota, for example, if the money came through and it was required that the Department of Welfare administer the body, we would then have two different State agencies administering funds for battered women.

Finally, my last comment is in terms of the allocation of funds and in regard to the proposed amounts of Federal funding. The data collected through the Minnesota program demonstrated the need for a minimum of 15 shelters in the State. Based on reports received from law enforcement, medical, and social service providers, over an 8-month period we have conservatively estimated that there were over 27,000 incidents of assaults on women by their partners in Minnesota last year.

Supported by data gathered over the first 18 months of the State program, professionals from all fields and community organizations in all regions of the State, Governor Albert Quie made the expansion of this program a top priority in his legislative efforts during the 1979

session. Governor Quie submitted a budget for \$2.7 million to fund a shelter in each of the State's 10 non-metro economic development regions and 5 metro shelters.

His budget also expanded the State's community education program and called for special programming for the violent partner. The legislature responded to the Governor's request for expanded funding by approving a total budget of \$3 million, \$300,000 more than the Governor was asking for.

Likewise, we anticipated that the Federal Government will find that, in a time when over 40 percent of the women and 11 percent of the men in this country that are murdered are killed by their partners, when one in every five marriages involves violence, when over one-half of the children who grow up in violent homes become abusers or victims themselves in adult relationships, and in a time when our jails and prisons are filled with men and women who grew up in physically and sexually abusive homes, domestic violence can no longer be considered a private matter.

The Federal Government must take the lead in providing financial aid; State governments must follow; and local communities must take the ultimate responsibility to create an environment in which there is no place for violence against women. Violence within families is a reflection of a larger societal attitude that the physically and psychologically vulnerable, primarily women and children, but also men, can be the punching bags for those seeking to find control in their lives through physical violence.

While this legislation provides much of the incentive to State and local communities to take the responsibility, it is only the beginning of the funding needed to effectively work toward the tremendous changes that must occur in this Nation. Its emphasis on community-based programming, on State involvement, on citizen participation, on not creating programs which are totally dependent on Federal funding, are all excellent features of this legislation.

Again, I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for this opportunity to testify.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. Thank both of you for your pertinent and direct remarks to changes or lack of changes in the legislation before us. I think it is going to be very helpful.

I note with some interest that Al Quie used to serve on this subcommittee and he went on to do good things in this field, and I see Joe LeFante's name on the front of this brochure here. Joe is new to the job, but if you have any trouble, let us know because he sat through these hearings last year and he cannot plead ignorance of the problem.

I assume from your testimony in a general sense that, even though you both represent States where rather progressive steps have been taken to expand the resources to individuals who find themselves in this very difficult situation, you would still support this type of Federal legislation, given the changes that you have recommended.

Would you see a need for it within your own State, not pleading the case for other States who have refused to do anything for whatever reasons?

Ms. PENCE. Definitely. I think what this will do, the examples that I gave in Minnesota, the kind of money that loosened up will happen in other States. And in those States where funding is already available, it really is never enough. I think there is a lot of programing that needs to happen in rural areas in Minnesota that will be able to happen with additional funding from the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLER. You also testified—and one of my beliefs in writing the legislation in this manner, with the 3-year period—although you testify for more money for a little longer period of time in terms of startup—was that these shelters do build a constituency. It appears from your testimony and from others that there is a great hardship in getting started, but once you get started and the community becomes aware, there does become a constituency for providing that service.

Apparently, at some point it also becomes politically acceptable in a really far-ranging community, from rural to urban to poor to rich, that finally there is a political reality that this is a problem, and you can build some financial support I am talking about for the continuation of the shelters.

Is it realistic for us to talk in 3-year terms; that by the end of 3 years, the shelter either is going to have community support or it is not? I am not sure we should have the Federal Government out there continuing to support a shelter which does not find support in the community.

Ms. PENCE. I think that, more realistically, a 5-year program would be a much more realistic program. For example, in Minnesota, shelters existed for several years before the State was willing to make the commitment. It has been 7 years of building a program in Minnesota where there is finally a recognition of the problem, and communities are willing to put money into those programs.

Another area. The Federal board that is going to be created in this legislation allows us to start loosening up other kinds of Federal money. It took over 2 years to get the community development block grant funding regulations changed to allow for the use of those funds for shelters for battered women, and we anticipate, with this kind of a Federal board, that we would be able to make a lot more changes. For example, title XX money, the CETA bill, and those kinds of moneys could be loosened up, and specific funding for these kinds of programs would not be necessary, once we were able to loosen up a lot of Federal money.

Mr. MILLER. Let me come back for your response also. My hope would be that today is different than 5 years ago, so that other States, other communities would benefit by the New Jersey experience, by the Minnesota experience, and would not suffer that 7-year period or, as we have seen in California, a shelter exists for a few months and dies out; they try again, it goes for a year and dies out; that that situation is changing.

We have changed the law in regard to title XX in terms of shelters for adults. CETA has been changed to some extent, and it has been made more easy to get CETA people in the shelters. ACTION Agency has taken some steps to try to provide volunteers for these shelters.

So the concern here is trying to limit that Federal role to getting the thing started and give them some financial breathing room as they look around to coordinate these other services, and then moving on and trying to do that in other areas where the services are needed.

You see the difference in trying to do that. Hopefully there is some benefit from what you have shown the rest of the country. I think it would be very difficult to get Congress to go along with a 5-year program. As much as I would support it, I don't think that that is the nature here. I just wonder if that is realistic, though. The burden may not be so great in the next State as it was in your two States to get it going.

Ms. ALLEN. I think that I would tend to agree with your analysis of the situation. I would think that the more and more experiences that we have developed that are exchanged between people who have developed those—as you spoke about the community block development grant that opened up. That opened up in New Jersey. That also permitted one of our groups to become fully funded.

So it would appear to me that, based upon the experiences, the 3-year situation that you talk about here is one that would permit giving a credibility to the issue, you know, from the Federal level. Based upon that, I am sure that you would find more and more groups going out to the community and picking up their own funding.

I might tell you that, to a very large extent, many of these areas do want to be totally funded by themselves.

Mr. MILLER. I am aware of that. We have been in a number of arguments on that issue.

Mr. KRAMER?

Mr. KRAMER. What vehicle do you see this bill doing, other than providing a new mechanism for funding? Most of the thrust of your comments has been: We need the extra money, we need additional money, there is not enough money ultimately available in the State now to provide the services you think need to be provided.

I would like for you to list what benefits this bill would provide, in your judgment, without any funding attached to it. For example, if we were to pass a bill without the grant mechanism in it, would that be of value? And if so, how?

Ms. ALLEN. I don't think, without funding at the present time, it would. No; I believe that, in order to help people who have been volunteering, such as they have, to maintain an establishment, to set up an establishment, that it takes, in my language, hard, cold cash first to do that. I think that is a base necessity, and then, moving from that, I think it also presents an educational value to the people because, as the funding comes along, the kind of reporting that I think I heard you talk about earlier this morning becomes a necessity. And as that becomes a necessity, there is better planning. There is better use of community groups so that they can extend themselves in that direction.

As they can show to people within the community results, then they have the opportunity to attract other moneys. But I think they need that cash first.

Mr. KRAMER. Ms. Allen, I have one other question for you, and that involves your suggestion that the definition section be changed. Would you tell me specifically why you want to do that, and what class of persons you think that change ought to be directed to?

Ms. ALLEN. Well, I referred to two definitions to be changed. You are talking about the definition of the victim?

Mr. KRAMER. Of domestic violence.

Ms. ALLEN. Yes. I think that the original definition that we now seek to change really means that you would extend it, so that we do not take into consideration only those people who are termed "legally married."

Mr. KRAMER. Why is that?

Ms. ALLEN. I think there is a changing role in our society today. I heard it expressed by the gentleman who was here just a few minutes ago from the Navy. I think that, as Americans moving in this society, we have to recognize different ways of life and different modes of living. I don't believe that those in any way take away the hurt of the violence that occurs as a result of people who have been living together.

Mr. KRAMER. Isn't the basis of this bill, though, to provide a mechanism short of the criminal courts to take care of some of these problems? If that is the case, of course, when there is a legal relationship, there are obviously difficulties involved that go beyond the mere assault—the children, the two people's financial obligations, and all the other things that sometimes make it difficult or are impediments to disengagement.

But in the case of people who are not married, it seems to me, the simple solution to someone who is getting beat upon is to move.

Ms. ALLEN. It sounds like a very simple solution to a big problem, but as a result of those people who have been living together, there can be children there. There can be the result of physical violence on an individual. And I believe that not only the subject we are trying to treat here has to be treated, but, as changes are made in our society, many other laws have to be treated. I am sure we will see those happening in the future.

Mr. KRAMER. I appreciate your explanation. I don't agree with you, but I appreciate your explanation.

Mr. MILLER. Do you want to respond to that?

Ms. PENCE. Yes. I have one comment. I think a man can pursue a woman, harass a woman, and beat a woman just as easily if she leaves the situation, whether they are or are not married. There is very little difference to two people living in an intimate relationship whether they are married or not. The economic dependency, the emotional dependency, and the continued harassment of women trying to get out of those situations remain the same.

In Minnesota, in the data we have collected, 65 percent of the women who were assaulted were legally married and living with their partner at the time. Another 15 percent were legally divorced or separated and were still being pursued. The rest of the people were not living with their assailants, or never had lived with their assailants.

Mr. KRAMER. I don't see how the establishment of a shelter facility prevents someone from following someone and harassing them, regardless of whether they are married or not. It seems to me that yes, you would have a place to go for counseling, you would have a place to go to find out what your other alternatives are. You would have a place to go so that on a temporary basis you could remove yourself from the situation. But on a permanent basis, there has got to be something other

than governmental involvement that is going to be a force to keep one person from harassing another.

Ms. PENCE. I think that one of the problems is most of the times when people testify in terms of the role of the shelter, they testify in terms of the individual women who are served there. In shelters in Minnesota, for example, there are between 400 and 500 people who are housed in a year in a shelter.

The primary purpose of a shelter, besides servicing those individual women, is to make changes within the current system, make changes in the way that law officers respond to domestics, the way that the court systems provide protection, that the kind of sentencing due to batterers, trying to require more sentencing into counseling—mandatory counseling—or jail sentences if people refuse to go into counseling.

So it is that kind of class advocacy that a shelter provides in addition to that individual caring for the individual victims of family violence. And it is a class advocacy which will eventually get to providing a system in which, in any community, violence is not condoned, and that every part of that community—from the police officer to the courts to the social service people—responds in a way which clearly gives the message to the man that there are serious consequences to physically abusing a woman, regardless of their relationship.

Mr. KRAMER. That is what we have a criminal law for, isn't it?

Ms. PENCE. There are no serious consequences now for a man abusing his wife traditionally in this country. It is one of the least prosecuted crimes in this country.

Mr. KRAMER. But why is that?

Ms. PENCE. It is the safest place for a man to vent his anger.

Mr. KRAMER. Isn't the reason a lot of prosecution never takes place is because the victim will not testify? In the majority of cases, that has been my experience.

Ms. PENCE. That is part of the reason. One of the primary reasons victims do not testify is because the result of their testimony is fairly negligible. Most sentencing for fairly serious crimes comes to stayed sentences, \$25 fines, \$100 fines. And to go through a 6-week to 6-month judicial process in which you are continually being harassed and threatened to end up with a \$100 fine against your husband does not show that the courts are effectively responding to that woman's need to try to get him some kind of help and to provide physical protection for herself.

The only place that provides the physical protection is a shelter, and that is only a temporary place. The goal is to try to get through the court system and the law enforcement system continued physical protection for that woman.

Mr. KRAMER. How are you going to do that?

Ms. PENCE. By having more serious consequences to his continued battering. Men who batter can be cured through counseling. However, there has been no place in the country where just counseling has shown to be an effective way of dealing with batterers. That has to be accompanied by serious consequences if they fail to continue in that counseling situation. And that is what is not there, the serious consequence.

In alcoholism there are all sorts of harmful consequences. You lose your job. You hit the bottom. But in battering there are no harmful consequences. We have not made the privilege that many men have of

being able to abuse their wives appear to be not such a privilege. There are very few consequences to battering in this country, and that is what we are trying to change. And that can be done, but only when a whole community changes their attitude.

Shelters symbolize that. They are the physical symbols in that community that men are beating up women. That does happen in reverse, too. Men do get battered. But it is a physical thing, right in the middle of a community, that it is happening here and the community has to respond. And you cannot ignore it when you have a shelter stuck in a town of 10,000 people. It becomes a reality in everyone's life.

Mr. KRAMER. How long do you envision people staying in these shelters?

Ms. PENCE. The average length of stay in Minnesota is 10 days. It is normally anywhere from 2 hours to 2 nights to 30 days.

Mr. KRAMER. And what percent return to their home?

Ms. PENCE. I could give you an example. In one shelter in Minnesota, which is the Duluth shelter, one-third of the women go out of the shelter and find alternative housing and file for some kind of legal separation, one-third return to the home with some significant changes in the man's behavior, and one-third return to the home with no changes in his behavior.

Mr. KRAMER. How long a period of time are you measuring the changes in his behavior.

Ms. PENCE. One year.

Mr. KRAMER. Over a 1-year period?

Ms. PENCE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Erdahl.

Mr. ERDAHL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to apologize to our witnesses this afternoon for not being here. Like many Congressmen, I get several things scheduled at one time, and especially to my fellow Minnesotan who is here today. I will make a couple of comments on that without being overly self-righteous.

I think in Minnesota we have made some significant advances. I am a former member of the legislature, and I think this last session provided good advances insofar as funding shelters. The one shelter with which I am personally familiar, because I have been there, is the one in Rochester.

At that time I had the opportunity to visit, not only with the counselors and some of the people there, but also some of the people who were being cared for. I guess I went into that meeting somewhat naive. There may be many people in society, especially men, who think that this is something that happens in the inner city and does not happen in a peaceful rural town in southern Minnesota.

As you point out in your testimony, which I just read, it was there. And some of the people I met were from some of these very peaceful little towns, so it is something that reaches across our society. Hopefully we will deal responsibly with it and try to solve some of the problems.

Thank you for being here today.

Ms. PENCE. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Ms. Mikulski?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There have been several questions raised about funding during the course of the hearing today, and one of the ones Congressman Kramer has raised is what will happen when Federal bucks run out? There is a reluctance on the part of the Congress to start programs where we all say that they have ad hoc funding or time-limited funding, and then we build a coalition for support and they come back.

If you had the opportunity to answer that question, how would you?

Ms. ALLEN. I would feel that once established and well based with the help of Federal funding, that the activity that would take place would permit a sufficient amount of time and effort to go toward the solicitation of other funding so that the thing that you suggest would not occur. I would also hope that the Federal funding would be administered in such a way that it would not be given to groups where it would appear that there was little, if any, hope of being able to retain it after a period of time. I think it has to have that kind of thinking in the disposition of the funds.

With those things both done, with the proper climate being set, I would hope that the States would be able to pick up a share of the funding and that through the use of groups in the community such as the United Way, those other things that exist, we would be able to maintain real viable groups.

Ms. MIKULSKI. So you really see on the long-term basis that programs such as this would be maintained at a local level through three sources of funds: First, governmental at a couple of different levels; second, the traditional volunteer social service sector, and some of those would be, for example, the convent from Catholic charities; and third, private initiatory fundraising efforts by, for example, the shelter board itself. But you really need three. No one single source of funding would either be adequate or wholesome.

Ms. ALLEN. At the moment, I could not see that as adequate or wholesome.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The reason I say "wholesome" is I think a lot of people get dependent on grants, and very often they lose their sense of mission. I have seen that in some of the programs I helped start in the sixties. I would like to get rid of the damn things now.

Ms. ALLEN. Because they get stale. They are not positively reviewed. They are not addressing the problem. And we would prefer not to see that happen.

I point out, for instance, in one shelter the State was able to provide the housing for the shelter at the rate of \$1 per year, but that was a great benefit and those were the kinds of things that I think we will be able to do more in the communities.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Ms. Pence.

Ms. PENCE. I guess my answer is similar. The one thing I would add is the reason local communities begin to commit money to shelters once they have been operating is they realize what a tremendous relief they are to the system. The welfare department does not know what to do with battered women. The police do not know what to do with battered women. And all of a sudden you have this place which will take those women and house them, and all of a sudden you have policemen coming to testify at city council hearings: "Yes, we think you should commit seed money for this house." And when you get the head

of the St. Cloud Police Department up there defending women's rights, it is an accomplishment. [General laughter.]

It does, in fact, raise the consciousness of the whole community. So I think it has been a problem that social service agencies and law enforcement people have dealt with on a private basis, and now they are coming out to make public testimony saying that we have to fund this place because it is helping us.

So I think these Federal moneys are going to do that. As a shelter gets started in some area where there is no State commitment, more and more people are going to start backing it and asking their State legislatures to loosen up money.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you very much. I know time is running late and we have some other witnesses, but I do appreciate that.

Ms. Allen, if you would give my regards to Mr. LeFante, we were freshmen here together and we often joked that we lived together because we shared the same apartment building and the same floor. I used to always borrow his corkscrew. He had a more efficient one. The Italian one was more efficient than the Polish one. [General laughter.]

Ms. ALLEN. Far be it from me to start any rumors, but when I go back I will tell him I met the other woman he was living with.

Mr. MILLER. Next we will hear from a panel of Cynthia Dames, Geraldine Stahly, Janice Moore, and Ginger McMahan.

Welcome. For those of you who have statements, they will be put in the record. So if you want to summarize them or change them, feel free to do so during your oral presentation. Why don't you just identify yourselves for the record, starting from left to right. You are first.

[The prepared statements of Cynthia Dames, Geraldine Stahly, Janice Moore, and Ginger McMahan follow :]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA DAMES, BATTERED WOMEN'S PROJECT,
SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

Good morning, gentlemen: My name is Cynthia Dames. I am Chairperson of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. I am from Santa Fe, New Mexico, and the director there of a shelter program for victims of spouse assault.

In the past two years, the people of this country have become aware of the problem of violent attacks on women by their husbands, boyfriends, and adult sons. The magnitude of the violence perpetrated on women in the home is not yet fully understood by the public. The ramifications of this violence are not entirely apparent, but it is clear that continued violence against women in this society is intolerable. Women across this nation are calling a halt to the violence, are rescuing battered women, and are helping women find alternatives to living a life of terror at the hands of the men that they love.

Spousal assault is epidemic. It knows no class, race, religion, age, nor geographical region. We know that many of the women in this room today and a majority of the women that we each know are victims of domestic violence. This violence may be merely a slap, punch or kick, but it is our experience that the violence more likely includes burning, cutting with knives, attempted strangulation, rape, facial disfigurement, and repeated and prolonged assault on the breasts and stomach, frequently causing miscarriage or organic injury.

Last year in the State of Maryland, local law enforcement agencies received 15,312 complaints of spousal assault.

A shelter in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania has been receiving 100 calls each day from women seeking shelter and support because they have been assaulted by their husbands or boyfriends.

One half of all couples in the United States have experienced physical violence in their relationships.

Of the assault victims seeking medical assistance at the emergency room of a Boston hospital, 70 percent were victims of domestic violence.

In its first year of operation, the Louisville, Kentucky shelter lodged 555 women and children and answered 2,709 hot line calls.

The community-based shelter program in Orlando, Florida sheltered 149 women and children in a two month period in 1978.

Many shelters across the country are turning away victims of domestic violence because of the lack of space. Some programs have found that they are unable to house as many as 30 women and children requesting shelter each day.

In a recent report of the office of the Attorney General of the state of Ohio came the startling revelation that although there were 16 shelters in that state, 69 more were needed to meet the needs of victims of domestic assault. Thus, 82 percent of the need in Ohio was unmet.

Nonetheless, funding is meager. The St. Louis Abused Women's Support Project is primarily funded from individual donations from \$5-\$100!

Most shelter programs began with one or two unpaid women coordinating the efforts of a score of volunteers. Frequently, the shelter was the home of one of the workers. Securing funding has allowed numbers of these groups to rent a shelter facility, to meet operating expenses and to hire small staffs. Typically the staff of a shelter will include a fundraiser/administrator, a house manager, a child-care worker, and a victim advocate. Volunteers continue to be the backbone of these shelters. Expansion of the staff in shelters of this size is essential to the continuity of the staff and the sustained energy of the volunteers; for most staff people and many volunteers in shelter programs work at least 11 hours per day, 6 days per week.

10,000 women and 20,000 children were sheltered or provided with other needed services by the 19 shelter programs affiliated with the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence last year. None of these programs have permanent or secure funding. All face the possibility of closing this year.

Fewer than 15 state legislatures across this country have enacted law providing funding for shelters. Most of this legislation does not establish permanent funding mechanisms. Almost all of it is inadequate to meet the needs of shelter programs.

Approximately 70 percent of the existing shelters obtain funding from private and local sources. Less than 50 percent receive any state or federal monies. Almost all piece their budgets together from multiple funding sources.

Even for the most sophisticated shelter programs, securing secure funding has taken years. Women Advocates of Minneapolis/St. Paul worked 7 years developing secure funding. Still, shelter programs in Minnesota must rely heavily on local and private sources to complete their budgeting requirements.

Many states have not made monies available to shelter programs when it was within their power to do so. Title 20 monies are virtually unobtainable for shelter programs in many states despite the recent amendments for adult protective services. Cutbacks in Title 20 and the reallocation of available funds have caused the temporary closing of a number of shelters across the country.

States need the incentives that H.R. 2977 provides. Clearly, most have not acted on their own initiative to generate funds for domestic violence programs. However, we are certain that once they have participated in the grant process provided in this legislation, they will recognize the need to generate new monies or reallocate appropriate funds to sustain the shelter programs.

Now let me turn my attention to who we are. The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence represents many of the more than 400 community-based shelter and hot-line programs all over the United States. Our programs provide a multitude of services to battered persons. Those services include counseling, child-care, agency advocacy, legal assistance, medical referral, court and police accompaniment, housing assistance, emergency hot-line assistance, employment training and referral, parenting courses, budgeting and fiscal management assistance, as well as sheltering. The philosophical underpinning of all these services is self-help. Victims helping victims. Growth through shared experience and support. We believe that this is the most effective process for escaping the cycle of violence and embracing a life free of the fear and immobility that the violence creates.

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence began as a concept discussed at the 1976 Domestic Violence Conference in Milwaukee. There was strong feeling among the participants that the many existing and emerging shelter programs could benefit through association with each other to share information, materials, problems, and skills. It was also agreed that there was a growing need to organize on both statewide and national levels to bring the issue of domestic violence to the attention of the public and to persuade government

leaders to make policies and pass legislation that assure the growth and development of services to the victims of domestic violence and their children.

The National Coalition was formalized as an organization at the Civil Rights Consultation on Domestic Violence held here in the District in March of 1978. Hundreds of people representing battered women's programs from every state in the Union participated in this exchange, and recognized the need to continue a dialogue among community-based shelter programs. The Coalition was born.

We plan to return to Washington this October for a national meeting of the membership of this grass-roots Coalition. At that time, and as we return home this week, we intend to share with our constituents and with our Congressional representatives our support of H.R. 2977.

Thank you for your time.

WOMENSHelter,
Long Beach, Calif., July 10, 1979.

SELECT EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE: I have been asked to testify regarding the need for the legislation pending before you which addresses the problem of domestic violence. I am currently the Executive Director of WomenShelter, a shelter home for battered women and their children in Long Beach, California. Concurrently, I am an Associate in Psychology at the University of California at Riverside completing a doctoral dissertation in Social Psychology on the topic of family violence and have published a review of the literature of spousal violence. During the last two years, I have served as a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors Task Force on Domestic Violence and have completed a survey of public agency response to this problem on a country-wide basis as chairperson of the Needs Assessment/Attitude Survey Committee. I am currently a member of the Southern California Coalition for Battered Women and the newly formed Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council. I have conducted training seminars for law enforcement, criminal justice, social services, mental health and health professionals. I am currently a consultant to the Los Angeles City Attorney's office, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's office, the Los Angeles County Department of Social Services and the California State Department of Mental Health.

WomenShelter is a residential crisis facility for battered women and their children, providing food, shelter, counseling, social service advocacy and child care services. In addition, the shelter operates a 24 hr. Hotline crisis intervention counseling service and out-of-house groups provide counseling to battered women not needing shelter and to battering men.

WomenShelter began services in September, 1977. During the past 20 months, 600 women and children have been residents and an additional 3,000 individuals have been served as Hotline callers and out-of-house counseling clients. The average stay of residents in the shelter is 21 days, although a client may remain until she can find safe permanent housing. In addition to direct client services, WomenShelter has provided community education on family violence to 6,000 individuals, including seminars on domestic violence for 1,500 professionals in law enforcement, criminal justice, social services, mental health and public health.

All of these services have been provided on a budget of under \$200,000 per year. Funding for WomenShelter comes primarily through CETA VI (\$150,000) and CSA (\$30,000) with the remaining \$20,000 from private sources. If the federal CETA and CSA dollars were to end, so would all of the services of WomenShelter.

Seven shelters now exist in the Los Angeles County area and all but one is funded in some way through Federal monies. Without these funds, shelter programs could not have survived beyond their meager beginnings as all volunteer grass-roots efforts. If federal monies were withdrawn, or allocated for other purposes at the discretion of City, County or State government, all but one shelter program in Los Angeles County would probably cease. Havenhouse, the oldest shelter for battered women in the country, has provided years of continuous service, to battered women and has developed extensive private support that constitutes 30 percent of their budget.

All of the shelters in Los Angeles County provide food, shelter and social services advocacy for battered women and their children. Many provide additional public education and training, and some provide counseling services to battering men. All of these services are provided at modest cost. Client cost per day ranges from \$15 to \$25. The alternative to shelter services are much more costly. Family violence is a spiral of increasing frequency and severity. If the violence continues, serious injury or death may result. No price can be put on a human life, but the cost to society of prosecution of the batterer, and the care of the now parentless children is immense. Injuries short of death often require hospitalization which can run several hundred dollars per day. The cost of placing a child from the violent home in a public facility cost three to four times the amount of providing safety for the child and their mother in a shelter. The emotional and psychological consequences of being physically assaulted by a partner are profound. The depression and anxiety that are the consequences of battering, are often labeled as mental disturbance rather than a situation response to violent, terrifying relationship. Some women find shelter from batterers in mental hospitals at a cost of hundreds of dollars per day.

Shelters provide a desperately needed and sometimes life saving service that is cost effective. Police refer to a shelter, the only available 24 hour crisis housing, prosecutors refer to shelter, clients who are witnesses in felony cases and need protection refer to shelter, and social service agencies refer women and children to shelter for safety. Mental health centers are sending women to shelters who are depressed and might otherwise be hospitalized. Emergency wards use shelters for injured women that require rest and recovery from traumatic injury. Shelters are in trouble. Client load increases with no staff or concomitant increase in funds. Funding services are often short term and gross-roots fund raising requires massive commitments on staff and volunteer energies at a time when clients loads are rapidly increasing. If shelter services are to survive, they must be identified, as the provider of necessary, often mandated, social services. Public agencies that use the shelter must pay for the services rendered. The shelter can provide services at a very low cost, but they receive adequate compensation for all the services provided or they will cease to exist. The shelter may close for lack of funds, but the need for services will not end. In one form or another, existing public agencies will pick up the service but probably less effectively and certainly at a much higher cost to taxpayers.

I have been involved with the issue of family violence for the past four years. During this time, I have witnessed an explosion of public interest and concern. Shelters for battered women and their children are opening all over the country, and as each opens, it is filled and existing shelters in the area, if there are any, watch in wonder and frustration as their already overtaxed hotlines ring even more frequently. We are witnessing a phenomenon! Every television show, radio program and newspaper article on the topic brings another deluge of calls. Three years ago there was one shelter for battered women in the Los Angeles County area and it received 100 calls a month. Today there are seven shelters and each one of them averages up to 300 calls month! All shelters turn away many more women and children than they can accept; as many as 15 clients cannot be served for every one finding space available.

It would appear from the statistics that we are in the throes of a problem massively increasing in frequency and severity. I do not believe the level of violence in families has increased so dramatically during the last three years as the calls to the Hotline would suggest. I do believe that a problem of long standing is finally being recognized. Each new shelter, each net Hotline, each shred of media coverage is a message to victims of the violent family that there is hope. There are alternatives. They need no longer be locked by public ignorance, unconcern and prejudice into silently bearing a tortured existence of fear and victimization. WomenShelter has received calls from battered women who have been beaten through 10, 15, 25 and even 40 years of marriage. The fact that there now exists a shelter gives women hope and encourages them to overcome the immense feelings of powerlessness, helplessness and dependency that prolonged victimization engenders, and reach out for help, often for the first time. Shelters provide more than emergency housing and food. Counseling and supportive social services give a battered woman a real opportunity to rediscover herself as a powerful and autonomous human being. As she can experience herself as deserving respect, she regains lost self-esteem and the ability to take care of herself. Unfortunately, many of the battered women calling for help in Los Angeles County cannot find space within a shelter. More shelter space must be

made available. Shelters alone cannot solve the problem of family violence. Public agencies dealing with violent families must increase the effectiveness of their intervention. Laws that protect a woman in her home must be strengthened and enforced. Education must become part of the responsibility of schools, mental and public health agencies.

The existence of shelters in the Los Angeles County area has had a significant impact upon public agency response to the problem of domestic violence. In providing advocacy for Hotline callers and shelter residents, shelters have become acutely aware of the often insensitive and ineffective response of public agencies. The Southern California Coalition for Battered Women, a joint effort of shelters and other concerned groups, has provided a lobby for the needs of battered women.

Growing out of the increased concern for the problems of domestic violence, stimulated by the experience and vocal participation of shelters, the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors formed a Task Force to study the problem on a country-wide basis. The report of the Task Force is included for the record of this committee. An important recommendation of the report that has been implemented is the formation of a permanent Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council. A description of the council is being submitted for the record. Included in this report is an attitude and information survey I constructed for use as part of a training needs assessment of County Agencies with responsibilities for victims and perpetrators of violence. The survey was completed anonymously by county law enforcement, criminal justice, medical and mental health professionals. The findings indicated the professionals dealing most directly with violent families, law enforcement and criminal justice, had the most misinformation on the topic and held the most negative stereotypes of the battered woman.

An extensive effort has been made, both by individual shelters, the Southern California Coalition for Battered Women and concerned public agencies to improve information and training of professionals. Both the Los Angeles District Attorney and the City Attorney of Los Angeles have instituted programs to address more effectively the problem of family violence. Information on both of these programs is included in the record. Of special interest is the program of the City Attorney, I believe the first prosecutorial agency in the county to introduce a program that, as a matter of policy relieves the woman of the burden of believing it is she who must "press charges." Under the City Attorney's new program, the Deputy City Attorney signs the charges and the woman is informed that she is not responsible for deciding whether the prosecutors case against her partner will go forward. It is the experience of the City Attorney's office that most women are co-operative once they no longer feel "to blame" for their mate's prosecution. Recommendations to the court are that first offenders be sentenced to probation with counseling mandated and, only if another offense occurs, will jail time be requested. These procedures have resulted in a 100 percent increase in the rate of conviction during the first year and it is believed that recidivism is being reduced. Further, the Los Angeles County Police Department, now assured that their arrests will result in charges and better prospects for conviction, are making more arrests and providing a somewhat better response to battered women needing assistance. Many more changes need to be made, but we have a beginning of a more just and effective handling of domestic violence. These changes are the direct result of the information generated by the shelters on the problems and needs of battered women in the Los Angeles County area and the advocacy provided by shelters.

The Southern California Coalition for Battered Women, as a representative voice of all the shelters, has been effective in providing liaison with Public agencies and government and advocacy for shelters and the battered women they serve. A one year ACTION grant has enabled the Coalition to hire permanent staff and expand activities to provide indepth training for shelter staff, volunteers and interested professionals. Now, requests for training are multiplying and the grant is ending. It is a concern for all of the shelters and the Los Angeles County Domestic Violence Council to find ongoing funding for the vital functions of the Coalition. A one year grant does not provide enough time to establish an effective program and to find other sources of ongoing funds.

During the last year, I have conducted training seminars for 1500 professionals on the topic of family violence. I find that professionals dealing with the battered woman share, with the general public, confusion over why a woman tolerates violence in a relationship, and once out of the situation may return to the violent

partner. Police often find the woman ambivalent or passive, unwilling and unable to decide whether to arrest. Prosecutors have often experienced a woman who is anxious to co-operate one day, and refusing to co-operate the next. Mental health professionals find a woman passive, dependent and manipulative, and believe the violence against her may result from her own personality characteristics. Hospital personnel sometimes find the woman reluctant to disclose the real cause of her injuries. Too often, frustrated in the attempts to help a few, the professional hardens herself to the situation of all battered women. Thus, insensitive and ineffective response begins. Information on the dynamics of the violent family and the consequence of battering on the victim can reduce the frustration of the professional and provide tools for more effective intervention.

The pattern of the violent family has been described by Dr. Lenore Walker as a 3-phase cycle, a long period of tension building in a violent battering episode and a last phase of loving reconciliation. The woman is not motivated to seek help during the tension building as she senses the approach of the battering episode. Unfortunately, most helping agencies are equipped to help only after the beating has occurred. But, when the beating is over, the loving reconciliation is in progress. The man is apologetic, loving and reassuring. The woman, whose self esteem has been devastated by the man's attack on her, now finds he is willing to make reparation, both material and emotional, and she basks in his attention and love. Now the system is ready to intervene, arrest the man, and lend her assistance but she is reluctant to co-operate. Clearly there is a tragic mismatch between the phase of the cycle and the function of the system. Further, the woman has often survived the battering relationship by yielding to the man's demands for a passive, dependent, submissive mate, isolated from friends and even family who may inflame her possessive jealousy. Passivity, dependence, even manipulative behavior become survival tactics within the battering relationship. If she summons the courage to ask for help, she is often rebuffed. To convince police, prosecutors and social service workers she needs help and will follow through, requires assertive behavior. The bind is an insidious one; survival tactics within that reduced relationship become counter productive if she is attempting to get assistance to end her victimization.

Once professionals understand the dynamics of the battering relationship, they can more effectively aid the battered woman and devise intervention strategies that will be effective in winning her co-operation.

The extent of the problem of domestic violence is well documented. At the White House conference on Domestic Violence, it was estimated that there are 28 million battered women in the United States. An FBI estimate presented at hearings of the California State Senate for bills SB 91-92 was that 20 percent of American families are violent. Further, 32 percent of homicides are between partners. The Statistics of spousal violence are staggering but to consider them alone is to seriously underestimate the impact of domestic violence on American life. I believe that violence in the family is the tap-root of the seize of violence in the streets. Surveys of individuals arrested for violent crimes inevitably reveal a background of family violence. Child abuse, abuse of the elderly, violent attacks on strangers and acquaintances are all patterns that begin in a violent home. The violence between adult partners devastates the children. At WomenShelter we have observed over 400 children from violent homes; 30 percent of these children victims themselves of the violence, but the remaining 70 percent also victims. The majority of all the children were developmentally behind their age level and demonstrated a wide variety of emotional and physical problems; neurists, nightmares, hyperactivity, hyperaggressiveness, extensive fearfulness, shyness, anxiety and learning handicaps have all been observed.

The consequences of the violent family on long-term socialization of the child is no longer in doubt; empirical studies demonstrate an extraordinarily high correlation between childhood experience and adult violent and/or victimization. WomenShelter clients report that 90 percent of their battering partners grew up in battering homes.

In a very real sense, money spent to alleviate the problem of domestic violence will pay its real dividends in the long-term effects on the children. In a real sense, the shelters can serve a vital role in prevention of violence. We, as a nation, have spent immense sums of money to prevent crime and rehabilitate the criminal, but recidivism is so high that much of our money is wasted. I believe that if we can reduce the violence that individuals suffer and observe in childhood, we can begin to reduce the staggering level of violence in our society.

I urge the passage of these bills to fund desperately needed shelters and to improve training of responsible public agencies, and to further the education of the public on the issue of violence, beginning in the home and spreading destructively into every aspect of our life as a nation.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Residential shelters for battered women and their children must be available as part of any comprehensive program to address the problem of family violence.

2. Shelters as non-profit, grass-roots entities provide cost-effective services to battered women and their children, and should be the choice over much more costly provision of such services by public agencies.

3. Shelters have become the experts on family violence, providing effective services to interrupt spousal violence. This expertise should be recognized and utilized by public agencies.

4. Shelters can train law enforcement, criminal justice, social services, mental health and health professionals to more effectively intervene with the violent family. Private and public agencies have training budgets and shelters should be paid as expert consultants in family violence for the training they provide.

5. Shelters must be funded in a stable, ongoing manner as a needed social service. Some method must be found for the continuation of the vital services and expertise of the shelter beyond time-limited funding of demonstration grants and other similar funding sources. To the extent public agencies refer to shelter, clients for protective and social services that are the agencies' responsibility, the shelter should be reimbursed from the public agency budget. This will insure the continuation of the needed services in the most cost-effective manner.

6. Prevention of violence requires long-term public education. Shelters can be central to the educational effort of a community by providing information on the causes, consequences and alternatives to the violence.

Respectfully submitted.

GERALDINE BUTTS STAHLY,
Executive Director.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JANICE MOORE, MY SISTER'S PLACE, WOMEN'S LEGAL DEFENSE FUND, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to testify before you today on this issue of vital concern. My name is Janice Moore. I am on the staff of My Sister's Place, a shelter for battered women and their children. The shelter, located in Washington, D.C., is a project of the Women's Legal Defense Fund. The purposes, philosophy, and operation of our shelter are consistent with those of many other shelters across the country.

As you have heard in previous testimony, a battered woman who has been forced to flee her home has many needs. One of her most immediate needs is to find refuge in a place which can provide a safe and supportive environment. Since friends and family are often unavailable, unwilling, or unable to house or help her, emergency shelters for battered women are essential.

To give you a typical example, a woman comes to the shelter without money or other resources. She has left her husband or boyfriend on whom she was either partially or wholly financially dependent. She will probably have her children with her. She or her children may require immediate medical attention. Usually she needs legal advice. She may require job referrals or training, and sometimes needs public assistance to support herself and her children until she can find such employment. If she has children, she may have to either place the children in day care or in school. If she decides not to return to her spouse, she will need help finding new housing.

Not only does a battered woman have these concrete needs which must be met, but having been both physically and psychologically abused she has little confidence in her abilities or her self worth. Out of fear, embarrassment, and guilt, a woman typically becomes isolated from the world around her. One of the results of this isolation may be that she does not have a clear understanding of what services are available to her. The prospect of beginning a new life on her own can be fraught with fear and anxiety. For these reasons, most battered women need support and assistance in achieving their goals.

Recognizing the complexity of her needs, shelters attempt to provide comprehensive services in a supportive environment. These services may include legal and psychological counseling, employment and housing assistance, welfare advocacy, medical aid, and children's programs. The staff in shelters help a woman identify her needs, direct her to appropriate resources and act as an advocate when she has difficulty obtaining needed services. Since the delivery of services by some social service agencies is fragmented and confusing, and their staff may be uninformed, if not uncooperative, advocacy is an important component of service delivery to battered women.

The children of battered women also require special attention. These children have often witnessed their mothers being beaten—some have been victims of abuse themselves. Many are hostile and aggressive, some shy and withdrawn. The problems these children bring with them to the shelter may be intensified by the demands of adjusting to a new environment. To try to make the children's transition from their home to the shelter as smooth as possible, it is necessary to have a program geared specifically toward meeting these children's special needs. In addition to offering them recreational and educational activities, shelter staff and volunteers can offer the children emotional support that their mothers, who are themselves in a crisis situation, may be unable to provide or need assistance in providing.

The philosophy and approach of service organizations are often as important as the actual services provided. Traditionally, community based shelters have incorporated the concepts of self-help and peer support into their programs. These principles provide the foundation for strengthening a battered woman's self-concept and enabling her to regain control over her own life. In general, shelters provide an environment in which supportive women take care of themselves and each other, learn to make and trust their own decisions, rediscover their abilities, and develop a stronger sense of their own worth.

Community based shelters have been started in a variety of ways, but the vast majority sprang from other more general service organizations such as women's centers, hotlines, or legal advocacy programs. Women in such organizations received thousands of calls for help from desperate women with no place to go to escape a violent home. It was in direct response to these pleas for help that the majority of grass roots shelters have been started.

Since it usually costs a substantial amount of money to operate a shelter, many were started in the homes of volunteers or by scraping together just enough money to rent an apartment. Over the years, many shelters which were started in this way have been able to raise the funds necessary to rent a 4 or 5 bedroom house and, usually with a heavy reliance on volunteers and in-kind contributions of food, furniture, linens, etc., have been able to keep their doors open. However, many of these shelters face the prospect of having to either close entirely or drastically cut back on services and coverage because start-up funds are usually only available for the first 2 years of operation, while it takes most organizations close to 5 years to become self-sufficient. Other shelters are still struggling to open or to move out of individual's houses because the seed money that is available is extremely limited. This is especially true in areas of the country which have not yet recognized domestic violence as an issue demanding public action.

Currently, the need for shelters far outweighs the number in operation. Shelters across the country routinely turn away at least 3 to 4 times as many families as they are able to serve. In fact, a study conducted in England concluded that there should be one shelter for every 10,000 families.

Our experience with raising money for My Sister's Place and with the efforts of other similar shelters is that even the most diligent and creative fundraising efforts are often not enough to ensure the opening or continuance of community-based shelters. As I mentioned before, "start-up" or seed money grants (usually from local private foundations) are difficult to obtain and are almost always limited to 1 or 2 years. National foundations are swamped with requests from shelters, and the vast majority will only consider requests from organizations which propose to address the problem on a nation-wide basis.

Another frequently used source of funding for shelters is found in local public agencies such as CETA, WIN, and the local Department of Human Resources. The manpower programs have been the mainstay of many community-based shelters. These programs, however, are now under fire from Congress and the Executive Branch. If the proposed cuts (especially to CETA) are passed, shelters and many other worthy non-profit agencies will suffer serious financial hardship.

Other sources of revenue include block grant funds and direct federal grant programs such as ACTION and LEAA. Block grant funds seem to be accessible in some areas (Minnesota is a good example) and very difficult to acquire in others (the District of Columbia being an example). The vagaries of the block grant process make them useful but extremely unreliable sources of funds.

Direct Federal grant programs are similar in that they may provide important revenue to a few shelters, but in general, access to these funds is extremely limited. Often the grants are for research and demonstration projects requiring sophisticated research skills. Even when this is not a requirement, the level of grantsmanship skills necessary to compete successfully with professional "think tanks" is high and usually beyond the reach of local grass roots organizations.

Title XX money, funneled from HEW through state and local governments, is equally unreliable. In many parts of the country it is virtually impossible to impact on the expenditure of these block grant funds. In the District of Columbia for instance, almost all of the money is used to fund government-run agencies. For years, local non-profit organizations have tried unsuccessfully to ensure that a greater proportion of these funds are made available to non-governmental agencies. Year after year of testimony and effort have yielded almost no result. In our city, as in many throughout the country, Title XX money is not accessible to programs for battered women.

The unpredictability of funding also creates other problems. Even where seed money is available to start a shelter, after the first few years of operation, the very existence of the shelter may be jeopardized. Long-term planning and program development is also impeded by funding constraints. For these reasons we would like to recommend that H.R. 2977 be amended from a 3-year to a 5-year program in order to allow more flexibility in funding so that, where appropriate, programs may receive funds for up to 5 years.

The shelter movement here and in other parts of the world has been characterized by its roots in the community. The success of shelters has in large part been due to their independence. Not only does a community based shelter relieve the government of one more administrative burden, but it provides services in an efficient and effective manner. Further, such shelters offer comprehensive services with certain philosophical ideals like those of self-help and peer support underlying all efforts to provide for a woman's psychological and material well being. It is these community based shelters which first responded to the needs of battered women and developed an expertise in approaching the problem and which can be relied upon to seek creative and practical solutions in the future.

For all of these reasons, assistance from the federal government in the form proposed in H.R. 2977 is essential to the continued survival of shelters for battered women and to the creation of the many more that are so desperately needed. On behalf of My Sister's Place and the hundreds of other shelters and support programs for battered women, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2977 and urge you to work strenuously for its passage.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GINGER McMAHON, ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTOR OF A
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROJECT

Good Day: My name is Ginger McMahon. I am from Delaware County, Penna. Currently, I am serving as Administrative Director of a domestic violence project in my home county.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to offer my testimony to this committee; my testimony is drawn from my personal experience as a victim of domestic violence. I intend to share with you some of the trauma my children and I experienced as victims of domestic violence, and hopefully, to suggest ways of implementing some of the needs which are critical for adults and children who experience abuse.

My experience is neither isolated nor unique; it is happening as a daily occurrence to thousands of families in the United States.

As a starting point, let me dispel a popular myth about domestic violence: domestic violence is not dictated by race, economic or social stature, education, or any of the common indicators of community standing. We were a comfortably established family living in a 12 room farm house on 20 acres. We owned our own business, we were able to afford vacations, new cars, recreational vehicles. We were respected members of our community, a small town conveniently close to a large city. My husband was active in scouting and served as a Little League coach.

In addition, he was a member of the local school board. I was a member of the Junior League and the League of Women Voters. I was appointed to the Mayor's Council on Drug and Alcohol and the Mayor's Commission on Delinquency, in addition to working as a volunteer in the Juvenile Probation Office. We were 12 in our family, my husband and myself, our two natural sons and one daughter, adopted as an infant, and seven adopted teenagers.

My husband is a college graduate; my education was interrupted by marriage. I found him brilliant, caring, gentle; we shared a strong love for children. I thought of him as a Pied Piper. One day the Pied Piper turned into Dr. Jeckyl and Mr. Hyde. We still do not know what happened. He began to drink more frequently. His attitude towards me became critical and dissatisfied. Within a year he had begun slapping me whenever I disagreed with him, and whenever anything I did did not meet with his approval. This included everything from my political opinions to what I prepared for meals. He would shove me, shake me, curse me for not agreeing with his views on business, religion, our children. If it rained, he held me responsible * * * whatever displeased him or thwarted his plans he blamed on me. I had changed from a bright, loving, competent person to a sullen, hysterical, unattractive and irresponsible one according to him. He began telling me that I was crazy and needed help. I discussed what was happening with our family physician who suggested that my husband was frustrated and had other things on his mind that were troubling him. My doctor gave me pills which he said would help me to cope with the situation. He also suggested that I speak to our minister. The minister's opinion was that it was my duty as a wife and mother to be patient and tolerant * * * in short that I should accept the abuse and keep my mouth shut. Needless to say, neither the doctor nor the minister was in any way helpful.

My husband's hostility and violence were increasing, and I was becoming more afraid to be alone with him. His hostility and rage were not directed toward anyone else, not friends, business associates or our children.

His rage increased and he began to punch me. I remember the first night that happened * * * he punched me and I forced myself to stay quiet so that the children would not be made aware of what had happened. The following day, I was in pain and had difficulty moving about. He asked me what was wrong, and when I told him that I was in pain as a result of his punching me he told me I was crazy and that I must have fallen. The beatings became more severe; on one occasion, he hit my face and cut me so that I needed stitches. He accompanied me to the doctor's office and he and the doctor concluded that I was becoming accident prone. After this incident, he apologized and told me that it would never happen again. For a while, things improved. He became more attentive, bought me presents, took me on trips. Because I wanted to believe that things would change, I took this brief respite as an indication that they were changing. However, the abuse began again, to be followed by his remorse and promises for change. This constant pattern of violence and remorse began to alter my behavior and thinking. I became afraid for my life. It became impossible to plan any activities because I never knew when my next "accident" would occur that might leave me visibly injured or even confined to bed. It was during this period that I began to lose my identity as a person. I began to believe that there must be something wrong with me * * * that I deserved the abuse, that I was crazy. I became totally isolated with my fear and humiliation. There was no one to whom I could turn * * * no one to talk to.

As a desperate remedy, I suggested marriage counseling to my husband. He became very angry, and spent 5 hours telling me that I didn't deserve to live, and choked me until I nearly lost consciousness. During that five hours, he "explained" to me how unappreciative I was * * * that all my friends were probably beaten by their husbands as well * * * that it was natural for men to beat their wives, where else might a man release his frustrations? As a result of this incident, my voice box was damaged, and the doctor said that the injury might be permanent. My husband had taunted me by telling me to try to get a divorce. He told me that if I tried, he would see to it that I lost the children. With no one to turn to, I knew I was trapped. I went to friends, and the reactions were what I have since learned is predictable. They didn't believe me, didn't want to get involved, suggested psychiatrists * * * and my life was becoming increasingly intolerable.

I knew that I had to get out. One of the resources I found was the Women's Counseling Center at U. Mass. It was about this time that our 4 oldest children still at home came to me and told me that they knew about the abuse. The children and I went to the counseling center where we discussed what was happening. The psychologist at the center was able to determine that all of the kids, even the youngest, were aware of the abuse and were suffering emotionally from it. I consulted with my oldest children, recalling them from college so that we could all share in the decision I was about to make.

Deciding to leave was easy * * * implementing the decision was not. All that we had, with the exception of one of the cars and the mortgage on the house was in my husband's name. Because of the amount of children I had, it was impossible to find a place to live. My family turned against me * * * they could not understand how I could think of leaving; I should stay and cope, try to make my marriage work. It was months before we were able to leave, and all during that time, the violence continued. During that time, the children and I drew closer together * * * one night, my husband's abuse became so bad that the kids called the police. Because of the way the laws are written, the police could do nothing unless my husband hit me outside of the house. Then, they could arrest him for disorderly conduct or disturbing the peace.

The children confronted my husband with their knowledge of his abuse. He was very angry that they had become aware of what was happening. He decided to leave, but told us that he would never provide any support. He made good that threat * * * he destroyed the business. The property had to be sold to pay off the debts he incurred. The little that he left us we used to relocate.

After we left, I found a job and the older children went to college. My husband returned periodically to harass me, often coming to my job. Two of my colleagues suggested that I seek employment elsewhere as a result of his harassment.

In the next three years, much of our time was spent in custody battles, support hearings, property settlements. I feel that a large part of that time was lost to the children and me as a result of the endless litigation in which we were involved.

Despite all the time we spent in litigation, we received no support. Although he was clever enough to maneuver legally to the point where he never even paid child support, I somehow feel that we have won something. We are together as a family. I am angry, I am bitter, I am disillusioned. The law provided no protection, no support, no redress for our suffering.

My husband was never brought to account for the abuse, for the lack of child support, for the lives he interrupted.

Had there been a shelter facility available, we would have been able to leave much sooner * * * we would have been spared at least those last agonizing months of fear and helplessness. Had there been equitable laws covering domestic violence, we would have had at least some financial support. I am grateful that I was able to find work, to relocate, to have the support of my children. But what of the women who cannot relocate, who have no job skills, whose children are unaware or too young, or who are bought off by their fathers?

I am the administrative director of the Marital Abuse Project, which has been in operation for three and a half years. We provide hot line and options counselling, court and hospital accompaniment, court advocacy, police training, and a variety of other services. We have several funding resources including LEAA, private foundations, and local money. We have also tried, unsuccessfully, to obtain Title XX money. In spite of all of this we have not been able to fund our shelter in Delaware County. We own a nine-bedroom house, which we could use for a shelter, but we haven't been able to get funds for the actual operation of the shelter. We need \$85,000 to operate for a year.

Our experience, and that of most groups throughout the country, is that operating funds are the most difficult to obtain, yet crucial if we are to begin to meet the emergency needs of victims of domestic violence. HR 2977 would provide that essential funding.

As a former victim of domestic violence, as an individual working with abused women, I cannot urge too strongly the need for more and better shelter facilities and for stronger and more effective laws protecting the rights of women and children.

PANEL PRESENTATION—GERALDINE STAHLY, WOMENSHELTER, LONG BEACH, CALIF.; JANICE MOORE, MY SISTER'S PLACE, WASHINGTON, D.C.; GINGER McMAHON, MARITAL ABUSE PROJECT, DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNA.; CYNTHIA DAMES, BATTERED WOMEN'S PROJECT, SANTA FE, N. MEX.

Ms. STAHLY. I am Geraldine Stahly, the executive director of WomenShelter in Long Beach, Calif.

Ms. MOORE. I am Janice Moore. I am from My Sister's Place in Washington, D.C.

Ms. McMAHON. I am Ginger McMahon from Delaware County, Pa. I am a victim and a director of a program.

Ms. DAMES. I am Cynthia Dames from Santa Fe, N. Mex. I am also the chairperson of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

Mr. MILLER. Geraldine, do you want to start?

STATEMENT OF GERALDINE STAHLY, WOMENSHELTER, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Ms. STAHLY. I really have a dual focus, and I would like to take that up in the summarization of the written testimony I have presented to you.

As executive director of a shelter, I have been most concerned with providing direct crisis intervention services to women and children in desperate situations. But also as an associate in psychology at the University of California, working on a dissertation on the topic, I have become very involved as well as a social psychologist in looking at the problem of violence in the family, its causes, its whole perspective, and trying to come up in our shelter, and in other shelters, with a perspective on intervention and a perspective on prevention.

We have been doing a lot of training and working a lot with professionals in law enforcement, in criminal justice, in mental health, and in health services to help them become more effective with the violent families with which they are dealing. I think the dimensions of the problem are very clear to the committee.

Twenty-eight million battered women was an estimate that came from the White House conference. I think that that, based on our experience at WomenShelter, probably entails 50 million or more children growing up in these violent families. I think those figures are almost too enormous to digest.

We opened in 1977 in September. In 22 months of operation we have had 600 women and children who have been sheltered. We have had more than 3,000 hotline calls. When we first opened 22 months ago, we had 100 hotline calls a month, and we had to reject about five women and children for every one we could accept.

Now currently in the last few months, we have had as many as 200 and 300 calls in a month and find that we are rejecting 15 women and children for every one that we can accept. And our experience is mirrored in all of Los Angeles County. Three years ago in Los Angeles

County there was one shelter that was functioning, and it was receiving about 100 calls a month. Now we have seven shelters, and each of these shelters is receiving 200 and 300 calls.

Of course, women will call more than one shelter, and still it is very clear that the existence of shelters within Los Angeles County has brought to the attention an enormous problem that was only suspected when shelters first began opening their doors. Many other communities have mirrored our experience. When help becomes available, massive numbers of women will reach out for that help.

Calls come to us at WomenShelter from women who have suffered violence in marriage for sometimes as long as 40 years, and often these women of marriages of long standing have long ago given up hoping or reaching up for help because they have been so often rebuffed in their early attempts to get help in years before.

Now that a shelter exists, now that there is beginning to be public attention to the issue, they again reach out for help. That, I think, is part of where this massive number of calls is coming from.

I think one of the important things in support of the legislation you are considering is the impact that shelters have on public agency response. In providing advocacy for women, they bring to the attention of the public and the public agencies the tremendous deficiencies that exist in the way agencies currently, in the past and continuing currently, handle the problem.

Police are reluctant to arrest. I understand there are still police forces which have informal stitch rules, where a woman who requires fewer than sometimes as many as 20 stitches will not be a woman whose husband will be arrested, or whose partner will be arrested. District attorneys continue to be reluctant to prosecute. In some areas, even in southern California, district attorneys have waiting rules where women who come in to press charges will be sent away and told to come back days later. So it is no wonder women become discouraged in trying to exercise their rights as a human being to be protected by the law.

Social service agencies in some areas are also very poorly geared in their regulations and in their procedures to help an adult woman get out of a dangerous relationship. In some areas, a woman is in a real catch-22 where she needs to establish an address away from her husband in order to get aid, and yet, without aid, she cannot establish an address unless a shelter exists in that community.

I think it is necessary also to consider the fact that the battered woman has been a difficult client for public agencies, the experience of police who have found women ambivalent and indecisive about whether an arrest should be made. Although that really isn't a decision a woman should be asked to make, nevertheless the police experience her as ambivalent, and that discourages them.

District attorneys do find that women, for some of the reasons that have already been mentioned in testimony, and it is a fact, often change their minds and become reluctant to testify, sometimes because of threats, but sometimes because of reconciliation of one form or another.

I think, in order to deal with the problem, we need to understand something about the dynamics of this relationship which causes the woman to be a difficult client for public agencies as they are now formu-

lated in their policies. All victims of violent assaults offer, in addition to physical injuries, emotional psychological injury and damage. A woman who is battered by her husband or her spouse or the man that she loves and has come to depend on for protection—it is a reversal that exacerbates the emotional and psychological damage of the attack.

Among the consequences of battering that we observe in the women at WomenShelter—and all the other shelters have similar experiences—is the low esteem and passivity and feelings of powerlessness which lead to great dependency and confusion.

I think it is important to realize that the passivity and the dependence of the women we see often is not a longstanding psychological characteristic of the woman, but rather can be viewed as her response to the battering situation. The battering man is often jealous and possessive and extremely controlling, and she may find that his violence is actually reduced by passive and dependent responses to him.

Now, this same woman, when she may want to leave the situation and get help, finds that the police and the prosecutor want to be helping only a victim who can be assertive and decisive and assures them that she will follow through. So we are asking this woman to do something rather extraordinary, to change almost instantly a set of behaviors that have been survival behaviors in the battering situation, to now stick up for herself, be decisive, be assertive in order to get help from the system.

I think it is unrealistic, and I think it is part of the reason that the system has not dealt at all effectively with the battered woman and has found her to be uncooperative. They have not given her the support that she needs in order to cooperate.

It is our finding in working with people in public agencies in Los Angeles that it can be extremely helpful to communicate to the public agencies something about the dynamics of this violent situation, to help them to gear both their policy and their individual responses of the line personnel to what is the real situation of the battered woman and her needs.

There is beginning to be a lot of literature and information on this. I think Dr. Lenore Walker has brilliantly described the dynamics of the battered relationship, where there are at least three distinct phases. There is a tension building phase during which the woman senses that the battering is coming. There is an acute episode. Then there is a loving reconciliation following.

During the loving reconciliation, the woman often gets the only positive things that exist in her life. Cut off, often, in this battering relationship by a jealous and possessive man, she has no other source of self-esteem or positive feedback. Now, following a battering, she receives love and attention and assurance that she is OK as a woman. After all, in our society, many, many women are socialized to feel that their primary role is to make a man happy, and failing to do that, the ultimate failure is to be a battered woman. So she feels devastated, often, as a human being.

When he comes to her with his apologies and his gifts and his love, it is not surprising that she accepts them.

Now, look at the way the system interacts with the dynamics of the battering relationship. When the woman is in that tension-building

phase, when she senses the battering is coming, she often comes to the shelter. We have begun to say at WomenShelter that a woman comes as often before the next beating as after the last one. It is during that tension-building phase that she is most motivated to leave and to reach out for help.

But when she reaches out for help to a public agency, she is rebuffed. She is told by the police they can't arrest him for what she thinks her husband may do to her when he gets home. The district attorney is often unwilling to prosecute for the minor injuries that sometimes occur during that tension-building phase, particularly when the same woman may have been reluctant to proceed at another date after a more severe battering.

I think it is extraordinarily important to understand that this mismatch is part of the problem of public agencies in being responsive. If we can begin to understand something about the dynamics of the family, I think we can create intervention that will be effective.

Shelters are impacting public agencies, in part by the advocates for the battered women and explaining to the agencies something of the dynamics that we are beginning to observe in these violent relationships. I think that a fine example of this is what has happened in Los Angeles County since the existence of shelters during the period of the last 3 years, when there have been a number of shelters.

In Los Angeles we are very fortunate. Haven House is a shelter that has been in operation now for 7 years, and is one of the oldest in the country. They are an example and were extremely helpful to other shelters that developed, so now there are a number of shelters in the Los Angeles area giving support to battered women, but also impacting public agencies.

The shelters together formed a coalition of shelters and other interested people, called the Southern California Coalition for Battered Women. This coalition, along with individual shelters, have had a tremendous impact on public agency response in the Los Angeles County area. I think, as a direct result of the shelters' existence and their work with battered women, the board of supervisors in Los Angeles County formed a task force on domestic violence, which created a report that was the result of a joint effort between grassroots people working in shelters with battered women and public agencies charged with the responsibility.

I have that report, which I would like to enter into the record. I think that it is evidence of what can come out of the existence of shelters in a community, in terms of influencing some changes at the level of government and at the level of public agency response.

Coming out of the work of the task force, there was an establishment of new programs, both by the district attorney and the city attorney in Los Angeles, and I have information on these also that I would like to enter into the record. You will find in the description of the city attorney's program specific acknowledgement to the role of the shelters and the people working with battered women to the creation of the new program.

It is a very unusual program. I think it is innovative. I don't know of any other prosecuting agency in the country that has quite their approach, and it comes from an understanding of the dynamics of

family violence. The city attorney is no longer asking women to file charges. They are communicating to the woman that it is not her responsibility to file charges, but it is the responsibility of the prosecutor as the representative of the State.

What they are finding is, when the woman is thus relieved of this terrifying and frightening and guilt-producing responsibility to decide if prosecution against her husband will go forward, that women are much more cooperative.

In the course of the last year with this program, the experience of the city attorney is that their convictions on battering, domestic violence cases has gone from 20 percent to 40 percent, a 100-percent improvement. I think it is a particularly positive program because the whole thrust of prosecution is to get the man into probation if it is a first offense, and if it is not a very serious offense causing extreme injury, into a mandatory counseling program. Then he is made to understand that a condition of his probation is that there be no further violence and that he participate in the program.

The attorney's office feels this is reducing recidivism, and they hope to have statistics soon to establish that.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Ms. Stahly, can I ask you how long your testimony is going to be? I am going to have to leave. I apologize because I have been looking forward to this part of the program more than to some of the earlier ones.

Ms. STAHLY. Just let me conclude very quickly by saying that I did want to say that the role of shelters in increasing public agency response and providing this necessary service is recognized in Los Angeles County, and yet shelters are still in trouble. They are understaffed, underfunded, and overwhelmed by clients, and they still have problems with agencies needing to implement on a line level changes that are happening at an administrative level to really change.

I want to say that the shelters are very cost effective. And as both the community and the public agencies have come to trust the shelter, they send more and more clients our way and we find ourselves, as you will find in our written testimony, providing services that are really the mandated services of those agencies. We are not reimbursed for those services and we cannot indefinitely survive unless we are essentially reimbursed for the mandated services to some extent that we provide for agencies.

And then the last comment that I want to make is that at the shelter we have been particularly struck by the consequences of violence for children. All of the children we see, nearly all of the children, have some sort of immediate problems directly resulting from being in a violent family. I think the long-term consequences of socialization is that we have a violent society.

I think the violence within the family is the taproot of the violence in our larger society. Until we can effectively intervene in the violence happening in the family, we will not be able to reduce the level of violence in the street and the level of violence occurring between strangers.

Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Janice Moore?

STATEMENT OF JANICE MOORE, STAFF MEMBER, MY SISTER'S PLACE, WASHINGTON, D.C., WOMEN'S LEGAL DEFENSE FUND

Ms. MOORE. Good afternoon. My name is Janice Moore.

Before beginning my testimony, I would like to say that I fully support the testimony of Ms. Stahly. On behalf of My Sister's Place and the Women's Legal Defense Fund, we would like to pledge our support of H.R. 2977 and urge its early passage.

I am on the staff of My Sister's Place, a shelter for battered women and their children, located in Washington, D.C. My Sister's Place is a project of the Women's Legal Defense Fund. The purposes, philosophy, and operation of our shelter is consistent with those of many other shelters across the country.

As you have heard in previous testimony, a battered woman who has been forced to flee her home has many needs. One of her most immediate needs is to find refuge in a place which can provide a safe and supportive environment. Since friends and family are often unavailable, unwilling, or unable to house or help her, emergency shelters for battered women are essential.

To give you a typical example, a woman comes to the shelter without money or other resources. She has left her husband or boyfriend on whom she was either partially or wholly financially dependent. She will probably have her children with her. She or her children may require immediate medical attention. Usually she needs legal advice.

She may require job referrals or training, and she sometimes needs public assistance to support herself and her children until she can find such employment. If she has children, she may have to either place the children in day care or in school. If she decides not to return to her spouse, she will need help finding new housing.

Not only does a battered woman have these concrete needs which must be met, but having been both physically and psychologically abused, she has little confidence in her abilities or her self-worth. Out of fear, embarrassment, and guilt, a woman typically becomes isolated from the world around her.

One of the results of this isolation may be that she does not have a clear understanding of what services are available to her. The prospect of beginning a new life on her own can be fraught with fear and anxiety. For all these reasons, most battered women need support and assistance in achieving their goals.

Recognizing the complexity of her needs, shelters attempt to provide comprehensive services in a supportive environment. These services may include legal and psychological counseling, employment and housing assistance, welfare advocacy, medical aid, and children's programs. The staff in shelters help a woman identify her needs, direct her to appropriate resources, and act as an advocate when she has difficulty obtaining those services. Since the delivery of services by some social service agencies, including hospital emergency, is fragmented and confusing, and their staff may be uninformed, if not uncooperative, advocacy is an important component of service delivery to battered women.

At this point I would like to make a comment about the testimony of the doctor from George Washington University. He said that they

don't see very many battered women coming to the hospital. With our experience, we don't find that to be true. What we do find to be true is women who go to hospitals tend not to identify themselves as battered women unless they are asked, and even when asked, if the batterer is there or if other people are present, she is apt to deny that. So I think it is more a matter of their not being identified as battered women rather than their not coming to the hospital.

I think some of that can be alleviated by training and sensitizing the staffs at these agencies and hospitals to the problems of battered women. Also, I don't believe it is true that women who go to hospitals can always be placed in shelters when they need it. We have had hospitals call and say they have a woman who needs shelter, and we have not been able to meet that need. We have called around to all the other shelters we know of and they have been full, too. So she is left with nowhere to go.

The children of battered women also require special attention. These children have often witnessed their mothers being beaten. Some have been victims of abuse themselves. Many are hostile and aggressive, some shy and withdrawn. The problems these children bring with them to the shelter may be intensified by the demands of adjusting to a new environment.

To try to make the children's transition from their home to the shelter as smooth as possible, it is necessary to have a program geared specifically toward meeting these children's special needs. In addition to offering them recreational and educational activities, shelter staff and volunteers can offer the children emotional support that their mothers, who are themselves in a crisis situation, may be unable to provide or who may need assistance in providing.

The philosophy and approach of service organizations are often as important as the actual services provided. Traditionally, community-based shelters have incorporated the concepts of self-help and peer support into their programs. These principles provide the foundation for strengthening a battered woman's self-concept and enabling her to regain control over her own life. In general, shelters provide an environment in which supportive women take care of themselves and each other, learn to make and trust their own decisions, rediscover their abilities, and develop a stronger sense of their own worth.

Community-based shelters have been started in a variety of ways, but the vast majority sprang from other, more general service organizations such as women's centers, hotlines, or legal advocacy programs. Women in such organizations received thousands of calls for help from desperate women with no place to go to escape a violent home. It was in direct response to these pleas for help that the majority of grassroots shelters have been started.

Since it usually costs a substantial amount of money to operate a shelter, many were started in the homes of volunteers or by scraping together just enough money to rent an apartment. Over the years, many shelters which were started in this way have been able to raise the funds necessary to rent a four- or five-bedroom house and, usually with a heavy reliance on volunteers and in-kind contributions of food, furniture, linens, et cetera, have been able to keep their doors open.

However, many of these shelters face the prospect of having to either close entirely or drastically cut back on services and coverage because

startup funds are usually only available for the first 2 years of operation, while in many organizations, more than that time is needed. They may take 3, 4, or 5 years in order to become self-sufficient.

Other shelters are still struggling to open or to move out of individuals' houses because the seed money that is available is extremely limited. This is especially true in areas of the country which have not yet recognized domestic violence as an issue demanding public action.

As has been said before, the need for shelters far outweighs the number in operation. Our experience with raising money for My Sister's Place and of the efforts of other similar shelters is that even the most diligent and creative fundraising efforts are often not enough to insure the opening or continuance of community-based shelters.

As I mentioned before, startup or seed money grants, usually from local private foundations, are difficult to obtain and are almost always limited to 1 or 2 years. National foundations are swamped with requests from shelters, and the vast majority will only consider requests from organizations which propose to address the problem on a nationwide basis.

Another frequently used source of funding for shelters is found in local public agencies such as CETA, WIN, and the local department of human resources. The manpower programs have been the mainstay of many community-based shelters. These programs, however, are now under fire from Congress and the executive branch. If the proposed cuts, especially to CETA, are passed, shelters and many other worthy nonprofit agencies will suffer serious financial hardship.

Other sources of revenue include bloc grant funds and direct Federal grant programs, such as ACTION and LEAA. Bloc grant funds seem to be accessible in some areas—Minnesota is a good example—and very difficult to acquire in others—the District of Columbia being an example. The vagaries of the bloc grant process make them useful but extremely unreliable sources of funds.

Direct Federal grant programs are similar in that they may provide important revenue to a few shelters, but in general, access to these funds is extremely limited. Often the grants are for research and demonstration projects requiring sophisticated research skills. Even when this is not a requirement, the level of grantsmanship skills necessary to compete successfully with professional think-tanks is high and usually beyond the reach of local grassroots organizations.

Title XX money, funneled from HEW through State and local governments, is equally unreliable. In many parts of the country it is virtually impossible to impact on the expenditure of these bloc grant funds. In the District of Columbia, for instance, almost all of the money is used to fund government-run agencies, and very little, if any, gets into nonprofit organizations.

For years, local nonprofit organizations have tried, mostly unsuccessfully, to insure that a greater proportion of these funds are made available to nongovernmental agencies. Year after year of testimony and effort have yielded almost no result. In our city, as in many throughout the country, title XX money is not accessible to programs for battered women.

The unpredictability of funding also creates other problems. Even where seed money is available to start a shelter, after the first few years of operation, the very existence of the shelter may be jeopard-

ized. Long-term planning and program development is also impeded by funding constraints. For these reasons, we would like to recommend that H.R. 2977 be amended from a 3-year to a 5-year program in order to allow more flexibility in funding so that, where appropriate, programs may receive funds for up to 5 years.

The shelter movement here and in other parts of the world has been characterized by its roots in the community. The success of shelters has in large part been due to their independence. Not only does a community-based shelter relieve the government of one more administrative burden, but it provides services in an efficient and effective manner.

Further, such shelters offer comprehensive services with certain philosophical ideals like those of self-help and peer support underlying all efforts to provide for a woman's psychological and material well-being. It is these community-based shelters which first responded to the needs of battered women and developed an expertise in approaching the problem and which can be relied upon to seek creative and practical solutions in the future.

For all of these reasons, assistance from the Federal Government in the form proposed in H.R. 2977 is essential to the continued survival of shelters for battered women and to the creation of the many more that are so desperately needed.

On behalf of My Sister's Place and the hundreds of other shelters and support programs for battered women, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 2977 and urge you to work strenuously for its passage.

Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much.

**STATEMENT OF GINGER McMAHON, MARITAL ABUSE PROJECT,
DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNA.**

Ms. McMAHON. Good afternoon. My name is Ginger McMahan. I am from Delaware County, Pa. Currently, I am serving as administrative director of the domestic violence project in my home county. I am pleased to have the opportunity to offer my testimony to this committee.

My testimony is drawn from my personal experience as a victim of domestic violence. I intend to share with you some of the trauma my children and I experienced as victims of domestic violence and, hopefully, to suggest ways of implementing some of the needs which are critical for adults and children who experience abuse.

My experience is neither isolated nor unique. It is happening as a daily occurrence to thousands of families in the United States.

As a starting point, let me dispel a popular myth about domestic violence. Domestic violence is not dictated by race, economic or social structure, education, or any of the common indicators of community standing. We are a comfortably established family living in a 12-room farmhouse on 20 acres.

We owned our own business; we were able to afford vacations, new cars, recreational vehicles. We were respected members of our community, a small town conveniently close to a large city. My husband was active in scouting and served as a little league coach. In addition, he was a member of the local school board.

I was a member of the junior league and the League of Women Voters. I was appointed to the mayor's council on drug and alcohol and the mayor's commission on delinquency, in addition to working as a volunteer in the juvenile probation office.

We were 12 in our family: my husband and myself, our two natural sons, one daughter adopted as an infant, and seven adopted teenagers. My husband is a college graduate. My education was interrupted by marriage. I found him a brilliant, caring, gentle person. We shared a strong love for children. I thought of him as a Pied Piper.

One day the Pied Piper turned into Dr. Jeckyl and Mr. Hyde. We still do not really know what happened. He began to drink more frequently. His attitude toward me became critical and dissatisfied. Within a year he had begun slapping me whenever I disagreed with him and whenever anything I did did not meet with his approval. This included everything from my political opinions to what I prepared for meals.

He would shove me, shake me, curse me for not agreeing with his views on business, religion, our children. If it rained, he held me responsible. Whatever displeased him or thwarted his plans he blamed on me. I had changed from a bright, loving, competent person to a sullen, hysterical, unattractive, and irresponsible one, according to him. He began telling me that I was crazy and needed help.

I discussed what was happening with our family physician who suggested that my husband was frustrated and had other things on his mind that were troubling him. My doctor gave me pills.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I knew you were going to say that.

Ms. McMAHON. He said they would help me to cope with the situation. He also suggested that I speak to our minister. The minister's opinion was that it was my duty as a wife and mother to be patient and tolerant: In short, that I should accept the abuse and keep my mouth shut. Needless to say, neither the doctor nor the minister was in any way helpful.

My husband's hostility and violence were increasing, and I was becoming more afraid to be alone with him. His hostility and rage were not directed toward anyone else, however; not friends, business associates, or our children. His rage increased and he began to punch me. I remember the first night that happened. He punched me and I forced myself to stay quiet so that the children would not be made aware of what had happened. It is called screaming quietly.

The following day, I was in pain and had difficulty moving about. He asked me what was wrong, and when I told him that I was in pain as a result of his punching me, he told me I was crazy and that I must have fallen. The beatings became more severe. On one occasion he hit my face and cut me so that I needed stitches. He accompanied me to the doctor's office, and he and the doctor concluded that I was obviously becoming accident prone.

After this incident, he apologized and told me that he would never do it again. For a while, things improved. He became more attentive, bought me presents, took me on trips. It was pretty good. Because I wanted to believe that things would change, I took this brief respite as an indication that they were changing. However, the abuse began again, to be followed by his remorse and promises for change again.

This constant pattern of violence and remorse began to alter my behavior and thinking. I became afraid for my life. It became impossible to plan any activities because I never knew when my next "accident" would occur that might leave me visibly injured or even confined to bed. It was during this period that I began to lose my identity as a person. I began to believe that there must be something wrong with me, that I deserved the abuse, that I was crazy. I became totally isolated with my fear and humiliation. There was no one to whom I could turn, no one to talk to.

As a desperate remedy, I suggested marriage counseling to my husband. He became very angry and spent 5 hours telling me that I didn't deserve to live, and he choked me until I nearly lost consciousness. During that 5 hours, he "explained" to me how unappreciative I was, that all my friends were probably being beaten by their husbands as well, that it was natural for men to beat their wives, that where else might a man release his frustrations?

As a result of this incident, my voice box was damaged, and the doctor said that the injury might be permanent. My husband had taunted me by telling me to try to get a divorce. He told me that if I tried, he would see to it that I lost the children. With no one to turn to, I knew I was trapped. I went to friends and the reactions were what I have since learned is predictable. They didn't believe me, didn't want to get involved, suggested psychiatrists. And my life was becoming increasingly intolerable.

I knew that I had to get out. One of the resources I found was the women's counseling center at the University of Massachusetts. It was about this time that our four oldest children still at home came to me and told me that they knew about the abuse. The children and I went to the counseling center where we discussed what was happening. The psychologist at the center was able to determine that all of the kids, even the youngest, were aware of the abuse and were suffering emotionally from it. I consulted with my oldest children, recalling them from college so that we could all share in the decision I was about to make.

Deciding to leave was easy. Implementing the decision was not. All that we had, with the exception of one of the cars and the mortgage on the house, was in my husband's name. Because of the amount of children I had, it was impossible to find a place to live. Imagine if you were a landlord and I came upon you with my entire brood; what you would say.

My family turned against me. They could not understand how I could think of leaving. I should stay and cope, try to make my marriage work. It was months before we were able to leave, and all during that time the violence continued. During that time, the children and I drew closer together. One night my husband's abuse became so bad that the kids called the police. Because of the way the laws are written, the police could do nothing unless my husband hit me outside our house. Then they could arrest him for disorderly conduct or disturbing the peace.

The children confronted my husband with their knowledge of his abuse. He was very angry they had become aware of what was happening. He decided to leave, but told us that he would never provide any support. He made good that threat. He destroyed the business. The

property had to be sold to pay off the debts he incurred. The little that he left us, we used to relocate.

After we left, I found a job and the older children went to college. My husband returned periodically to harass me, often coming to my job. Two of my colleagues suggested that I seek employment elsewhere as a result of his harassment.

In the next 3 years, much of our time was spent in custody battles, support hearings, property settlements. I feel that a large part of that time was lost to the children and me as a result of the endless litigation in which we were involved.

Despite all the time we spent in litigation, we received no support. Although he was clever enough to maneuver legally to the point that he never even paid child support, I somehow feel that we have won something. We are together as a family. I am angry, I am bitter, I am disillusioned. The law provided no protection, no support, no redress for our suffering.

My husband was never brought to account for the abuse, for the lack of child support, for the lives he interrupted.

Had there been a shelter facility available, we would have been able to leave much sooner. We would have been spared at least those last agonizing months of fear and helplessness. Had there been equitable laws covering domestic violence, we would have had at least some financial support. I am grateful that I was able to find work, to relocate, to have the support of my children. But what of the women who cannot relocate, who have no job skills, whose children are unaware or too young, or who are bought off by their fathers?

I am the administrative director of the Marital Abuse project, which has been in operation for 3½ years. We provide hotline and options counseling, court and hospital accompaniment, court advocacy, police training, and a variety of other sophisticated services. We have several funding resources, including LEAA, private foundations, and local money.

We have also tried, unsuccessfully, to obtain title XX money. We all know what happened to title XX. In spite of all of this, we have not been able to fund our shelter in Delaware County. We own a nine-bedroom house, just deeded to us, which we could use for a shelter, but we haven't been able to get funds for the actual operation of the shelter. We need \$85,000 to operate for a year.

Our experience and that of most groups throughout the country is that operating funds are the most difficult to obtain, yet critical, if we are to begin to meet the emergency needs of victims of domestic violence. H.R. 2977 would provide that essential funding.

As a former victim of domestic violence, as an individual working with abused women, I cannot urge too strongly the need for more and better shelter facilities and for stronger and more effective laws protecting the rights of women and children.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you very much.

I would like to recognize for a moment, before our next witness, Congressman Bob Edgar, who I know was here several times earlier this morning, to testify in support of one of the witnesses.

Mr. EDGAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would just like to commend you and Barbara for the actions you are taking today in holding these hearings, and also to commend Gin-

ger, who is from my congressional district and has been very articulate in sharing, from her personal point of view, the kinds of conflicts that she has had in the past with domestic violence.

I first became aware of this issue long before I ever thought that I would be a Congressman. I was a cofounder of a service called the People's Emergency Center, in the city of Philadelphia, which is a shelter for women and families, that was instituted back in 1972. It grew out of my work with the Philadelphia police-clergy unit. I was amazed, in going back to accident wards and police stations in north Philadelphia, to see women and families huddled in the corner, waiting to get through the night, because of a domestic quarrel or a utility failure that had occurred in a home somewhere in the urban center of Philadelphia.

When I explored the situation a little further, I discovered there were three shelters for vagrant males and no shelters for women, so we took an old church on Chestnut Street in Philadelphia and renovated the first floor. Without asking any permission from the State or local authorities, we simply opened a shelter. We thought maybe we would help 100 or 200 families during the course of a year.

In the first year of operation, we helped 2,000 people who came to the center, people who were homeless because of a variety of reasons. Most of them were women running away from something, and usually the running away was from a husband who was causing quite a bit of pain and trouble.

Late into the night, when women and families were staying in our shelter on weekends, many times we discovered the same kind of thing Ginger has described, and that is the harassment from the husband, the banging on the door of the church to get in.

I think it is extremely unfortunate that the legislation which you have been so active in pushing over the last couple of years has not attained the support of the majority of the House and Senate. I think it is about time we move on it. We get caught in all kinds of pressures here, fiscal and otherwise, but I believe that this is a priority piece of legislation. I am willing to put my name on it and am willing to do whatever I can to support the effort.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Bob.

Ms. DAMES?

STATEMENT OF CYNTHIA DAMES, CHAIRPERSON, NATIONAL COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms. DAMES. My name is Cynthia Dames. I am chairperson of the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. I am also director of a shelter for battered women in Santa Fe, N. Mex., which serves primarily Hispanic, Chicano, and native American women.

I will try to make my brief testimony briefer. In the past couple of years, the people of this country have become aware of the problem of violent attacks on women by their husbands, boyfriends, and adult sons. The magnitude of the violence perpetrated on women in the home is not yet, however, fully understood by the public.

The ramifications of this violence are not entirely apparent, but it is clear that continued violence against women in this society is intoler-

able. Women across this Nation are calling a halt to the violence, are rescuing battered women, and are helping women find alternatives to living a life of terror at the hands of the men that they love.

As said previously, but I think it bears being said again, battering knows no class, race, religion, age, or geographical background. We know that many of the women in this room today, and a majority of the women that we each know, are victims of domestic violence. This violence may be merely a slap, a punch, or a kick, but in our experience, the violence that occurs much more likely includes burning, cutting with knives, attempted strangulation, rape, facial disfigurement, and repeated and prolonged assault on the breasts and stomach, frequently causing miscarriage and/or organic injury.

Last year in Maryland, local law enforcement agencies received approximately 15,000 complaints of spousal abuse. A shelter in Pittsburgh, Pa., has been receiving 100 calls a day from women seeking shelter and support from husbands and boyfriends. One-half of all couples in the United States have experienced at least one incident of physical violence in their relationship.

Of the assault victims seeking medical assistance at the emergency room of a Boston hospital, 70 percent were victims of domestic violence. In its first year of operation, a Louisville, Ky., shelter lodged 555 women and children and answered approximately 2,700 hotline calls.

The community-based shelter program in Orlando, Fla., sheltered 149 women and children in a 2-month period in 1978. Many shelters across the country, and I think it is important to be aware of this, are actually turning away victims of domestic violence because of lack of space. Some programs have found they are unable to house as many as 30 women and children requesting shelter each day.

In a recent report of the Office of the Attorney General of the State of Ohio came the startling revelation that, although there were 16 shelters in that State, 69 more were needed to meet the needs of victims of domestic assault. Thus, 82 percent of the need in Ohio is unmet.

Funding is meager. The St. Louis abused women's support project is primarily funded from individual donations, from \$5 to \$100. Most shelter programs, as we have heard, have begun with one or two unpaid women coordinating the efforts of a number of volunteers. Frequently the shelter was the home of one of the workers.

Securing funding has allowed numbers of these groups to rent a shelter facility to meet operating expenses and to hire small staffs. Typically, the shelter will include a fundraiser, administrator, a house manager, a child care worker, and a victim advocate. Volunteers continue to be the backbone of the shelters.

Expansion of the staff in shelters of this size is essential to the continuity of the staff and the sustained energy of the volunteers. For most staff people and many volunteers in shelter programs, they work at least 11 hours a day, 6 days a week. Ten thousand women and 20,000 children were sheltered or provided with other needed services by the 19 shelter programs affiliated with the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence last year.

None of these programs have secure funding. All face the possibility of closing this year. Fewer than 15 State legislatures across the country have enacted laws providing funding for shelters. Most of this legisla-

tion does not establish permanent funding mechanisms. Almost all of it is inadequate to meet the needs of shelter programs.

About 70 percent of the existing shelters obtain funding from private and local sources. Less than 50 percent receive any State or Federal moneys. Almost all piece their budgets together from multiple funding sources. Even for the most sophisticated shelter programs, securing secure funding has taken years.

You heard earlier from Minnesota. Women's Advocates of St. Paul, for example, spent 7 years developing secure funding. Other programs in Minnesota must rely heavily on local and private sources to complete their budgeting requirements.

Many States have not made moneys available to shelter programs when it was within their power to do so. Here is where we come in contact with the title XX issue. TitleXX moneys are virtually impossible in many States. The National Coalition, as a matter of fact, will be submitting a paper detailing some of our concerns and some of the roadblocks that we see in the administration of title XX funding.

States need the incentives that H.R. 2977 provides. Clearly, most have not acted on their own initiative to generate funds for domestic violence programs. However, we are certain that, once they have participated in the grant process provided in this legislation, they will recognize the need to generate new moneys or reallocate appropriate funds to sustain the shelter programs. Here too, it is just a question of education. I think that is what we are looking for in terms of funding, to buy time to be able to do that educating within our local communities.

Let me turn our attention to who we are, the National Coalition. The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence represents many of the more than 400 community-based shelter and hotline programs all over the United States. Our programs provide a multitude of services to battered women. These services include counseling, child care, agency advocacy, legal assistance, medical referral, court and police accompaniment, housing assistance, emergency hotline assistance, employment training and referral, parenting courses, budgeting and fiscal management assistance, as well as sheltering.

The philosophical underpinning of all these services is self-help, victims helping victims, growth through shared experience and support. We believe this is the most effective process for escaping the cycle of violence and embracing a life free of fear and the immobility that violence creates.

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence began as a concept at the Milwaukee Domestic Violence Conference in 1976. There was strong feeling among the participants that the many existing and emerging shelter programs could benefit through association with each other to share information, materials, problems, and skills. It was also agreed that there was a growing need to organize on both statewide and national levels to bring the issue of domestic violence to the attention of the public and to persuade Government leaders to make policies and pass legislation that assure the growth and development of services to the victims of domestic violence and their children.

The National Coalition was formalized as an organization at the Civil Rights Consultation on Domestic Violence held here in March 1978. Hundreds of people, representing battered women's programs

from every State in the Union, participated in this exchange and recognized the need to continue a dialog among community-based shelter programs.

Consequently, the Coalition was born. We are planning to return to Washington, not uncoincidentally, for a national meeting of the membership of this grassroots coalition. At that time certainly, and this week as we return home, we intend to share with our constituents and with our congressional representatives our support of 2977.

On behalf of the Coalition, we would like to thank both you, specifically, Congresswomen Mikulski, and Congressman Miller, for your attention to this issue. We would also like to thank the committee for allowing these hearings to take place. It is amazing the advocacy and work that has been done by shelters of this nature on enormously low budgets.

We invite committee people to come and visit their local shelters, spend time with staffs as well as the people we serve and work with, the victims, and begin the educational process of learning what we are seeing out there in the community.

Thank you for your support, and we offer our support for H.R. 2977.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. We appreciate that.

Barbara?

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Miller.

First of all, I would like to thank you and compliment you on your testimony. I am reminded of when George and I were here last March, or March a year ago, when we thought we were really going to be able to put it over a term ago. Again, we were, I think, inspired and energized in terms of our own efforts in the Congress by listening to the people who are either directly affected or who are the front line people.

In addition to people like yourself, we had a legal aid lawyer from Appalachia and a woman who was trying to run a shelter on an Indian reservation. One of the things that strikes you is, No. 1, not only the incredible need and the bravery of the victims as they try to grapple with their own lives, but really the strength and courage of the people involved in the shelter movement.

Congressman Miller spoke earlier about my leadership and I talk about his leadership, but I will tell you, sometimes it is really a drag being here trying to advocate this legislation. And one of the reasons the hearings are important is not only to build a record of the need but to really energize those of us who have a different set of national priorities sometimes than the dominant mentality. So it is very helpful to have you here.

Ms. Dames, I have a question I do want to ask you.

One of the things that continually comes up, for example, as Ms. Moore raised, is what do you do when the seed money runs out? As someone who has worked both as a social worker at a local level and as a city councilwoman, that is a problem that comes up all of the time. I wonder if part of your coalition's effort and if maybe part of the kinds of things we need to pay attention to in funding is the education and provision of technical assistance for grassroots groups on how to raise money.

One of the hardest problems I had when I got into politics was to find out how to raise money for a campaign, and I didn't know how to do that. I knew how to run programs. I had done all of those things. But I just wonder if that is something the coalition has thought about, if you think that is a needed framework in the technical assistance to be provided. And I don't mean raising money by Government sources, but from the United Fund, private fundraising and so on. I just wondered what you think about that.

Ms. DAMES. There is no question there is a need for continued technical assistance in learning how to raise money. I think there are people within the grassroots movement who have done that very, very successfully. You would be surprised at the creativity that has been used within this movement to keep shelters going this long.

The problem is that we are so swamped with our individual shelters and the demands that come on those and the constant issue of survival for those that it is an additional burden for us then to go and travel across the State or across country to begin to teach other people how to do adequate fundraising.

That is not to say that we don't do it. I am building a coalition right now in New Mexico and have been working with several groups in terms of teaching them how to do fundraising. What I am saying is the expertise is there within the grassroots movement. It is a question of being so underfunded that it is an additional burden for us to travel to whatever area to begin to share that expertise.

With the funding you are suggesting, I think that it would allow us the time, which is one of the most critical things, to not only build up our own shelters in terms of State and local government sources, private sources, and other social service resources, but to begin to do in a more consistent way the kind of education amongst ourselves that you are suggesting.

For example, part of the goal of this national conference which we will be having in October—there will be three goals, actually. One will be to teach lobbying skills and how to work with legislators on a State and National level, which we are sure will be useful in October.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Can we come? [General laughter.]

Ms. DAMES. I am sure you could educate us.

Ms. MIKULSKI. When is your meeting going to be?

Ms. DAMES. It will be October 10 through October 14.

The second goal of the conference will be to teach organizing skills on a local, regional, and national scale, and the third would be to arrive at media strategies on a local, regional, and national level. That is all, finding people within our movement who have that kind of expertise who have been very successful to teach others about how to be more successful at those kinds of things.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you. I just have one other question, if the chairman will allow.

A great deal of emphasis during this discussion today has been on the need for shelters, but the bill has several other components. One is the Federal coordinating council so that the food stamp program makes sense in terms of shelters, and there is a media thing—public service announcements and whatever. I just wonder if any of the members of the panel have had a chance to look at that and if they feel that it is a necessary component of the legislation.

Ms. DAMES. I myself think it is absolutely necessary to the legislation. I also think that a civilian group, as it were, of people who would accompany and work with that interagency council is absolutely crucial. The reason is, that so many of us get so involved in the particular area we are working in, the unfortunate thing that happens is that we get further and further away from the real issues that confront the victims of domestic violence.

So that if we indeed had *x* victims, grassroots people involved in direct service programs like the ones we represent, I think that that kind of balance of both the sophistication and knowing how the Federal Government works and what things can and cannot be changed, along with the sophistication of knowing what is needed and what is not needed, could be a very powerful experience and one that would be growthful for both sides.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you. I would like to thank the other members of the Panel even though questions were not specifically addressed to them.

I would also like to note that Senator Cranston still has not introduced the bill over on the Senate side. Congressman Miller and I have conferred about that. I have already had a terrible argument with Senator Cranston about it, and my feeling is that if he does not, I would like you all to perhaps convey to him the intensity of your concerns. It is my feeling if he doesn't do it by near the time we get ready to adjourn in July, we are prepared to go find another sponsor.

Ms. McMAHON. Thank you.

Mr. EDGAR. I have one followup comment, and that is on how to lobby. Barbara has rightfully spoken about the need to put some pressure on Senator Cranston. But it seems to me there are some other important facets of lobbying, and that is the notion of eye contact, of actually taking House Members by the arm, showing them the shelter, and having them experience the impact of what is happening to women in their communities.

We spin like tops here in Washington. We get 20,000 different bills introduced. We get 185 committees and subcommittees who run around in all directions. And those of us who do not serve on this committee may not have the opportunity to learn about the problem unless you teach us.

The best lobbying is to try to contact the Member in his or her district and to extend an invitation to visit the district, contact me by inviting me to come to a facility. I would hesitate against using form letters and petitions. They may be very helpful in organizing your own groups but not very helpful here in Washington. It becomes a clerical problem for us to get the letters pumped out. I think more effective is to make actual contact.

If you cannot get the Congressman himself, then get his district staff to spend a day at your shelter and focus on the issue, and then every 6 months or every year, renew that experience.

I appreciate the testimony I have heard and I want to congratulate you for coming. I think that you really are the movers and shakers of this legislation; and if it is going to move, we need 218 votes in the House and 51 votes in the Senate, and word-for-word agreement between the two bodies. And that is really your goal and our goal as well.

Mr. MILLER. Let me thank you very much for coming and testifying,

and I am sorry that it took until so late in the day to have your panel.

As you know, Congressman Simon, the chairman of the subcommittee, indicated it would be his desire to try to come to mark up this legislation and report it from the committee immediately after Labor Day, so maybe we can give you an actual case to work on in October in lobbying. We can measure your successes and our successes.

Thank you so much for sharing your knowledge and your experience with the committee.

The committee will continue these hearings tomorrow morning in room 2261.

[Whereupon, at 3 :25 p.m., the hearing was recessed.]

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE: PREVENTION AND SERVICES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1979

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Paul Simon (chairman of the subcommittee), presiding.

Members present: Representatives Simon, Miller, Hawkins, Stack, Kramer, Coleman, and Erdahl.

Staff present: Judith Wagner, staff director; Thomas Birch, counsel; Sylvia Corbin, executive secretary; Rhonda Barovsky, secretary; and Jennifer Vance, minority legislative associate.

Mr. SIMON. The Subcommittee on Select Education will resume its hearings.

Our witnesses compose a panel, Fay Warren, General Federation of Women's Clubs; Jane Campbell, the National Council of Churches; Beth Olson, Junior League of Jacksonville, Fla.; and Dr. Kinsey Green, executive director, American Home Economics Association.

The four of you, if you are here, would you take your seat in the front? If you would identify yourselves, both for us and our reporter, that would be helpful.

Ms. KINSEY. I am Kinsey Green, executive director, American Home Economics Association.

Ms. CAMPBELL. I am Jane Campbell, National Council of Churches.

Ms. OLSON. I am Beth Olson, Junior League of Jacksonville.

Mr. SIMON. All right, Ms. Campbell, we will begin with you. The procedure is, if you have formal statements, if you wish to read them, that is fine. If you wish to enter them in the record and summarize them to save a little time, that is also fine—however, you wish to proceed.

Ms. CAMPBELL. We have a formal statement, which we will enter into the record, and I will summarize it for you.

Mr. SIMON. All right, that statement will be entered into the record. [Prepared statement of Jane Campbell follows:]

STATEMENT OF JANE CAMPBELL, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Chairman Simon, Members of the Subcommittee, and guests. I am Jane Campbell, a member of the Justice for Women Working Group of the National Council of Churches. At home in Cleveland I serve as the Executive Director of Womenspace, a coalition of fifty organizations that work for social change for the betterment of women. As a result of that activity, I served on the Ohio Attorney General's Task Force on Domestic Violence.

The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. is a cooperative agency of thirty-two Protestant and Orthodox bodies in this country. I do not purport to speak for all members of the communions which are constituent to

the National Council of Churches. I am speaking for the Justice of Women Working Group, which is a core unit of the Division of Church and Society. This group's task is to address issues which deny the personhood of one half of our population, as well as initiate policy in this area through the Governing Board. This Board is the policy-making body composed of persons selected by member denominations in proportion to their size. It is this group which determines the policy decision through which the Council seeks to fulfill its expressed purpose "to study and to speak and to act on conditions and issues in the national and the world which involve moral, ethical and spiritual principles inherent in the Christian gospel."

The National Council of Churches is grateful for this opportunity to testify before you today on "The Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act of 1979" (H.R. 2977), a bill designed to address the compelling social problems of violence within the family. We commend the subcommittee for holding hearings on what we believe to be a crucial issue that tears apart the fibers of our nation's people and families in particular.

As early as February 22, 1967 the Governing Board passed a Policy Statement entitled "Church-States Issues for Social and Health Services in the U.S.A." in which it recommended: "that every local church develop a committee devoted to study, discussion and action on social problems; attention to such social welfare problems as economic dependency, family breakdown, separation, divorce, delinquency, alcoholism, mental illness and problems of aging * * *." It is from such study as well as the experience of our members involved in community social service problems that "the need for a balanced range of preventive and treatment services is apparent." The policy urges the "support for the development of needed services * * *" and asks service agencies to activate " * * * specific attention to questions of public policy affecting those family and social problems with which it is most concerned." H.R. 2977 addresses an issue of our concern and of our social justice action as well as one such needed service for our local communities. We are grateful for the awareness of congress-people to the issue and will continue to work for and to support your efforts for passage of this bill.

Taking seriously the responsibility to help shape sound public social policy and committed to improving the lives of those who are victims of violence, the National Council of Churches in September 1978 was a participant in an *amicus* brief in the city of New York regarding the rights of women to receive protection orders from Family Court. The case is now in the New York State Court of Appeals. We believe H.R. 2977 is another good step in that direction.

The bill under consideration today is long past due. It is a well-targeted piece of legislation that provides assistance and support of local activity. Even though the economic mood of Congress and the country may be against spending money or anything, we would be dangerously short-sighted to continue to ignore the plight of women and children who suffer from physical abuse within their own home. Every sociological study that has been done on this topic indicates that the pattern of violence repeats in succeeding generations. Therefore, we must intervene in the cycle in order to prevent the children of today from becoming the victims and abusers of tomorrow.

One particularly laudable part of this bill is the focus on private and non-profit agencies. Most of the effort that has brought the needs and concerns of battered women out of secrecy and into the public arena has been generated and sustained by small groups of women in local areas. We have taken battered women and their children into our homes, raised money at potluck suppers, bake sales and cocktail parties, and relied on volunteers and donations. Local churches have taken up offerings and have given us use of their basements. Pastors have come to us seeking assistance for members of their congregations. In some areas community foundations have responded.

Still, shelters suffer from financial instability and lack of recognition of the need for their services. This bill could change that situation by establishing violence in the home—which is almost always violence against women and children—as behavior that will no longer be tolerated by this society, and by providing money and technical assistance to those groups who are willing to work with the victims, especially those who have already undertaken the task. The Congress has the opportunity to participate in the making of a stronger and safer society.

As a pioneer person in this area and out of my experience and research, every shelter that has opened in this country has far more demands for its services that it can handle. Especially in the early stages when staff members are busy

making the connections between welfare, job-training assistance, housing resources, counselling agencies and educational institutions that victims of domestic violence need to rebuild their lives, stable financial support for these efforts is essential. Once the service exists within a community, that community can no longer deny that the problem exists. The clients of the service and their children are living proof of both its value and its necessity.

In Cleveland, we have been fortunate to have two generous and progressive community foundations. After a group of ten women brought the issue to the public attention in 1976 through a media campaign and a series of community meetings and began to provide counselling services and some shelter, we were awarded three years of stable support. Now in 1979, our shelter received funds from the county, lives in a donated house that is being renovated with city community development block grant funds, operates a CETA-funded job training program, and receives funds from the United Way Services. That development took three years, but now the shelter is stable and will be able to focus its energy on providing quality services to its clients rather than on financial survival. Finally, the staff is being paid a living wage. This example is proof that the kind of program outlined in H.R. 2977 can work.

In Cuyahoga County the Policy Chief's Association estimates that there are 27,000 battered women. This is merely an indication of the scope of the problem. A problem of this magnitude cannot possibly be addressed by private foundations alone.

Someone you know is or has been a victim of domestic violence. Estimates of domestic violence by sociologists and psychologists that involve physical abuse range from 25-50 percent of all marriages. The problem is just as prevalent in the suburbs and rural areas as it is in the inner city. Your constituents have the right to your commitment to their safety.

As you deliberate, consider this bill a means of strengthening the family unit and enabling the survival of love, affection and caring among family members. A family member who fears for her life and safety cannot provide good care for her children or herself. A shelter gives her the opportunity for safety and repair of broken relationships with her children.

We urge you to move this much-needed legislation along its process as quickly as possible. Know that we will be working with you and your constituents for the passage of H.R. 2977.

Thank you.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE U.S.A.,

Washington, D.C., July 11, 1979.

PAUL SIMON,
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Select Education.

The following organizations express a basic concern for the victims of domestic violence and support legislation that assists our local social agencies and people working with this issue.

Rev. PAUL KITTLAUS,
*Director,
Washington Office,
Office for Church in Society,
United Church of Christ.*

MARY JANE PATTERSON,
*Director,
Washington Office,
United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.*

Rabbi DAVID SAPERSTEIN,
*Union of American Hebrew
Congregations.*

RUBY RHOADES,
*Washington Representatives,
Church of the Brethren.*

ARIE R. BROUWER,
*General Secretary,
Reformed Church in America.*

JOYCE HAMLIN,
*Women's Division,
Board of Global Ministries,
United Methodist Church.*

JESSMA BLOCKWICK,
*Director,
Population Department,
Board of Church and Society,
United Methodist Church.*

JUNE TOTEN,
*Director of Governmental Relations,
American Baptist Churches, U.S.A.*

ROBERT Z. ALPERN,
*Director,
Unitarian Universalists Association,
Washington Office.*

CHARLES V. BERGSTROM,
*Executive Director,
Office for Governmental Affairs,
Lutheran Council in the U.S.A.*

**STATEMENT OF JANE CAMPBELL, NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF CHURCHES**

Ms. CAMPBELL. Chairman Simon, and members of the subcommittee, I am Jane Campbell, a member of the Justice for Women Working Group of the National Council of Churches, which is a core unit of the Division of Church and Society.

At home, in Cleveland, Ohio, I am the director of the Women's Base Coalition, which is a coalition of 50 women's organizations that works toward social change for the betterment of women. In connection with that activity, I was appointed, last year, to the State of Ohio's Task Force on Domestic Violence, where we analyzed the laws in the State of Ohio, and the services that were available, and made specific recommendations.

I was also involved in helping to create the first shelter for battered women in Ohio.

The National Council of Churches is grateful for this opportunity to testify before you on the Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment Services Act of 1979, House Bill 2977.

We commend the subcommittee for holding hearings on what we believe to be a crucial issue that tears apart the fibers of our Nation's people and our families in particular.

The National Council of Churches, as early as February 1967, set policy in its governing board for local churches to see the need for a balanced range of preventive and treatment services. Furthermore, the National Council of Churches was a participant in an amicus brief in September 1978 in the city of New York regarding the rights of women to receive protection orders from the family court. This case is now pending in the New York State Court of Appeals.

The bill that we are considering today is long past due. It is a well-targeted piece of legislation that provides assistance and support of local activities. It does not purport to set up a whole new Federal bureaucracy, but rather one of the particularly laudable parts of it is that it deals with private and nonprofit agencies on a local level.

Most of the effort that has brought the needs and concerns of battered women out of secrecy and into the public arena has been generated and sustained by small groups of women in local areas.

We have taken battered women and their children into our houses. We have raised money at potluck suppers; we have had bake sales; we have had cocktail parties, and we have relied on volunteers and donations. Still, the shelter suffered desperately from financial instability and lack of recognition of the need for our services.

This bill could change that situation by establishing that violence in the home, which is almost always violence against women and children, is behavior that is no longer going to be tolerated by this society, and that the Congress is willing to provide some money to do something about it. The Congress has the opportunity to participate in making a stronger and safer society by passing his bill.

From my experience and my research, I know that every shelter in this country that has opened, has had far more demands for its services than it can handle, especially in the initial stages, when the staff is busy making the proper connections between the welfare system, the job training assistance programs, housing resources, counseling activities, and educational institutions. It is imperative that the shelter have stable financial support.

Once the service exists within a community, it is no longer possible for that community to deny that the service is needed. In Cleveland, we were lucky. We had two progressive foundations that gave us 3 years of solid financial support for our shelter.

Now, in 1979, 3 years later, the shelter is stable. It is living in a donated house that is being renovated with community development bloc grant funds from the city. It has received funds from the county. It operates a CETA funded job training program. It receives stable funding from United Way Services.

That development took us 3 years, but now we have a stable shelter. The need for this kind of development is nationwide, and cannot be handled by private foundations alone. In Cuyahoga County alone, our police chiefs estimate that there are 27,000 reported cases of violence against women in the home. So it is clear that there needs to be Federal money made available to get these services underway.

Domestic violence is a problem that has permeated throughout our society. It exists in rich areas, in poor areas, in the suburbs as well as in the cities. Your constituents and friends of yours have been victims of domestic violence.

As you deliberate, I would urge you to consider this bill as a means of strengthening the family unit, and enabling the survival of love, affection, and caring among family members. A family member who fears for her life and safety cannot provide good care for her children or for herself. The shelter gives her the opportunity for safety and to repair the relationships with her children.

I have attached to this testimony signatures from various church groups who are concerned about domestic violence, and we join together in urging you to move this much needed legislation along its process as quickly as possible.

You can depend on our support, to work with you, and know that we will help in any way we can toward the passage of H.R. 2977.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much, Ms. Campbell.

What we will do is hear from all members of the panel, and then have questions.

Ms. Olson, if you would proceed.

[Prepared statement of Beth Olson follows:]

THE JUNIOR LEAGUE OF JACKSONVILLE, INC.,
Jacksonville, Fla.

TESTIMONY ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Prepared for : The Subcommittee on Select Education.

Submitted by : Beth Tebault Olson, Junior League, of Jacksonville, Inc., Jacksonville, Florida.

Presented on : July 11, 1979, Washington, D.C.

Representatives Miller and members of the subcommittee : The Junior League of Jacksonville is one of 229 Junior Leagues throughout the country, representing 125,000 individual members. I am pleased that our League has been asked to testify to this committee on the subject of domestic violence.

The purpose of the Junior League is to promote voluntarism, and to develop the potential of its members for voluntary participation in community affairs and to demonstrate the effectiveness of trained volunteers.

Each member in the Junior League goes through an initial training course which familiarizes her with all the important facets of the community in which she lives.

I am here due to my League's commitment, interest and involvement in Hubbard House, which is the name of Jacksonville's shelter for physically abused women and sexually abused children.

My testimony is based on my direct involvement with Hubbard House as a volunteer and Board member and is coupled with 16 years of volunteer service within the community.

IS ABUSE REALLY A PROBLEM

The F.B.I. reports indicate that there are three times more incidents of wife abuse reported than rape and there is a rape reported every three minutes.

According to Jacksonville, Florida's Sheriff's Department 50 to 60 percent of all police calls are in response to family quarrels. Complaints about police indifference abound, but we have to concede some justification for on a national level the F.B.I. reports that one-fourth of all police killed in 1974 were trying to break up family fights.

Prior to my becoming involved with Hubbard House, I did volunteer work for Legal Aid. My job was to interview prospective clients seeking dissolution and to see if they qualified for Legal Aid's services. It became very clear during my four years of interviewing that spouse abuse was for our community a definite reality. Not only did I hear testimony to physical abuse, I was on numerous occasions witness to the results of it. I would estimate that of the 900 women I interviewed 70 to 80 percent had experienced physical abuse.

The first shelter for battered women in the United States came into being in 1974 in St. Paul, Minnesota. In just five years, 200 other shelters have come into existence and they are all filled to overflowing!

HUBBARD HOUSE

Plans for Jacksonville's shelter were conceived early in 1975 by a group of feminists who had the right combination of concern, dedication and energy. This group of women was able to find "seed" money from a private, local foundation and Hubbard House opened officially in May of 1976 making it the first shelter in the Southeast and the fourteenth shelter in the United States.

No one could have perceived that the need for our shelter was as great as it is. The tiny three bedroom house was swamped with women and children needing refuge.

Hubbard House reached out to the heart of our community and it responded. Money came from everywhere—clubs, churches, individuals and business. Money from the grass roots of our community and money that amounted to \$60,000 the first year.

During that first year of operation Hubbard House sheltered 200 physically abused women and their 325 children. Information, referral and counseling was given to over 200 walk-ins and 2,000 hot line and information calls were answered. The very first year, still in its infancy, and Hubbard House touched on the lives of 2,725 women!

It became obvious by the second year of operation that they simply had to have more room. The search was on and in time they located an old rooming house that was in horrible condition but had the space and location that made up for its imperfections.

The Junior League, well aware of the need for a larger facility, gave us the down payment and the community once again rallied forth with the money for the needed renovations.

PREVENTION

It was during this period that the staff and Board of Directors agreed to try to keep our small facility as well. Since Hubbard House began operating in 1976, it was painfully obvious that the children of families suffering domestic violence were in desperate need of a program designed for them. Statistically we knew the risks were extremely high that they would grow up to be abusive and/or abused themselves. A proposal was outlined and submitted to our downtown Rotary. Our project was chosen and we are now in the process of implementation.

The importance of the children's program in our growth and direction is truly monumental. Hubbard House and, in fact, many other agencies, as well as the funding sources, have got to address the subject of prevention or be resolved to the perpetuation of the problem. We are positive that we need shelters and the statistics demand that we need prevention.

WHERE IS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE?

Domestic violence is in all neighborhoods—yours, mine, and theirs. The popular assumption that marital violence occurs more frequently in the ghetto and among the lower class families is clearly not true.

Studies of Fairfax County, Virginia (one of the wealthiest counties in the United States) compare with West Harlem and Norwalk, Connecticut, in that the population as well as the domestic violence are the same.

The Jacksonville police offense reports on spouse abuse clearly show that the calls they receive are equally distributed among the South, North, East and West areas of our city.

Many would be somewhat surprised to learn that the average woman in Jacksonville who utilizes our shelter is white, 29 years old, has two children, has been married 6 years and has a family income of \$13,000 a year.

TODAY PLUS TOMORROW EQUALS FUNDING

From January to June of 1979, Hubbard House has served:

Women	235
Children	349
Males (wife beaters who received counseling)	14
Black	61
White	172
Other	3
Walk-ins	192
White	124
Black	54
Other	13
Hot line and information calls	2, 650

From January to June of 1979, Hubbard House has served 235 women, 349 children, 14 wife beaters, 192 walk-ins, and answered 2,650 hot line and information calls. With six months left in the year, we have assisted in varying degrees, 3,439 women and children.

Traditionally, programs for women have been under funded. Hubbard House operates on $\frac{1}{4}$ the budget of some agencies we know of while serving three times the number of people. Our funding sources must improve if we are to stay in operation and improve considerably if we are to move in the area of prevention.

At present Hubbard House is operating with the following seven funding sources:

United Way	\$26, 000
LEAA	25, 875
CETA	23, 875
State	20, 000
Community donations	14, 000
Foundations	3, 000
Resident house fees	1, 200

As you know two of our funding sources are not permanent (LEAA and CETA). Community donations, foundations, Resident House fees and, in fact, United Way will vary.

Our state money is rather unique in that five dollars has been added to the cost of marriage licenses in Florida and this "added" money in turn will be allocated to the shelters in the state. Stipulations are attached to the money in that you must have an existing shelter and \$25,000 in matching funds. The maximum money given to any one shelter will not exceed \$50,000. This innovative piece of legislation was brought into being by Senators Ken Plant and Betty Castor in 1978.

In closing, I'd like to share with you an incident that took place last week. I was working at Hubbard House when Ned, a fourteen year old boy with cerebral palsy, decided to sit down and talk a while. He asked me in his slow, labored speech if I were married. I told him I was and I asked him if he were married. He grinned for a moment but then his expression changed and in the gravest manner possible said, "Marriage is not good for your life." What a pathetic sight he was—thin, pale, his arms hooked over and his legs bent and twisted.

I thought for a moment of telling him some marriages were not violent but something in his expression and even in his tone told me the subject was closed.

Ned's seven year old brother came in counting aloud. He asked if I could count to one hundred and I said that I could. He was pleased that I could count. I think, for he asked me which numbers were larger, 100 or 1,000, and several other questions pertaining to counting. At one point, Ned's little forehead wrenched into a frown and he asked, "Do numbers ever end?"

David's mother called for both boys just then and as he left the room with Ned struggling after him, I wondered do numbers of abuse victims end? How far do we count until the numbers end?

STATEMENT OF BETH OLSON, JUNIOR LEAGUE, JACKSONVILLE, FLA.

Ms. OLSON, Chairman Simon, and members of the subcommittee. The Junior League of Jacksonville is one of 229 junior leagues throughout the country, representing 125,000 individual members. I am pleased that our league has been asked to testify to this committee on the sub-

The purpose of the Junior League is to promote voluntarism, and to develop the potential of its members for voluntary participation in community affairs and to demonstrate the effectiveness of trained volunteers.

Each member in the Junior League goes through an initial training course, which familiarizes her with all the important facets of the community in which she lives.

I am here due to my league's commitment, interest and involvement in Hubbard House, which is the name of Jacksonville's shelter for physically abused women and sexually abused children.

My testimony is based on my direct involvement with Hubbard House as a volunteer and a board member and is coupled with 16 years of volunteer service within the community.

The FBI reports indicate that there are three times more incidents of wife abuse reported than rape, and there is a rape reported every 3 minutes.

According to Jacksonville, Fla., sheriff's department, 50 to 60 percent of all police calls are in response to family quarrels. Complaints about police indifference abound, but we have to concede some justification because on a national level the FBI reports that one-fourth of all police killed in 1974 were trying to break up family fights.

Prior to my becoming involved with Hubbard House, I did volunteer work for legal aid. My job was to interview prospective clients seeking dissolution and to see if they qualified for legal aid's services. I became very clear during my 4 years of interviewing that spouse abuse was for our community a definite reality.

Not only did I hear testimony to physical abuse, I was on numerous occasions witness to the results of it. I would estimate that out of the 900 women I interviewed, 70 to 80 percent had experienced physical abuse.

The first shelter for battered women in the United States came into being in 1974 in St. Paul, Minn. In just 5 years, 200 other shelters have come into existence and they are filled to overflowing.

Plans for Jacksonville's shelter were conceived early in 1975 by a group of feminists who had the right combination of concern, dedication, and energy. This group of women was able to find "seed" money from a private, local foundation and Hubbard House opened officially

in May of 1976, making it the first shelter in the Southeast and the 14th shelter in the United States.

No one could have perceived that the need for our shelter was as great as it is. The tiny three-bedroom house was filled with women and children needing refuge.

Hubbard House reached out to the heart of our community and it responded. Money came from everywhere—clubs, churches, individuals, and business. Money from the grassroots of our community and money that amount to, during our first year, \$60,000.

During the first year of operation, Hubbard House sheltered 200 physically abused women and their 325 children. Information, referral, and counseling was given to over 200 walk-ins and 2,000 hotline and information calls were answered. The very first year, still in its infancy, Hubbard House touched on the lives of 2,725 women.

It became obvious by the second year of operation that they simply had to have more room. The search was on and in time they found an old rooming house that was in horrible condition but had the space and location that made up for its imperfections.

The Junior League, well aware of the need for a larger facility, gave us the down payment and once again the community rallied forth with the money for the needed renovations.

It was during that period that the staff and board of directors agreed to try to keep our small facility as well. Since Hubbard House began operating in 1976, it was painfully obvious that the children of families suffering domestic violence were in need of a program designed for them.

Statistically, we knew that the risks were extremely high that they would grow up to be abusive and/or abused themselves. A proposal was outlined and submitted to our downtown Rotary. Our project was chosen and are now in the process of implementation.

The importance of the children's program in our growth and direction is truly monumental. Hubbard House and, in fact, many other agencies, as well as all funding sources, have got to address the subject of prevention or be resolved to perpetuation of the problem. We are positive that we need shelters and the statistics demand that we need prevention.

Domestic violence is in all neighborhoods—yours, mine, and theirs. The popular assumption that marital violence occurs more frequently in the ghetto and among the lower-class families is clearly not true.

Studies in Fairfax County, Va. (one of the wealthiest countries in the United States) compare with West Harlem, and Norwalk, Conn., in that the population as well as the domestic violence are the same.

The Jacksonville police offense reports on spouse abuse clearly show that the calls they receive are equally distributed among our city to the north, east, south, and west areas.

Many would be surprised to learn that the average woman in Jacksonville who utilizes our shelter is white, 29 years old, has two children, has been married 6 years, and has a family income of \$13,000 a year.

From January to June 1979, Hubbard House has served 235 women, 349 children, 14 wife beaters, 192 walk-ins, and answered 2,650 hotline and information calls. With 6 months left in the year, we have assisted, in varying degrees, 3,439 women and children.

Traditionally, programs for women have been underfunded. Hubbard House operates on one-fourth of the budget of some agencies we know of, while serving three times the number of people. Our funding sources must improve if we are to stay in operation, and they must improve considerably if we are to move in the area of prevention.

At present, Hubbard House is dependent on the seven following funding sources: United Way, LEAA, CETA, State, community donations, foundations, and resident house fees.

Our State money is rather unique in that \$5 has been added to the cost of marriage licenses in Florida and this added money, in turn, will be allocated to the shelters in the State. Stipulations are attached to this money in that you must have an existing shelter and \$25,000 in matching funds. The maximum money given to any one shelter will not exceed \$50,000. This innovative piece of legislation was brought into being by Senators Ken Plant and Betty Castor in 1978.

In closing, I would like to share with you an incident that took place last week. I was working at Hubbard House when Ned, a 14-year-old boy with cerebral palsy, decided to sit down and talk a while. He asked me, in his slow, labored speech, if I were married. I told him I was, and asked him if he were married.

He grinned for a moment, but then his expression changed and in the gravest of manner possible, he said: "Marriage is not good for your life." Let me repeat this, "marriage is not good for your life." What a pathetic sight he was—thin, pale, his arms hooked over and his legs bent and twisted.

I thought for a moment of telling him that some marriages were not violent. But something in his expression and even in his tone told me the subject for him was closed.

Ned's 7-year-old brother, David, came in counting aloud. He asked if I could count to 100. I said that I could. He was pleased that I could count, I think, for he asked me which numbers were larger, 100 or 1,000, and several other questions pertaining to counting. At one point, Dave's little forehead wrenched into a frown and he asked, "Do numbers never end?"

David's mother called for both boys just then, and as he left the room with Ned struggling after him, I wondered, do numbers of abuse victims ever end? How far do we count before the numbers end?

Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you for your excellent testimony.

Now, Dr. Kinsey Green, executive director of the American Home Economics Association.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Green follows:]

STATEMENT ON FAMILY VIOLENCE BY DR. KINSEY GREEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION, ON BEHALF OF THE COALITION OF FAMILY ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Select Education Subcommittee. My name is Kinsey Green, and I am the Executive Director of the American Home Economics Association. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before your Subcommittee to speak in support of H.R. 2977, the Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act because this legislation reflects growing national attention to the widespread and serious problem of violence in American families.

This morning I speak not only for my own organization, but as a representative of a Coalition of Family Organizations, composed of the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy, the Family Service Association of America, the National Council on Family Relations, and the American Home Economics

Association. The Coalition was formed two years ago, and combines a membership of over 75,000 persons who are educators in colleges and secondary school programs, social service providers, researchers, family counselors, agents in the Cooperative Extension Service, and members of the business community. As advocates working with families, we are well aware that American families are undergoing dramatic changes and that many new strains and pressures are being placed on families in this country. Although violence in families is not a new situation, and historically is well documented, the growing public attention and understanding about the extent of violence in families may encourage a larger commitment to support service programs that will enable families to function well. The Coalition believes that the assault of one individual family member upon another is more than a private family problem, but rather is symptomatic of a larger and deeper problem of family dysfunction which often creates a cycle of violent family behavior that can be transmitted from one generation to the next and have serious consequences for society.

The Coalition supports the efforts of the co-sponsors of H.R. 2977 to encourage the federal government to play a larger leadership role in funding emergency services to victims of family violence. However, even as we are prepared to commit the substantial resources of our organizations to seek enactment of this federal program, at the same time, we wish to call attention to sections of the bill that we think need further explanation and clarification.

The legislation is titled the "Domestic Violence Prevention and Services Act," but the scope of the bill encompasses only one manifestation of family violence, i.e., spouse abuse and principally assault against women. It is important to bear in mind that family violence covers the entire age spectrum from child abuse, to sibling violence, abuse of the elderly, as well as spouse abuse. The legislation is more narrow in scope than the actual pattern of violence behavior among family members.

The title of the bill also addresses two separate program needs—prevention and services. However, the legislative language places the emphasis upon the funding of direct services to abused women, with only a passing nod to prevention. We agree that mechanisms for reducing family violence must include short term crisis-oriented intervention, such as emergency shelter services, a 24-hour hot line, regional directories where individual communities can obtain information on shelters and support groups, family counseling and therapy. But unless we are prepared to institutionalize the shelter system as the primary way of reducing family violence, then we must begin to examine and develop long range preventive human services programs. We must begin to consider not only the immediate needs of women and children as victims of violence, but also consider the effects on all members who live in violent homes. When we focus on child abuse or wife beating, the remedies tend to be emergency measures which are only temporary solutions. Emergency measures do not provide a positive alternative environment or change violent family interaction. We do not suggest abandoning these measures, but rather we must place them in a perspective—one remedy within a context of other services to prevent the initial act and/or repeated acts of violence.

In the section of the bill titled "Findings and Purposes," we would like to expand the purposes to include a clear statement that assures services to the abused person's family, including the victim's spouse, in instances where the battered spouse wishes to return to the family and preserve the family relationship. On page 5, line 4, we suggest that the language be modified to read ". . . to assist victims and dependents of victims of domestic violence and to provide access to counseling and therapy services when the victim indicates a preference to return to his or her family."

A further point that we would like to call to your attention. In the section of definitions, the phrase "domestic violence" is too narrowly defined and again overlooks the scope and intensity of the problem. For example, the age designation of 18 years or older" places adolescent parents who are often 18 years or younger outside of the boundaries of the legislation. A possible modification of the definition could read "Family violence includes all physical or sexual assaults between family members or persons who live together, or persons who have a close personal relationship. Assault is the threat or actual act of physical or sexual abuse."

There are other provisions of the legislation that we think should receive more emphasis and attention. The media campaign to heighten public awareness is one such example. Over the past 4 or 5 years, although there has been

a spate of newspaper and magazine articles, television reports and documentaries about spouse abuse, there is still substantial public apathy that needs to be overcome. The ground work for better community understanding of the problem and perhaps eventually for the support of programs for victims and offenders, can be laid through educational programs which define the problem, explain the possible contributing factors, and challenge the popularly held myths about wife abuse and family violence in general.

The Cooperative Extension Service, through such land grant institutions as Purdue, Cornell, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and Oklahoma State University, have organized and sponsored panel discussions, educational programs on family violence, and community forums that have helped fill the gap in public information and understanding. A description of some of the work of extension service agents at Purdue University will help explain ways in which the extension service uses its county and State networks to train a core group of service providers who work with families, and how those trainees can have a larger ripple effect throughout the state.

Two years ago, the extension service began a training program for about 20 agents who serve the same number of counties in Indiana. Training sessions were developed to discuss the nature of family violence, some misconceptions, especially about wife abuse, and an enumeration of currently available referral services in the counties for families in crisis. Another facet of the discussion focused on the need for many existing service agencies to change and become sensitive to signs of violence in families and the effects upon family members.

Last February, the cooperative extension service together with the Department of Child Development and Family Studies at Purdue conducted a 2-day symposium on family violence, including workshops on child abuse and wife abuse. About 300 people participated: social workers, extension agents, nursery school personnel, and members of the general public.

Last May, the Extension trained about 60 CAP outreach workers at a weekend conference on family violence. Finally, each year, the extension service hold a homemaker's conference, with an audience of about 500 homemakers; last year, the subject was family violence and ways for citizens to become involved and help.

Another example of public education is AHEA, together with the other Coalition organizations, embarking upon a pilot project funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, to test the effects of a large scale media campaign on a local family service systems and the response capability of these systems. Three cities will be the test sites: Santa Barbara, Calif.; Fayetteville, N.C., and Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minn.

On page 7, line 18, there is a provision which states ". . . any project for which a grant is made will be administered and operated by personnel with appropriate skills . . ." The coalition believes that this provision has particular significance because some service providers who have the first contact with a family member in crisis may not always be skilled enough to understand the group dynamics in family violence, and may not be able to assess in a realistic manner the psychological or emotional distress of an individual who has been abused. The American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy has designed and conducted training programs for other professionals, and has worked with older women to train them as counselors for shelter programs.

In Pawtucket, R.I., the Family Service Association, together with the local police department has developed an interdisciplinary team approach to families in crisis, where a member of the police force and a counselor with knowledge and training in public assistance, child welfare and/or mental health programs work in teams. In some cases, bi-lingual counselors have been called in to work in neighborhoods with a high concentration of Hispanic population. The teams are available during the day and in the evenings and work out of the police stations. Often they will make the initial contact with a family in need of assistance and can follow-up with four or five return visits. Outside consultants from other community agencies ride with team members on a regularly scheduled basis, while the teams are on duty, and have an opportunity to discuss a situation immediately following the intervention. Team members meet monthly with different consultants, including representatives from runaway shelters, protective services, women's centers, community alcohol and drug programs, and local community mental health agencies. At least 15 of the FSAA agencies are helping to develop these community services networks.

One further long term effort in prevention should include family life education as an integral part of the K-12 school curriculum. As early as the kindergarten years, young children begin to develop a concept of self-worth and self-esteem, and a sense of the roles they will play as adults. We need to teach children that there are shared responsibilities for boys and girls as they prepare for the major roles that almost all adults will fill—parent, spouse and wage earner. Role expectation is a very important aspect of family life education. Another includes problem solving skills and handling of resources—financial, physical, emotional and intellectual—with an emphasis upon developing these skills without resorting to violent behavior. For adolescents and young adults, family life education includes concepts of parenting and child development; this program has proved to be an effective means for reducing and preventing child abuse.

Finally, the coalition recommends that the legislation address the need for family-based research and develop coordinating mechanisms to utilize and build upon existing research efforts about families and the impact of violent behavior on families. Let me offer one illustration of the kinds of gaps that exist in current data about families. There is little existing data that accurately describes the numbers of abused women who return to a violent family situation, why they return, what services they need or want, and what kind of further abuse they are subjected to once they return home. We need more long term basic research and evaluative research to monitor the problem of family violence as well as the success of existing programs. Without more of this data, we cannot adequately develop the services and support systems that families need to function in a manner that will provide safety for their members.

The coalition will continue to work with you toward the enactment of this important piece of legislation. Thank you again for this opportunity to present the interests of the coalition. I will be glad to answer any questions that you might have.

**STATEMENT OF KINSEY GREEN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION**

Ms. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, and members of the Select Education Subcommittee. I am Kinsey Green, and I am the executive director of the American Home Economics Association. I appreciate the opportunity to appear this morning, and appreciate your leadership in addressing what our association and others like us believe to be a significant problem.

I speak not only, this morning, for my own organization, but as a representative of the Coalition of Family Organizations, composed of the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy, the Family Service Association of America, the National Council on Family Relations, and the American Home Economics Association.

This coalition was formed 2 years ago, and combines a membership of over 75,000 professionals and volunteers who are educators in college and university programs, secondary and elementary schools, post-secondary programs, social service providers, researchers, family counselors, agents in the Cooperative Extension Service, and members of the business community.

The members of these four associations literally reach millions of families on a day-to-day basis. As advocates working with families, we are well aware that American families are undergoing dramatic changes and that many new strains and pressures being placed upon families are frequently attributed as causes for domestic violence.

The coalition supports the efforts of the cosponsors of this bill to encourage the Federal Government to play a larger leadership role in funding emergency services to victims of family violence. Specifically, we support the Federal role as catalyst, the role of the Federal Government as role model for States and for community governments,

the attention to public awareness campaigns, and the concern for services as crisis intervention.

We do, however, request the following amendments, or make the following recommendations:

(1) That the definition of the scope of family violence be broadened beyond that of spouse abuse with particular attention to abused women, because we are aware from some data conducted by our professionals that the extent of violence not only against children, but against the elderly, sibling violence against other siblings, and violence against the handicapped are also problems in American families. So we would urge your attention to a broader definition of domestic violence.

(2) We would also call your attention to the fact that while the bill is entitled "Prevention and Services," the bulk of the content of the bill talks about crisis intervention, or services treatment to the abused. We would urge more concentration on prevention through family life education, through resource provision, because we do have a data base that shows that physical and financial stress are causative factors. We urge support for families, including respite care for the vulnerable and dependent, and day care.

(3) The prevention aspect of the bill pay more attention to family research, that we might have an adequate data base, particularly relating to the causes and solution of a variety of populations, including abuse against the elderly and handicapped.

The members of our four associations represent the creation of model programs, they represent research, they represent a variety of services and preventive programs in this arena.

We would urge that the definition of parents as being 18 years or older is not sufficient. That does not encompass a number of adolescent parents in this country, who are beneath the age of 18, and in whom we are finding a substantial incidence of violence in the home.

The media campaign to heighten public awareness is another concern. That is a laudable approach. The American Home Economics Association is now involved with LEAA in a contract to conduct such a public awareness campaign. We quickly found out, however, that a public awareness campaign which urges people to report to various kinds of services—counseling, therapy, educational programs—which, in fact, do not exist is not a service to the people.

So our contract has taken a different mode in that our first attempt will be to ascertain in four principal cities in the United States exactly what programs and services do exist for victims of family violence. Why call the public's attention and urge them to seek help, if no such programs and services exist, or if, indeed, they are limited.

The Cooperative Extension Service, through such land grant institutions as Purdue, Cornell, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and Oklahoma State University, have organized and sponsored panel discussions, educational programs on family violence, and community forums that have helped fill the gap in public information and understanding.

The Cooperative Extension Service represents a network in every community in this country that could be of service in educational programs, family life education, child development resource management, to help allay the causes of family violence.

In many States, the Cooperative Extension Service has presented extensive programs to train their counselors to work with families where abuse has taken place.

The coalition believes that the provision for "personnel with appropriate skills" to man the centers and the clearinghouses has particular significance because some service providers who have the first contact with family members in crisis may not always be skilled enough to understand the group dynamics in family violence, and may not be able to assess the psychological and emotional distress of an individual who has been abused.

The American Association of Marriage and Family Therapy has designed and conducted training programs for other professionals, and has particularly worked with older women to train them as peer counselors.

In Rhode Island, the Family Services Association together with the local police department has developed an interdisciplinary team approach to families in crisis, where a member of the police force and the counselor with knowledge and training in public assistance, child welfare and/or mental health programs work in teams.

In some cases, bilingual counselors have been trained to work in neighborhoods with a high concentration of Hispanic population.

Finally, the coalition does recommend that legislation address the need for family based research and develop coordinating mechanisms to utilize and build upon existing research efforts about families, and the impact of violent behavior on families.

We are concerned that the entire family structure have that support system, and not just the abused individual or, as the bill implies, the victims and dependents of the victims.

One long-term effort in prevention should include family life education as an integral part of the K through 12 school curriculum. As early as the kindergarten years, young children begin to develop a concept of self-worth and self-esteem, and a sense of the roles that they will play as adults. We need to teach children that there are shared responsibilities for the home and for the family, as they prepare for the major roles that all adults fill, that of worker, parent, spouse, community participant.

Role expectation is an important aspect of family life education. Another important aspect is the provision and management of resources—financial, physical, emotional, intellectual—these would seem very closely to relate to the data base we already have on the causes of family violence.

The coalition will continue to work with you toward the enactment of this important piece of legislation. We are supportive of the services aspect and of the delineation of the role of the Federal Government as catalyst. We would urge your attention, in summary, to broadening the scope of family violence beyond that of spouse abuse, to emphasize prevention vis-a-vis treatment and crisis intervention, and to a broader research base on the causes and solutions.

Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Thank you very much, Dr. Green. We appreciate also your very specific suggestions for modification.

I might mention here that we intend to mark-up shortly after the Labor Day recess, so any others who have any specific suggestions along

this line, for possible amendment of the bill as it now exists, that will be appreciated. It is the kind of practical testimony that we need.

Ms. Campbell, you talk about Cuyhoga County, 27,000. Is that an annual figure, or what is that?

Ms. CAMPBELL. It is an annual figure.

Mr. SIMON. Ms. Olson, I was interested. You mentioned working with the children, and you used the family situation. How do you do that? The concept, I like, but I don't understand what is happening.

Ms. OLSON. There are some primary things that need to be done with the children, especially they need to have some male models to identify with, who are not, in effect, abusive. We hope to have that afforded in these children's program.

We want to have a day care center, too. We are applying for a license for the program, so that possibly we can hold onto these children a little longer than the 3 to 5 weeks that we normally would have them. We want to counsel them using play therapy. The children have, even to an untrained observer, definite emotional problems. You could walk into any shelter, and within a few minutes you would know that there is stress and a great deal of trouble inside of these youngsters.

Mr. SIMON. Are you a volunteer, or are you full-time?

Ms. OLSON. I am a volunteer through the Junior League at Hubbard House, and also a board member.

Did I answer your question?

Mr. SIMON. Yes; you did. Thank you.

Mr. Coleman?

Mr. COLEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the ladies who, obviously, have a great deal of interest in voluntarism.

Let me ask you a question. Ms. Campbell. I understand the city of Cleveland has financial problems, and is not contributing any funds to the program.

Ms. CAMPBELL. They city is contributing funds through the community development bloc grant for the renovation of the shelter facility itself. There is one public service employee from the city of Cleveland's CETA consortium.

Mr. COLEMAN. I note that the authorization in the legislation, as it is presently written, is \$15 million for the first year, and according to the formula, if it is divided by 50, we are not going to have a whole lot of money for every State. In fact, it will be \$300,000 per State for the first year. Is that going to be any significant contribution toward solving any of the problems that you have related today in your States?

Ms. OLSON. Yes; I think it will. I think the criteria should be that the shelters should be in existence. I think that they need to illustrate that there has been need in the community for them, and that they do have grassroots support for them.

A shelter, if there is a need, can establish itself. We are at the point now, in Jacksonville, and I am sure in Cleveland, where when you hit that third year, you have just about used up your sources at the local level, and you have to reach out for Federal or State money.

Mr. COLEMAN. I am interested in your Florida law of \$5 added to the marriage license. Is that a model, or is that unique?

Ms. CAMPBELL. It is pending in Ohio right now, with a \$10 charge. It has passed the Senate, and it is being considered by the House.

Mr. COLEMAN. How much revenue do they anticipate in Florida?

Ms. OLSON. Overall, I could not tell you, but our shelter alone, this year, we are looking at \$20,000 coming in.

Mr. COLEMAN. What percentage of your operation is that?

Ms. OLSON. We really have not gotten the revenue yet, so I cannot answer that very accurately for you. But I do wish it could go up to \$100 because I don't understand why marriage should be so much cheaper than divorce. [Laughter.]

Mr. COLEMAN. A fee could be tagged on to the petition for divorce, and you might get \$20 on that.

Ms. OLSON. That is a possibility, too.

Mr. COLEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Hawkins?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, I apologize because I did not hear the witnesses, but may I ask a general question, and see which of the witnesses may care to answer.

Is there any correlation between domestic violence and the economic conditions? Is there any fluctuation depending on, let us say, the rate of unemployment?

Ms. OLSON. We do find that domestic violence exists in all economic areas. It really does.

Dr. Green might want to add to that.

Ms. GREEN. We do know that the incidence of child abuse and spouse abuse increases as unemployment increases, and as general economic times are tougher. We have some very significant case records, one being from Flint, Mich., for example. That is the question that I was getting at when I talked about resources for families—employment, financial resources, and respite care and day care, which will help relieve the financial, emotional, and physical stress that we know to be a causative factor in family violence.

Mr. HAWKINS. Are you familiar with the study on Cook County, with due apologies to the chairman of the subcommittee, linking child abuse rather directly with economic conditions, particularly with the rise and fall of unemployment?

Ms. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HAWKINS. Do you generally agree with the findings of that Cook County study?

Ms. GREEN. Well, there is some contradictory evidence, but I believe that the testimony presented on the full employment bill was pretty impressive about the connection between the financial stress in the home and the striking, lashing out at the more vulnerable and dependent members in that relationship.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Did you get the answer you wanted?

Mr. HAWKINS. I am a strong supporter of the bill, but it is not enough to deal with the effects, without at the same time dealing with the causes. The bill itself, I think, is very supportive in ideas, but at the same time, it seems to me, we have to also deal with the basic causes of domestic violence. Unless we do that, the rest is just patchwork.

Ms. GREEN. This is really a services bill. It is not a prevention bill, I believe.

Mr. HAWKINS. Until we get around to the sanity of trying to deal with economic policies in the broad aspect.

Thank you.

Ms. CAMPBELL. May I add something, Mr. Hawkins?

Mr. SIMON. Yes.

Ms. CAMPBELL. The other thing, in terms of the prevention aspect and the causes, it is important to look at the historical role of women in this family. If you look at the law that we operate with, it comes from the British common law where women were considered the property of their husbands. That kind of background is the framework in which the marriage and family relationships still exist.

There is a great problem, we found, when we sat and reviewed the laws of the State of Ohio, actual operation and procedure in the court and the treatment by the judges and the prosecutors, too often there was a tacit acceptance of abuse against women as appropriate behavior for husbands.

I think that the economic conditions are indeed important, but also the recognition of women as whole people is an essential step toward preventing this kind of violence.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Erdahl?

Mr. ERDAHL. I don't have any questions. I just want to thank the panel for the testimony, and what I did not hear, I will read. Thank you.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. Thank you. I also want to apologize for not being here earlier. I was testifying over in the Senate. I wanted to thank the panel for their testimony because I honestly believe that the success or failure of this legislation is going to depend upon a very united group of supporters in a broad range of social activities in this country.

I think the fact that the National Council of Churches, the Junior League, the American Home Economics Association, and the Women's Clubs, are here shows that the legislation is supported by people who are concerned about maintaining the family.

Those who want to criticize this as some kind of massive Federal intervention really do not understand what is happening, really, because by the time that the process that we are talking about attending to, the physical battering of the members of that family, is taking place.

The question is, how do you support these individuals to get their lives back together? I think that with groups such as yours, we can do it. The Junior League has taken this on as part of their national projects this year, which I think is going to be very helpful, just as their support in foster care over the last couple of years was.

So I am delighted to have you come and testify because there are some Members of Congress who think that this is some kind of radical approach to family policy.

I agree with your statements. I hope some day, when we show evidence here that we are able to put families back together, and we are able to put individuals back together and sometimes back into the family setting from which they fled.

We now see in a project in California where, probably the most heinous of crimes, incest, 80 percent of those people return to their family with long-term counseling, but they are back as a unit. The mother has not fled out of guilt. The father is not in jail. The daughter is not emotionally disturbed. They are back together, and they are working on their problems.

Maybe some day we will have family resource centers that are open 24 hours a day, where people who are supposed to be delivering the services are not in the building from 8 to 5, and families who need support, not intervention, can go and seek help.

Maybe some day, when the cumulative evidence is in on these kinds of centers, and other volunteer programs that support families after the sun goes down and before the sun comes up in the morning, then we will see a system of family resource centers in middle-size communities across this country with volunteers and bureaucrats, and others working together to try to hold together.

Right now it is very clear that the family is splitting apart at the middle, from the children to the grandparents, to everybody involved.

So I think that your testimony is going to be very helpful as we mark up this bill, and as we make our case to the full Congress.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. Stack?

Mr. STACK. I, too, would like to commend the witnesses in particular for their emphasis on prevention. It means that we really have to give very hard consideration to causes. Obviously, one cannot get to prevention unless one gets to the causes.

The causes of the problem that we are dealing with are very complex, obviously, they are deep-seated psychologically. Long-range prevention means that we have to try to understand people, and the structure of the family, individuals, more accurately than we have done in the past. I think that this bill is leading us in the right direction.

Mr. Hawkins' question as to the effect of the economic status as a causative factor is a point that we certainly wish to consider. Without any question, it is a factor.

One of the things that I have found, and I might point out that I was in law enforcement for many years before I came to the Congress, the abuse of alcohol and other drugs can be prevented, and to the extent that we are successful with prevention of the abuse of alcohol and drugs, we may strike a blow for liberty in this area that we are considering today. These are very closely related.

I worked for many years in drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs, and none of these problems offered simple solutions. But I do think that overall, what you ladies have suggested is that we should broaden our scope. We have to think in terms of child abuse, in particular. This is a devastating crime. As we all know, the abused child grows up to be a child abuser. We have to break this chain in some fashion or other.

The abuse of the elderly by young people, as you pointed out, and the abuse of the handicapped, all of these things are matters of deep concern.

I would like to suggest and I thought of this as a result of something that Mr. Miller said, speaking of whether or not we have social

service agencies available on a 24-hours a day basis, I would like to suggest that you go back to your communities and embrace the idea that the police department, if properly trained should be a 24-hour a day social service agency.

The function of the police should go much beyond, let us say, making arrests. I know I defined my role, as the sheriff of Broward County, a county of a million people, as a full-time social worker. That is the way that I considered myself.

I do think we should try to impress this on social consciousness. A police officer should be trained properly to deal with all these aspects of domestic violence. That is the way that I trained my own men, my deputies. I sought help from other areas, from the city of New York, and I brought them down to train my men. This is something that we get into. This is the practical way to go.

I do think that this bill is something that we desperately need as indication of national support of what has to be one of our most massive, complicated social problems. It is a token in a sense, but it does focus, I hope, national attention on this. When we get into mark-up, perhaps we can get more specifically into causes.

I do commend the ladies for coming to us, and I find their testimony very interesting, indeed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SIMON. We thank you for coming here, and your testimony.

Before we take the next witnesses, we have a roll call on the floor. We will take a 10-minute recess, and resume at that point. [Recess.]

Mr. MILLER. The committee will reconvene for the purpose of hearing witnesses from the administration, specifically, Sam Brown, the Director of Action; Blandina Cardenas Ramirez, Commissioner, Administration for Children, Youth and Families of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; J. Robert Grimes, Administrator, Office of Criminal Justice Programs, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

We will take the witnesses, with Ms. Ramirez going first, and Sam Brown, and then Robert Grimes.

**STATEMENT OF BLANDINA CARDENAS RAMIREZ, COMMISSIONER,
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES, DE-
PARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE ACCOM-
PANIED BY JUNE ZEITLIN, OFFICE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

Ms. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I am Blandina Cardenas Ramirez, Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, in the Office of Human Development Services. Accompanying me this morning is June Zeitlin, Acting Director of the Office of Domestic Violence.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the Department's continuing concern about the problem of domestic violence and to provide you with an up-date on activities that have occurred since the subcommittee hearings last year. I would like to summarize my testimony and insert the full statement in the record. When I testified last year, we were aware that domestic violence was a serious problem, affecting an unknown number of families, causing suffering and hardship, particularly to women and their children.

Across the country, the victims of spouse abuse have come forward with specific information about their plight and, in response to their needs, voluntary local groups and human services agencies, both private and public, have put together programs to respond to these needs. Individual communities have recognized the problem and, in a variety of ways, sought solutions. Domestic violence has received national attention because individuals, women's groups, and other community organizations have asked the Congress and the Federal Government for help.

In HEW during this past year, we have increased our understanding of the dimensions of domestic violence, begun to focus the work of the agency whose missions and resources can appropriately be related to treating the problems, and taken the first steps in coordinating our own activities.

Domestic violence is a serious problem. The data which have been presented to you in these two days hearings related to the magnitude of the problem are those which reflect our own knowledge of the problem.

Since our testimony last year, several steps have been taken at the direction of the President and Secretary Califano that will enable the Federal Government to begin to appraise and address the problem of domestic violence.

As a first step, Secretary Califano has established an Office on Domestic Violence within my office, ACYF. We do not see the creation of an Office on Domestic Violence as an alternative to services. We are continuing to examine the legislative options available to us, including the bills pending before this subcommittee, that would enable us to provide the broad range of services needed. In the meantime, however, the office is serving as the Department's "eyes and ears," and we hope conscience, on activities related to domestic violence. This office will—

- provide a central focus for policy planning;
- keep track of current developments in service delivery, research, and evaluation of domestic violence projects, and coordinate these activities;
- help to develop a Department-wide research and evaluation agenda;
- serve as a focal point for information both within the Department and for other Federal agencies and outside groups;
- assist other HEW agencies to improve services to victims of domestic violence;
- develop, collect, and disseminate information on domestic violence, and, I might add, on ways in which communities can respond to domestic violence.
- work with other Federal agencies to develop joint programs and activities;
- provide the staff support for the Interdepartmental Committee on Domestic Violence.

The office has been in operation for only a month, yet in that short time we have received requests for information on domestic violence, particularly on funding sources, from groups and individuals in almost one-half of the States. The office is already receiving approximately 50 inquiries per week.

For fiscal year 1980, the office will have more than \$1 million available in funds for programs and activities on domestic violence.

The office staff has already begun to consult widely about next year's programs with community and provider groups, members of the interdepartmental committee, and others interested and experienced in the field.

As several of you have suggested, the first major activity that the office is undertaking is the development of a National Clearinghouse on Domestic Violence. Working with an already existing clearinghouse operation, the Office on Domestic Violence plans to become the single, comprehensive source of information in the Federal Government. We are working closely with related programs at the Department of Justice, and the National Institute of Mental Health in this effort. Specifically, the new office is working closely with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and their grantee, the Center for Women's Policy Studies, to develop and disseminate information on the availability of resources, on organizing and implementing domestic violence programs, and on strategies for coordinating criminal justice, community development, and social service activities at the local level.

We recognize that domestic violence is a problem that requires responsiveness from the criminal justice, health, shelter, and social services systems. We hope that through these joint efforts we will be able to capitalize on existing resources, and avoid unnecessary duplication.

Domestic violence requires a coordinated response from these many Federal agencies. Mechanisms are needed to link the various Federal, State, and local programs together in a way that is meaningful and helpful for victims of domestic violence.

This spring, the President asked Secretary Califano to organize and chair an Interdepartmental Committee on Domestic Violence composed of representatives of 10 Federal departments and agencies. These include: ACTION, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Community Services Administration, and the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor, and **Interior**.

The committee was asked to coordinate a review of Federal programs which currently provide or could provide assistance to victims of domestic violence. As part of that review, we will examine Federal agency and program policies which may hinder the development of domestic violence programs, and submit recommendations to the President to strengthen the Federal, State, and local government response to this problem.

The interdepartmental committee will serve as a forum for this task. The committee has begun to meet and will begin its work by—

- identifying Federal agency programs and policies that relate to services for victims of domestic violence and compiling these into a Federal resource handbook for domestic violence programs;

- assisting State and local agencies to identify programs that could serve victims of domestic violence;

- facilitating joint Federal and State agency activities including research, demonstration programs, and public information activities;

exchanging information about ongoing and planned activities within the Federal Government.

This review will enable us to determine the capability of the Federal Government to respond to domestic violence problems, to make recommendations to the President, and to take the necessary steps, where possible, to enhance Federal, State, and local responsiveness to the problem.

In fiscal year 1979, HEW will spend about \$1.1 million for research and demonstration projects on domestic violence. Examples of these projects include:

—A project by the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism which has funded research on the interaction between alcohol and violence, and their effect on the family.

The National Institute of Mental Health has funded a survey to determine the extent of violence in American families. This survey has given us the most accurate estimates we have on spouse abuse, child abuse, and sibling abuse.

NIMH has also funded two studies to identify the possible psychological determinants that may inhibit women from leaving a relationship in which they are battered.

The Office of Human Development Services has funded a grant to examine State and local "best practices," and to determine how those best practices can be transferred from one program to another.

The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect has been funding services in several demonstration programs to abused mothers, as well as to their children. I might add that the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect will be including questions about spouse abuse as they evaluate the 71 demonstration programs that are currently in place.

HEW has again proposed an amendment to title XX of the Social Security Act which will allow State social services agencies to provide emergency shelter to adults as a protective service. As you know, HEW proposed such an amendment during the last session of Congress; it was introduced by Representative George Miller, and passed the House. However, no final action was taken by the Senate during the last hectic days before adjournment. This amendment is included in H.R. 3434, which was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee, and is awaiting floor action. This amendment would enable the Department to support local efforts by encouraging States to develop needed shelter services for battered women and families.

Currently, States are using title XX funds for a variety of services for battered women, such as information and referral, counseling, and child care. But title XX funds cannot be used to pay for emergency shelter. Forty-nine States are using funds to provide protective services to adults; 43 are providing counseling; 43 are providing employment services; and 43 are providing legal services to battered women.

As demonstrated by these activities and initiatives, the President and the Secretary are committed to addressing the problem of domestic violence. We are increasing our understanding of the multifaceted problem, and developing the capability to transmit this information—in terms of research, advice, and funding sources—to the field. We are beginning throughout the Federal Government to make ourselves

more aware of the problem of domestic violence and to coordinate the response of our many programs.

Despite these significant steps, we are aware that in many areas not all of the immediate services needed by battered women and their families are available or accessible to them. The women in greatest need are those who, forced to flee their homes, have no other place of refuge, neither friends nor family, who can take them in and help them through a particularly severe ordeal. These women need protection, emergency medical care, temporary shelter, and the opportunity to remove themselves and, in some cases, their children from the violent situation.

They also need followup services which will enable them either to set up safe independent households for themselves and their children, or to return to their homes with some measure of protection.

These followup services include health care, legal services, housing or housing referral and information, income maintenance for the provision of food, clothing, and shelter, child care, counseling for victims and abusers, job training and placement, protection from further abuse, and services designed to keep families together, where appropriate.

While there are a number of Federal, State, and local programs which are beginning to provide these services, there are three basic problems: First, they are not available in every community. Second, there are not adequate services available to the women who decide to return. Third, they are often not responsive or accessible to the needs of a frightened woman, perhaps with serious or painful injuries, who has fled her home with her children in the middle of the night, and has no money, no access to the family resources, and no place to go.

The real impetus for meeting the needs of battered women in a comprehensive manner has come from local communities. As you know, the primary emphasis of this grassroots movement has been the development of shelters for battered women. These shelters offer protection from immediate danger, furnish information and referral about resources available in the community, and provide other important services.

Five years ago, almost no emergency shelters for battered women existed. Now there are 200 shelters. Shelters have been established on a shoestring budget by the cooperative efforts of women's groups, religious organizations, community organizations such as the Salvation Army or YWCA, public and private social service agencies, and many dedicated individuals.

These shelters usually receive financial support from many sources. They seldom obtain stable, long-range funding. While some funding is received from the public sector, shelters receive the majority of their support from private sources.

The distribution of shelters around the country is uneven. Even where shelters do exist, there are problems with funding, overcrowding, and coordination with other community agencies.

We all recognize that shelters are not the solution to the problem of domestic violence. They are necessary, important, provide community-based support for victims, and more shelters are needed than currently exists. But not all communities or all victims of domestic

violence may need or want shelters. Some communities are developing alternatives.

We must move beyond shelters and crisis intervention centers ultimately if we are to reduce the problem of domestic violence. Additional research on identifying the extent of, and solutions to, domestic violence, public awareness campaigns, and prevention measures are also necessary ingredients of a program to address the root causes of domestic violence.

Mr. Chairman, you and other members of the committee have proposed legislation that addresses many of the issues of concern. We deeply share your concerns and have taken steps to respond to some of these needs. Yet, we recognize that a portion of those needs, emergency shelters, for example, are being met primarily at the local level with little Federal support. We have already proposed an amendment to title XX. We are currently examining legislative proposals, which permit a more comprehensive response to this problem. Several principles we are considering in developing such a response include:

1. A focus of prevention and obtaining access to a range of needed services for battered spouses, as well as providing the basic needed service: emergency shelter;

2. The establishment of close linkages and access to the existing service system, instead of creating a new one;

3. Continuation of the focus on community projects, while establishing incentives for State efforts which include improving access to State-funded services, and reforms in State and local law enforcement systems.

4. Fostering innovation and experimentation in order to learn and utilize the most effective approaches.

In closing, let me reiterate that we share your concern for the victims of domestic violence and the needs they have. We have been exploring the best ways to assist them and hope that this year the Congress will enact the emergency shelter amendment to title XX we have proposed. We look forward to continue discussions with you and to working together toward improving the quality of life for victims of domestic violence.

[Prepared statement of Blandina Ramirez follows:]

STATEMENT OF BLANDINA CARDENAS RAMIREZ, COMMISSIONER, ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, OFFICE OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Blandina Cardenas Ramirez, Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families, in the Office of Human Development Services. Accompanying me this morning is June Zeitlin, Acting Director of the Office on Domestic Violence.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the Department's continuing concern about the problem of domestic violence and to provide you with an up-date on activities that have occurred since Subcommittee hearings last year. When I testified last year, we were aware that domestic violence was a serious problem, affecting an unknown number of families, causing suffering and hardship, particularly to women and their children.

Across the country, the victims of spouse abuse have come forward with specific information about their plight and, in response to their needs, voluntary local groups and human services agencies, both private and public, have put together programs. Individual communities have recognized the problem and, in a variety of ways, sought solutions. Domestic violence has received national attention because individuals, women's groups, and other community organizations have asked the Congress and the federal government for help.

In HEW during this past year we have increased our understanding of the dimensions of domestic violence, begun to focus the work of the agencies whose missions and resources can be appropriately related to treating the problem, and taken the first steps in co-ordinating our own activities.

THE PROBLEM

Domestic violence is a serious problem which adversely affects the lives of millions of women, children and men.

Nationwide, the best estimates are that about 2 million women are victims of domestic violence annually.

Assaults are seldom single or isolated incidents, but tend to increase in terms of both frequency and intensity over time.

Domestic violence often leads to serious injury and may even lead to death—in a Michigan survey, 85 percent of battered women required hospitalization for injuries such as concussions, miscarriages, broken/cracked ribs and first-degree burns.

Domestic violence cuts across all social, ethnic, racial and economic lines. It is not confined to families in poverty or minority groups. It is a problem for all economic and racial groups and is further complicated by geographic location and isolation.

Data from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect reporting system indicate that spouse abuse was also observed to be present in about 20 percent of child abuse cases.

Moreover, we still don't know the full extent of the problem, what causes domestic violence, how to prevent its recurrence and how best to deliver the services needed by the victims of domestic violence and their dependents.

Since our testimony last year, several steps have been taken at the direction of the President and Secretary Califano that will enable the federal government to begin to appraise and address the problem of domestic violence.

THE OFFICE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

As a first step, Secretary Califano has established an Office on Domestic Violence within my office, the Administration for Children, Youth, and Families. The Administration does not see the creation of the Office on Domestic Violence as an alternative to services. We are continuing to examine the legislative options, including the bills pending before this Subcommittee, that would enable us to provide the broad range of services needed. In the meantime, the Office is serving as the Department's "eyes and ears" on activities related to domestic violence.

This Office will—

- provide a central focus for policy planning;
- keep track of current developments in service delivery, research, and evaluation of domestic violence projects, and coordinate these activities;
- help to develop a Department-wide research and evaluation agenda;
- serve as a focal point for information both within the Department and for other federal agencies and outside groups;
- assist other HEW agencies to improve services to victims of domestic violence;
- develop, collect, and disseminate information on domestic violence;
- work with other federal agencies to develop joint programs and activities;
- provide the staff support for the Interdepartmental Committee on Domestic Violence.

The Office has been in operation for only a month, yet in that short time we have received requests for information on domestic violence, particularly on funding sources, from groups and individuals in almost one-half of the states. The Office is already receiving approximately fifty inquiries a week.

For fiscal year 1980, the Office will have more than one million dollars available in funds for programs and activities on domestic violence. The Office staff has already begun to consult widely about next year's program with community and provider groups, members of the Interdepartmental Committee, and others interested and experienced in the field.

As several of you have suggested, the first major activity that the Office is undertaking is the development of a National Clearinghouse on Domestic Violence. Working with an already existing clearinghouse operation, the Office on Domestic Violence plans to become the single, comprehensive source of informa-

tion in the federal government. We are working closely with related programs at the Department of Justice and the National Institute of Mental Health in this effort. Specifically, the new Office is working closely with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and their grantee, the Center for Women's Policy Studies, to develop and disseminate information on the availability of resources, on organizing and implementing domestic violence programs, and on strategies for coordinating criminal justice, community development and social service activities at the local level.

We recognize that domestic violence is a problem that requires responsiveness from the criminal justice, health, shelter, and social services systems. We hope that through these joint efforts, we will be able to capitalize on existing resources, and avoid unnecessary duplication.

THE DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Domestic violence requires a coordinated response from these many federal agencies. Mechanisms are need to link the various federal, state, and local programs together in a way that is meaningful and helpful for victims of domestic violence. This spring, the President asked Secretary Califano to organize and chair an Interdepartmental Committee on Domestic Violence composed of representatives of ten federal departments and agencies. These include: ACTION, the Commission on Civil Rights, the Community Services Administration, and the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, Labor, and Interior.

The Committee was asked to co-ordinate a review of federal programs which currently provide or could provide assistance to victims of domestic violence. As part of that review, we will examine federal agency and program policies which may hinder the development of domestic violence programs, and submit recommendations to the President to strengthen the federal, state, and local government response to this problem. The Interdepartmental Committee will serve as a forum for this task. The Committee has begun to meet and will begin its work by:

- identifying federal agency programs and policies that relate to services for victims of domestic violence and compiling these into a Federal Resources Handbook for Domestic Violence Programs;
- assisting state and local agencies to identify programs that could serve victims of domestic violence;
- facilitating joint federal and state agency activities including research, demonstration programs, and public information activities;
- exchanging information about ongoing and planned activities.

This review will enable us to determine the capability of the federal government to respond to domestic violence problems, to make recommendations to the President and take the necessary steps, where possible, to enhance federal, state, and local responsiveness to the problem.

OTHER HEW ACTIVITIES

In fiscal year 1979, HEW will spend about \$1.1 million for research and demonstration projects on domestic violence. Examples of these projects include—

The National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism has funded research on the interaction of alcohol and violence and their effect on the family.

The National Institute of Mental Health has funded:

A survey to determine the extent of violence in American families. This survey has given us the most accurate estimates we have on spouse abuse, child abuse, and sibling abuse;

Two studies to identify possible psychological determinants that may inhibit women from leaving a relationship in which they are battered.

The Office of Human Development Services has funded a grant to examine state and local, as well as nonprofit agency services, to battered women and to determine how model service systems can be transferred from one program to another.

The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect has been funding services in several demonstration programs to abused mothers as well as to their children.

In fiscal year 1980, we expect that about \$2.8 million will be spent on research and demonstration projects in this area.

HEW has again proposed an amendment to title XX of the Social Security Act which will allow state social services agencies to provide emergency shelter

to adults as a protective service. As you know, HEW proposed such an amendment during the last session of Congress; it was introduced by Rep. George Miller and passed the House, but no final action was taken by the Senate during the last hectic days before adjournment. This amendment is included in H.R. 3434, which was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee, and is awaiting floor action. This amendment would enable the Department to support local efforts by encouraging states to develop needed shelter services for battered women and families.

Currently, states are using title XX funds for a variety of services for battered women such as information and referral, counseling, and child care but it can not be used to pay for emergency shelter. Forty-nine states are using funds to provide protective services to adults; 43 are providing counseling; 43 are providing employment services; and 43 are providing legal services to battered women.

As demonstrated by these activities and initiatives, the President and Secretary are committed to addressing the problem of domestic violence. We are increasing our understanding of the multifaceted problem and developing the capability to transmit this information, in terms of research, advice, and funding sources, to the field. We are beginning throughout the federal government to make ourselves more aware of the problem of domestic violence and to coordinate the responses of our many programs.

ONGOING CONCERNS

Despite these significant steps, we are aware that in many areas not all of the immediate services needed by battered women and their families are available or accessible to them. The women in greatest need are those who, forced to flee their homes, have no other place of refuge, neither friends nor family, who can take them in and help them through a particularly severe ordeal. These women need protection, emergency medical care, temporary shelter, and the opportunity to remove themselves and, in some cases, their children from the violent situation.

They also need follow-up services which will enable them either to set up safe independent households for themselves and their children or to return to their homes with some measure of protection. These follow-up services include health care, legal services, housing or housing referral and information, income maintenance for the provision of food, clothing and shelter, child care, counseling for victims and abusers, job training and placement, protection from further abuse, and services designed to keep families together, where appropriate.

While there are a number of federal, state, and local programs which are beginning to provide these services, there are three basic problems. First, they are not available in every community. Second, there are not adequate services available to the women who decide to return home. Third, they are often not responsive or accessible to the needs of a frightened woman, perhaps with serious or painful injuries, who has fled her home with her children in the middle of the night and has no money, no access to the family resources, and no place to go.

The real impetus for meeting the needs of battered women in a comprehensive manner has come from local communities. As you know, the primary emphasis of this grass roots movement has been the development of shelters for battered women. These shelters offer protection from immediate danger, furnish information and referral about resources available in the community and, in some areas, act as the access point for these resources, and provide a supportive environment which allows a battered woman to consider the best alternatives for herself and her children.

Five years ago almost no emergency shelters for battered women existed; now there are over 200 shelters. Shelters have been established on a shoestring budget by the co-operative efforts of women's groups, religious organizations, community organizations such as the Salvation Army or YWCA, public and private social service agencies and many dedicated individuals.

These shelters usually receive financial support from many sources: but are the result of donations from individuals, religious organizations, community and business organizations, volunteered services, grants from foundations and government funding at the city, county, State, and federal levels. They seldom obtain stable, long range funding. While some funding is received from the public sector, shelters receive the majority of their support from private sources.

The distribution of shelters around the country is uneven. Half of the shelters are located in the ten most populated and urban states, and some states have no shelters at all. Even where shelters do exist, there are problems with funding, overcrowding, and coordination with other community agencies.

We all recognize that shelters are not the solution to the problem of domestic violence. They are necessary, important, provide community based support for victims, and more shelters are needed than currently exist. But not all communities or all victims of domestic violence may need or want shelters. Some communities have begun to develop alternative types of programs, and these programs, which include hotlines, multipurpose crisis intervention centers, family development centers, and police intervention training projects need to be encouraged, their effectiveness evaluated, and their "best practices" disseminated for use in other communities.

We must move beyond shelters and crisis intervention centers ultimately if we are to reduce the problem of domestic violence. Additional research on identifying the extent of, and solutions to, domestic violence, public awareness campaigns, and prevention measures are also necessary ingredients of a program to address the root causes of domestic violence.

Mr. Chairman, you and other Members of the Committee have proposed legislation that addresses many of the issues of concern. We deeply share your concern and have taken steps to respond to many of these needs. Yet we recognize that a portion of those needs, emergency shelter for example, are being met primarily at the local level with little federal support. We have already proposed an amendment to title XX to provide for reimbursement to states for emergency shelters for adults. We are currently examining legislative proposals, which permit a more comprehensive response to this problem. Several principles we are considering in developing such a response include—

- a focus on prevention and obtaining access to a range of needed services for battered spouses, as well as providing the basic needed service, emergency shelter.

- the establishment of close linkages and access to the existing services system, instead of creating a new one.

- continuation of the focus on community projects, while establishing incentives for state efforts which include improving access to state funded services, and reforms in state and local law enforcement systems.

- fostering innovation and experimentation in order to learn and utilize the most effective approaches.

In closing, let me reiterate that we share your concern for the victims of domestic violence and the needs they have. We have been exploring the best ways to assist them, and hope that this year the Congress will enact the emergency shelter amendment to title XX we have proposed. We look forward to continued discussions with you and to working together towards improving the quality of life for victims of domestic violence.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Ramirez, this testimony is so much more refreshing than when we initiated or had our first hearings on domestic violence approximately 14 months ago.

I would like to compliment the Secretary for establishing this temporary Office, and for his choice in appointing Ms. Zeitlin.

I have some questions that are not so much as to the programmatic activity.

What would be the difference between your temporary Office and the legislation that we now have under consideration?

Ms. RAMIREZ. The basic difference is that the legislation we now have under consideration provides for funding of services, and we do not now have within the scope of the Office of Domestic Violence, provision for the funding of services.

We are analyzing those programs that we now have, and identifying the barriers to the funding of services in those programs we now run. But we are not going to fund services.

Ms. MIKULSKI. The reason I ask that question is that there were some questions raised yesterday that said that if you wanted to solve the problem, and not spend any money, how would you go about doing it?

It would seem to me that, as your first step, with no appropriation, your clearinghouse is providing information, technical assistance, and so on.

However, is it your professional opinion, with the experience that you have had with calls coming in, that the temporary Office providing information and advice is no substitute for funds that will provide direct services, and that some type of legislation for services as well as information is absolutely needed?

Ms. RAMIREZ. My professional opinion is a little more complex than that. No, the Office is no substitute for services. But I think that it is incumbent upon the Office to look at ways in which our existing service programs can provide those funds for services. I am very concerned, Ms. Mikulski, because I run a number of very small service programs, that we not concentrate on another small service program to the exclusion of looking at the other ways in which services could be focused on this particular population. I am thinking of the population as the total family.

Let me tell you a little about the runaway-youth program—it has a small appropriation, and we fund temporary shelters. That legislation is always in some kind of trouble because the appropriation is always too small. For the runaway youth, I want to get title XX and other service programs. We have to start concentrating on the population.

I think that the Office of Domestic Violence must look at the other service programs that are run by HEW, HUD, and other agencies, and try to influence the channeling of service moneys to the problem of domestic violence.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I could not agree with you more. My experience has been that the runaway youth tends to be from situations where there is enormous drug abuse, alcoholism, and usually that is tied with violence, either physical or emotional trauma. A kid does not run away simply because he wants to find himself.

Ms. RAMIREZ. It is not an adventure, any more.

Ms. MIKULSKI. When you talk about the coordination with the Federal Council, there are several things which I would like to bring to your attention.

One, I consider it a very important function, not only to working with the internal programs of HEW, but also there are other programs where the very nature of the regulations works against what we want to do.

We heard yesterday the testimony of a research assistant from the Kansas City Police Department, who outlined in rather clear specificity those regulations, for example, that the Department of Agriculture and a whole host of other things that work against it.

We would like to share with you just those preliminary identifications, so that we are not really working against each other.

Would Secretary Califano have the power, within this Coordinating Council, to encourage other agencies to be more flexible, and integrate those services?

Ms. RAMIREZ. We will be making recommendations to the President, through the Secretary, about exactly those kinds of issues. We would welcome the identification of those practical things that can be done here and now, so that we can we make those recommendations more complete.

Ms. MIKULSKI. My final point—when you talk about exploring other legislative options, I don't know what would be better than a big Miller-Mikulski bill, but could you outline for us what are these other legislative options, what direction HEW is leaning in, and when can we expect a decision?

Ms. RAMIREZ. The legislative options, basically, focus around issues related to the degree of State involvement, the funding mechanism for the funding of services, the degree of linkage to the title XX program, with greater Federal direction or more direction by the States. Those are generally the issues which we are examining in considering legislative options. I cannot give you a date for a decision on those legislative options. We are looking at budget issues.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Do you have kind of a target framework, though? I know that it will not come on the Feast of the Assumption, or anything like that.

Ms. RAMIREZ. I would hope that we would be able to participate with the committee in the consideration of the current piece of legislation once we have made the decision about our own options. I don't think that it is too far away.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I understood what she said, but please don't ask me to explain it.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have any further questions.

I would like again to thank you for the advances that have been made.

I am working on the children's legislation with Mr. Waxman, which is an integral part of what we all want to accomplish. I am going to excuse myself to go over to that. If you don't see me around, it is because I am over there.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Stack?

Mr. STACK. I commend the expert witness for a very excellent statement. I will now leave and do my duty.

Mr. MILLER. The committee is going to recess. I will have some questions when I come back. There is a vote following this vote, so we should be back in about 20 minutes, if the witnesses would remain.

[Recess.]

Mr. MILLER. The committee will convene to continue to hear from witnesses representing the administration.

Ms. Ramirez, to put it politely, let me say I am not all that delighted, as my colleagues are, with the testimony of the administration. I do recognize that it is a long ways away from where the administration was last year and far more positive, but my concern is that we appear to be going down a road which concerns me because I think, to some extent, it is a road that has discredited many programs of the past in the eyes of the public, and that is, that prior to the delivery of service, one, we are starting to spend some money, not in this case all that much, but \$1 million, which I would be interested in knowing where it came from at least, and the time of a lot of people to coordinate, to become

innovative, and to analyze programs which I am prepared to stand to be corrected on, for which they have never participated in or delivered service once.

That is my concern. I don't think it is enough to say that you recognize that—and I am looking for your statement—but I believe it is along the lines that this work is not a substitute for services. It is a candid statement, but it does not solve the problem. My concern is this: We have seen the sheltered network in this country and citizens who are concerned with the problems of spouse abuse, family violence, child abuse, however you want to term it, who have volunteered their time, who have run their operations on a shoestring—some have longer shoestrings than others—but they have gone out, as we have heard testified yesterday, and made a great deal more progress than they did a year ago in securing LEAA funds, community bloc grants, because they obviously were able to show local governments the problems and the benefits of action volunteers, because they are readily available and also because they had somewhere to put them. It is just a difference in philosophy, I guess, because I think if you continue to nurture the grassroots movement and to provide them the wherewithal to hold on, they will find these Federal services with or without this coordination.

I think the coordination should take place, but it can't be a substitute. I do not think I can sit here and suggest that we can let time go by. I think that if the administration really is in a position that they can't endorse funding for shelters and the services provided by shelters much more far-reaching than suggested in your statement, because they do provide a multitude of services, counseling, hotlines, reception, followup, job placement, all of which can be coordinated, so you have the opportunity to either provide the coordination at 200 local levels as of today, or Washington, D.C., where people can write for a handbook.

I don't mean to make light of it, but I think it is a question of where delivery of services and information is going to take place. I am terribly concerned about that. I think the exciting thing about your statement is that absent some barriers, there are some tremendous resources that can be put in place if the people and those agencies and the Department really want to deal with the problem.

I don't think you can sit here, and I don't think the committee can sit here, and suggest that if my amendment or anybody's amendment on title XX is passed, that that is going to solve the problem. We are going to have a fight here to raise title XX by \$1½ billion. It has been undercapitalized for 7 or 8 years. There are barracuda in that pond.

Now, are you going to throw this little fledgling in and say, "You compete for title XX funds"? I am fighting like hell to keep foster children, who have a much larger constituency than this, in title XX. Russell Long wants to put these people in title XX. You are telling a lot of novices, "Jump in, the water is fine." That is the way to stop a program at this point unless the administration wants to commit the money based upon need rather than the suggestion of OMB.

I think that that is my concern. I don't think it is rhetorical. I think it is really a question of what are you going to purchase for the \$15 million to \$20 million to \$30 million a year in the way of relieving the pain and coping with the problem, and what are you going to purchase at the end of all these machinations that you could not get

otherwise from people building constituencies at the local level to get the Federal Government to respond to what they perceive as a problem and obviously have some constituency for it.

When we wrote the legislation, we took hours of testimony and we kept asking people who were directly involved in the delivery of services, "How would you do this?" Most of them, I think, have been through this bureaucratic maze and it did not work very well. That is why the original bill, interestingly, was so abhorrent, because there was not enough Government control by the conservatives on the committee; they thought we were going to throw the money away because we didn't want this to happen, we didn't want to study the victim, we did not want to coordinate and analyze because there are people out there who have done that.

To suggest that the Federal Government has to do it before it gets a stamp of approval is a mistake, in my mind. I am concerned, unless there is some assurance that this is going to be followed up by some supportive services. I am just not going to give you credit yet for the placement of ACTION people, for the placement of LEAA grants, for getting HUD and others to talk about other housing problems, because that happened in response to what local individuals did. I can't give you credit for that.

Now, I want to know, when are you going to create the "new" that is going to relieve the pain? That is my concern.

Ms. RAMIREZ. I can't disagree with anything you have said. I would like to allay some of your fears. First of all, your question about where the money came from. What we have done is caused those agencies within HEW who we believe have a mandate to do research which touches on issues related to domestic violence, we have caused, because of the Secretary's concern, a clearer focusing of that responsibility in those agencies. Maybe we don't deserve credit for that because they should have been doing it anyway. Those things don't happen unless somebody in the bureaucracy advocates for them to happen and causes that focus to occur.

We are not asking for the credit for what local people have done. As a matter of fact, every program in my agency is a program run by people at the local level; that is why I happen to think that their programs work.

We would not minimize the importance of putting the resources of the Federal Government most directly in the hands of the people with the greatest stake in seeing to it that those persons work. At the same time, as you know, we are caught in a bind because the question becomes how much Federal leadership can we exert when our ability to exert leadership is not there, such as through title XX which puts much of that responsibility at the State level.

So throughout all of that I think the most appropriate response is one which is not a leader but one in which the Federal Government in an agency like ACYF and OHDS, which is supposed to be concerned about people, captures in a focused way every opportunity that we have to make those programs targeted on people at the local level. That is why we are continuing out of ACYF and OHDS and HEW to press for looking at the legislative options for the condition of those services at the local level.

It is a very difficult time to be pressing for those kinds of things, but we think the creation of an Office of Domestic Violence, the creation of interest in other departments in the administration and in the Federal Government, the collection of information about ways in which these things can work, will put us in a better position to capture the opportunity to do the most that we can with those mandates we now have and to examine in the most effective way the opportunities that we might have to press for the provision of services at the local level.

MR. MILLER. You can obviously argue the different cause, not to be trite, but that is a sort of Jerry Brown approach to a problem.

MS. RAMIREZ. I don't know Jerry Brown.

MR. MILLER. You talk about doing something, or you put new money into mental health. When you get there, you find out it is different money, the same money, it has been washed, colored a little different; it is not new money.

You talk about getting programs, whether it is LEAA which comes under severe fire in the Congress in the funding. You are talking about ACTION, which this committee knows better than anyone has some problems in terms of new money, of doing more.

Now, you can't just run the Government like that, because at some point it is just like deferred maintenance on a house; it just falls down around you.

When I say "you," I am not talking about you; I am talking about the administration. It may not be the time to press for renewed programs, but it is not time to dismantle the Government in light of need. There is a difference. Surely we will never again see the Great Society programs for some time to come, and I am not sure we should; but when you have local community responses to a problem, I am not sure the Federal Government should press forward for a Federal program. The question is: Are we going to help provide resources?

I am not going to look for Federal leadership. In this case I abhor Federal leadership because I think there are a lot of people out there who can do it better, more efficiently, can do it easier, or can write the grants or whatever the mechanism is to trigger funding, to put people to work.

I am not here concerned about creating Federal leadership and the overhead. I would not create State overhead if I had my druthers on this bill, but that did not work out. You can't mislead these people because they have gone too far in terms of trying to create a network to help these people and expressions of concern are not enough; and the administration—not you, the administration—has got to understand that. If, in these times, they can't risk their credibility—they don't have to support my bill; let them write their own bill—but in these times if they can't stretch out a little social conscience credibility on behalf of these people and try to suggest you are going to bootstrap it from child abuse studies and bootstrap it from other ongoing operations that are starving to death, is a bit misleading.

That is my concern.

We have to go vote again.

MR. STACK. MR. Chairman, I would like to make this one observation: You are never trite but sometimes you do lapse into parochialism.

With that, I feel I just got here.

Mr. MILLER. Can I give you my card?

Mr. STACK. What was that name again? Was it Jerry?

Mr. MILLER. If you feel you would like to respond, you can do it right now. I have said my piece. I felt that I needed to respond.

Are there any questions by other members of the committee?

I don't think so. Mr. Stack is out of questions. If I don't melt in the meantime, I will be back very shortly. We are working under the President's energy policy right here in this building.

Thank you very much for coming and telling us what the administration is planning on doing.

Mr. MILLER. Next we will hear from Sam Brown.

Let me ask, if you will cooperate in this effort. My understanding is that we heard yesterday the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence is doing a paper and analysis of title XX and some of the barriers in terms of access. They are going to submit that to you, or to HEW, but I think, specifically, to your office, for comment. We are going to mark this bill up right after Labor Day. It will be very helpful if, after we get that paper, we could provide some immediate comments and responses, so that the committee can share in that understanding before we write the legislation, because there may be some things we want to change in terms of barriers within programs.

The jurisdiction of the Education and Labor Committee we can deal with.

Mr. BROWN. We just talked with the chairperson of the council, and she will be sharing that information with you.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you.

[Brief recess.]

Mr. MILLER. Welcome to the committee. We look forward to hearing how you have gone about directing some of your resources to helping people to run shelters and supplying some people, and what you expect to do in the future.

STATEMENT OF SAM BROWN, DIRECTOR, ACTION, ACCOMPANIED BY TORRIE MATTES, OFFICE OF POLICY AND PLANNING; KATHLEEN FOJTIK, NATIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER; AND SHARON VAUGHAN, WOMEN'S SHELTER, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here. I have to say in all candor I have rarely felt that way in recent weeks about my appearances but it is always a pleasure to see you and I appreciate the chance to be here.

There are a couple of other people with me that I would like to introduce who can provide additional information. Torrie Mattes is here, who is in the Office of Policy and Planning who has been working on the interdepartmental committee.

There are two people here, Kathleen Fojtik who, in addition to being a county commissioner in Washtenaw County, Mich., which is the Ann Arbor district, runs the National Technical Assistance Center, which I am going to talk about in my testimony, and is the director of Safe House. She is a community person who has some relationship to the Federal Government.

Sharon Vaughn is here who was, when she was a VISTA volunteer, the founder of what is said to be the first women's shelter in the country in St. Paul, Minn., and is now with the shelter in Minneapolis.

We are proud to say that we have tried not to take a Jerry Brown approach to the problems that we face but a somewhat different approach. I believe we have had some of the most extensive experiences in addressing the issue of violence in the home. We have now about 600 volunteers working in 30 States on about 100 different projects through 3 different programs, some through VISTA, some through RSVP and some through Foster Grandparents, working on problems of violence in the home.

Last year we funded, a National Technical Assistance Center to try to provide some forms of assistance on the problem. We funded it at the level of \$300,000. The center is in its 11th month of existence. It has responded to over 20,000 specific requests for information on domestic violence—all of it growing from a local volunteer, principally a volunteer base—programs, shelter programs around the country.

It may be interesting for the committee to note that for this year when we had \$750,000 total in discretionary moneys for grants for innovative programs in volunteer activity to be divided among five areas of concern, one of those areas was in domestic violence.

For the \$150,000 which was designated in each of those issues we had 156 applications from shelters around the country for assistance, financial assistance. That is 150 applications for \$150,000 for which we were able to assist three, which would suggest that the need exceeds the ability to meet it at this point.

The center which I referred to, the National Center for providing technical assistance, provides "hands on" expertise to the volunteers. A shelter cannot help people if it cannot pass a health inspection, if it cannot meet zoning requirements, if it cannot pay the telephone bill.

We surveyed 162 organizations around the country and it is largely on the basis of that survey of shelters that I would like to make three comments about specific areas of very real need that we see.

One is that despite any kind of technical assistance, many programs, it appears, are going to be in serious trouble if CETA funds are cut as now appears to be a possibility. CETA funds now provide about 45 percent of the support money for professional staff in centers. Of the 84 shelters that responded to that question on the survey, about 45 percent of the professional staff came from CETA.

Any cut in CETA would have a devastating effect on the ability to have a full professional staff and to keep the centers open on any kind of professional basis.

The second concern is need in rural areas which are now dramatically underserved. Of the 162 organizations that were involved in this survey, only 5 of them serve in communities of under 20,000 and anecdotally we know of areas, for instance, 1 place in Nebraska, where a woman came 150 miles, including driving on back roads for fear of her husband and ended up the last 75 miles after an automobile breakdown, or something, hitching and catching rides to get to the nearest center where they could provide any kind of supportive services.

It is clear that rural areas are dramatically underserved. The lack of public transportation, lack of opportunity for housing, community health centers in rural areas exacerbates an already existing problem.

The third concern we have is that the Federal Government in any approach it takes to the problem needs to complete and support the work of local volunteers. H.R. 2977, requiring three-quarters of all the funding to go to private nonprofit agencies, is a substantial step in the right direction in assuring that the money ends up in the group that is already there which can use it most effectively.

Finally, I would like to simply point out that from the agency's standpoint in terms of trying to deal with this problem, it appears to us that there is need for a comprehensive approach to the problem in addition to specific needs which the shelter movement now has. It is pretty clear that violence is a learned behavior trait.

Frequently, men who beat their wives are themselves past victims of child abuse. They are the sons of child batterers, turn out to be future criminals, turn out to be future batterers themselves. There are very serious problems that need to be addressed that comprehensively focus on the need to deal with the spouses and the children.

Lou Harris did a poll about a year ago now, the results of which it seems to me were very important because people were asked to rank those things which they saw as the most important concerns in their life and the list was a broader list than the normal energy or this or that or the other thing, public issue concerns, but also addressed some private issue concerns.

The three things which came out on top in that survey, in terms of the most important, were family life, health, and peace of mind.

It is very clear that the issue with which you are dealing in domestic violence deals very centrally with all three of those issues which the American people rank as the most critical issues in their lives. An approach now has, I believe, the capacity to offset long-term cost by the expenditure of some moneys now. The present cost of not addressing the issue is clearly too high.

We are pleased to be a part of an effort to help address the problem but we believe that there are some critical areas of continuing need for addressing it.

I have submitted prepared testimony for the statement which I have just summarized, so, if we can insert the prepared testimony.

Mr. MILLER. It may be inserted in the record in its entirety.

[The prepared statement of Sam Brown follows:]

TESTIMONY OF SAMUEL W. BROWN, DIRECTOR OF THE ACTION AGENCY,
BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, last year I appeared before this committee to testify on proposed legislation which would have provided federal support for the work of thousands of American citizens who are volunteering to help the victims of domestic family violence. At that time, I focused my remarks on the concepts that buttressed the work of these volunteers, especially our commitment to support locally based community groups. This year I would like to be more specific. ACTION, as an agency, has some of the most extensive experience in addressing the issue of violence in the home. We take some pride in the fact that Sarah Vaughn, a VISTA volunteer, created what is now recognized as the first modern day shelter for battered women in 1974.

In the intervening five years, volunteers all across America have responded to the needs of those who need help. Eighty per cent of the approximately 210 shelters which now exist in this country that provide comprehensive services for seven days or longer have been started by volunteers within the last five years. This fact alone is testimony to the continued concern and generosity of the American people.

ACTION, as an agency, has remained committed to helping community based groups help the battered wife, the abused child, and even the angry husband who from learned experience believes violence in the home is as American as apple pie. Much of our effort has been in the form of human capital—the time, commitment, resourcefulness, and love of our volunteers. At present, approximately six hundred ACTION volunteers are working in thirty states on about one hundred domestic violence projects. Three of ACTION's programs—VISTA, RSVP, and our Foster Grandparent program are involved in this effort.

Last year, ACTION took another step in developing a response to family violence by becoming the first federal agency to provide technical assistance to volunteer groups across the nation. Since August of 1978, ACTION's National Technical Assistance Center in Ann Arbor and its ten regional centers have responded to over 20,000 requests for information and technical assistance around the issue of domestic violence.

A brief description of the National Technical Assistance Center may be in order. The Center and its ten regional centers are funded through a grant of \$300,000. The principle focus of its work is to provide practical, "hands on" expertise to the volunteers that have created and maintained the majority of crisis centers and shelters in the country. Our concern in establishing the Center was to assure their ability to respond to the growing demands on them. An estimated 3500 women are being helped each month according to a survey conducted by the Center of one hundred and sixty two programs, and that number will grow as more women and men become aware that they can be helped. We had discovered that while the volunteers who had started these shelters had the commitment and caring to help others, they in many cases simply didn't have the experience and expertise to respond as effectively as they might to women in need.

A second problem was that the volunteers who started the centers often lacked a business sense of how a twenty four hour crisis center should properly function. The business of running a shelter had taken a back seat to responding to the immediate crisis at hand. To some extent this is to be expected. It is difficult for a volunteer to see how spending their time setting up good bookkeeping procedures, learning zoning laws, or how to raise funds is of prime importance when they are confronted with a woman who has just been beaten and fears for her personal safety. The instinctive reaction is to respond to the crisis at hand—to help the women in need. But the dry, practical business of maintaining a center and ensuring that it has the full support of the local community must be done if a center is to be successful. A shelter for battered women can't provide shelter unless it meets the health and zoning laws. A crisis center can't provide the psychological counseling a victim of a beating may immediately need unless it can pay the bills. Volunteers can't help a woman who has just been beaten unless they know how to end her hysteria or break through her isolation by proper counseling.

The goal of our National Technical Assistance Center and the ten regional centers has been to provide community volunteer groups with the practical advice they need—the "how to" of how to do things. This help is both informational and direct. The Technical Assistance Center has provided volunteers with "how to" manuals on every aspect of the business of running a shelter from training volunteers on how to counsel victims to how to write a grant proposal. Our technical experts, who are locally based, have often simply packed up their bags and gone to where help is needed.

A second focus of the National Center has been to take the practical experience these volunteers are gaining and assure that this information is shared. To that end, each of our regional centers has focused on a particular aspect of meeting the needs of the victims they help and the business of managing shelters effectively. In the next six months each region will hold a conference to discuss their specific projects. For example, in the Far West the regional center in Southern California is focusing on effective volunteer intervention and prevention. In The South our regional center has focused its attention on prevention. In New York the concentration has been on how to raise money. We believe that this specialization of expertise is a fine example of how a decentralized community based system of helping organizations can have a national impact without losing their community base. These organizations are at the heart of the movement to help the victims of domestic violence. In the last year they have organized almost thirty statewide coalitions of shelters. Much of this has been accomplished under the leadership of Mary Berg from the Chairman's homestate of Illinois.

In the eleven months that our Technical Assistance Center has been in operation we have gathered specific information that may be of assistance to committee members in your deliberations. Some of this information has come to us as a result of a survey conducted by the Technical Assistance Center in October of 1978 which was responded to by one hundred and sixty two domestic violence projects. I have submitted the complete survey results for the record along with a more detailed analysis of the eighty four shelters that provide emergency housing for victims and their children.

The first observation is that the most critical need facing existing shelters is the need for continued funding. The number one question that is asked across the country is how to continue existing projects. This problem will become more acute with the change in CETA regulations. Of the eighty four shelters that responded to our survey 45 percent receive their primary funding from CETA and 20 percent receive the majority of their funding from LEAA. The funding pattern is significant because it indicates the short term special project nature of the funding currently available for domestic violence programs.

The new CETA guidelines fund public employment jobs for up to eighteen months with a possible extension for another eighteen months. Current shelter programs may be seriously impaired by the lack of continuity and constant change in staffing if they are unable to gain an extension for another eighteen months or find additional local funding sources that provide them with a permanent base. Volunteers are the backbone of the movement to help the victims of domestic violence. I have no doubt that they will remain the backbone of future efforts. They have brought the issue to the attention of the American people. They have manned the hotlines and staffed the shelters on a twenty four hour basis. But these volunteers can not provide all the long term professional help that is needed or the continuity that is required for these programs to succeed. At the very least professional staff is needed to guide and supervise the volunteers.

I do not believe that the existing level of federal support will lead to total dependence on the Federal Treasury for support and I would not support such a move. The shelter movement has been successful because it has a community base. One of the tangible aspects of that base has been the funding support these shelters receive from their local community. This support should not be allowed to disappear. But the potential reduction of existing federal support is a major concern of most programs that are now in operation.

A second observation is that the needs of rural communities are acute. The second most asked question over the last eleven months has been "how to start services in rural communities?" Many rural communities lack the infrastructure—transportation, community mental health centers, housing, and employment opportunities that victims of family violence need. We know of one case where a woman in a rural area attempted to walk to a shelter one hundred and fifty miles away from her home. For fear of her husband she used backroads and actually had walked seventy-five miles before she received transportation to the center.

A third concern is that the focus of the ongoing research about the domestic violence might well be decentralized. Much of the research can be done by the people who are in the field doing the work. All future research efforts should not be centralized in Washington. Mary Berg, the director of the Community Crisis Center in Elgin, Illinois which is one of our regional centers has four years of data compiled. What she needs is the support to analyze the data she has collected. What is not needed is for someone in Washington to start a research project from scratch on the same subject. The Federal Government should not be in the business of reinventing the wheel again and again as so often has happened in the past. I make this observation only to stress that there is an existing and expanding network of community based volunteer groups that has been doing constructive work in addressing the issue of domestic violence. The Federal Government should not try to take the place of community volunteer groups.

A fourth observation is that responding to the immediate crisis of helping a battered woman is only half the solution. Prevention must be stressed and a successful prevention program must also see men as victims. The problem of a battered spouse is not just an issue that should concern women. The men today who beat their wives are in many cases also victims. Violence in the family is a learned behavior. Men who beat their wives are the past victims, present victims, and their sons may well be future victims if we only view this issue as one that

should concern women. If we are to stop the next generation of wife beaters from developing prevention must be stressed, and this prevention should have as its focus getting whatever help is necessary for the children who come from violent homes. The short term costs of such help will more than be offset by the long term cost savings. The present cost to society of not addressing this issue is too great:

Forty percent of the women in Cooke County jail are there for murdering their husbands who beat them yet everyone of them called the police five times or more prior to the killing;

A survey of San Quentin prison revealed that 100 percent of those interviewed indicated that they had been victims of family violence or had witnessed their mothers beaten at the hands of their fathers;

Eighty percent of the children in the special education programs in Takoma, Washington, come from violent homes.

Louis Harris in poll taken last October asked Americans what were the most important things in their lives. The three most important concerns were—family life, health, and peace of mind. Each of these concerns is in a direct way affected by family violence. To the extent that the Federal Government can help the many Americans seeking to address this problem we will be in a very direct way be responding to the most important concerns of the American people.

Mr. MILLER. In the placement, specifically in the placement, of VISTA volunteers, they are placed in existing programs, is that right, shelters or what?

Mr. BROWN. Theoretically, the guidelines would permit the possibility of placement in an area where they could be creating a new institution, not simply already an existing institution. The real world impact, however, is somewhat different.

As you know, we are on a continuing resolution. The direct results of that is that because of commitments made a year or two ago we have an ongoing obligation to fulfill the volunteer assignment we have already made and have little latitude in terms of new assignments.

In real world terms, basically the volunteers end up most frequently in an existing institution with some capacity to help in the institution-building process, supporting the Sharon Vaughns of this world who are building new institutions.

Mr. MILLER. They are there at the request of the local program?

Mr. BROWN. That is right.

Mr. MILLER. They put in a request that they want a VISTA volunteer or they like foster grandparents maybe to deal with some of the problems of bringing children to the shelter and in an abuse program you can have both without any problem?

Mr. BROWN. You can have both.

Mr. MILLER. How long have you had them?

Mr. BROWN. You can have both. It is theoretically possible. We look for joint sponsorship not only with those programs but directly with CSA programs as well.

Mr. MILLER. How long have you been placing people at the request of some of these programs in this type of program, abuse-oriented program?

Mr. BROWN. I frankly do not know. I know there has been a good deal of encouragement of it the last year. VISTA's have been involved at least since 1974, and some of our foster grandparent volunteers have been involved with this issue for approximately 12 years.

Mr. MILLER. They have had access to volunteers for this purpose if they have made that request?

Mr. BROWN. I simply want to make the real world point that that is pretty limited.

Mr. MILLER. I understand that. My point is that there is in fact an institutional responsibility by the ACTION agencies. I do not want to start pitting agencies against one another. The point is that there is the ability of at least your agency to respond to the direct demand for services by local entities given your funding problem?

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. That is my point. Let me ask you this: You are involved in the interdepartmental task force.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Can somebody tell me what is going on there from your viewpoint?

Ms. MATTES. The committee has only met once at this point. We tried to encourage the mutual support concept to ascertain exactly what the agencies were doing, what sections we could get involved with and what would be our role in the future. It was not as extensive as we would have liked to see. It was a preliminary meeting.

Mr. MILLER. Can I make an assumption that there will be a second meeting?

Ms. MATTES. I hope so. We have also had informal meetings all the way through this, specifically dealing with research and development programs of all the different agencies. That has been ongoing process during the last year.

Mr. MILLER. You are not at this stage recommending perhaps that your technical assistance operation either becomes the model or in fact the vehicle for carrying out part of the clearinghouse functions? You have nothing that far?

Ms. MATTES. We will be recommending that in the near future.

Mr. MILLER. I do not know, how good is your technical assistance?

Ms. MATTES. It is excellent.

Mr. MILLER. My concern is that in the effort to build something that appears to be new you just start running over old ground. That is my concern when I heard the previous testimony. It is one thing to take all of the components and coordinate them and say that we had a more efficient operation. It is another thing to take all of them and then declare you have grabbed the high ground. I do not think one is necessarily so. It delays the implementation of other programs that are in existence.

Mr. BROWN. Our approach to that last year was to provide the funding to basically already existing networks. That is to try to find the people in various parts of the country. The mechanism for that was through a central grantee. We did some subgrants to programs around the country that had particular expertise in particular areas.

So that it is not run out of Washington. It is run out of Ann Arbor. It is not run directly by Federal employees. It is run through a grantee network that consists essentially of people who are already involved in the shelter movement over the preceding year.

It was "hands-on" experience. It was not somebody from here going out and saying, "Hey, what about this?" It was people who had gone through a fundraising in their local community and could help another shelter figure out how to get United Way or Good Person Foundation to put up some money to make it work.

Mr. SIMON. As I read through your statement, it kind of follows on the question Mr. Miller asks. Your third concern here is that future

research efforts should not be centralized in Washington. The Federal Government should not be in the business of reinventing the wheel again and again as so often has happened in the past.

The Federal Government should not try to take the place of community volunteer groups. Do you see some dangers in this legislation? Is it possible that it needs further amendment? Are you suggesting that or am I reading something in your testimony that is not meant to be read into your testimony?

Mr. BROWN. My own view is that this year's legislation moves in a direction that makes it more possible to be responsive.

Less likely it will be dominated from Washington and more likely it will be responsive to local concerns. So, I have no amendments to recommend. I am sort of raising the flag.

Mr. SIMON. Good. Thank you.

Mr. MILLER. I have no more questions. I think you are one of the bright spots, given all of the administrative problems you have had with Congress and elsewhere, to be able to place people and to respond. I know a number of programs that have volunteers from your agency. I like to think they are doing a little bit better because of it.

I think it also shows, and I think the next witness from LEAA also shows, the response is possible now and there are some places where there are legislative barriers and I do not think it requires great imagination to eradicate them and keeping to the intent of the law.

I appreciate your testimony because I think it is very important to show that if we can create the vehicle to receive the services and the support of the Federal Government, that the services and support can be there. If you do not have a shelter, a hot line, if you do not have an organization that is alive and well, you do not have anywhere to send your volunteers. I think that is the bottom line.

Mr. BROWN. I appreciated that. I am always reticent to add any emendation to somebody who says something nice about what we have done. I simply want to reinforce again the resource problem, one with which you are very well aware. We would like to do more.

Mr. MILLER. Next we will hear from the representatives of the Law Enforcement and Assistance Administration. Mr. Robert Grimes, who will be accompanied by Jeannie Neidermeyer-Santos.

**STATEMENT OF J. ROBERT GRIMES, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR,
OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAMS, LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION; ACCOMPANIED BY JEANNIE
NEIDERMEYER-SANTOS, PROGRAM MANAGER, FAMILY VIO-
LENCE PROGRAM**

Mr. GRIMES. With your permission, I would like to submit my formal statement for the record. We will be glad to respond to questions at the end. Jeannie Neidermeyer-Santos is the Program Director of our family violence program. She will have the detailed expertise for any questions you may have.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration is indeed pleased to be here to discuss programs designed to prevent domestic violence and provide services to victims of domestic violence. This is an area in which LEAA has been quite active. I am pleased to report that, in

spite of future cuts that are now being proposed in our appropriation, we intend to continue our strong commitment and priority to family violence programs.

I cannot say at this time, however, the kind of resources we will have available for the program in the future.

Family and domestic violence has become increasingly recognized as a problem of national scope. Intrafamily difficulties may manifest themselves as physical violence against spouses or children, psychological abuse, or neglect of basic needs.

Instances of domestic violence have become well documented in recent years as authorities have become more sensitized to the problem. Just as it is apparent that domestic violence takes many forms and has many implications, it is also clear that governmental agencies and private organizations must work to develop more effective prevention and treatment mechanisms.

It is the mission of LEAA to provide leadership and financial and technical assistance to State and local governments, as well as private nonprofit organizations, in order to increase their efficiency and effectiveness in dealing with criminal and juvenile justice issues. LEAA is not an operational agency and does not itself directly provide services. LEAA funds are, however, used to support the operations of State and local agencies.

In the fall of 1977, LEAA announced a major new discretionary initiative aimed at reducing and preventing domestic violence and sexual abuse. Subsequently, \$1.8 million in fiscal year 1978 funds was awarded to support eleven local demonstration projects which adopted a comprehensive approach and provided for the active involvement of all relevant public and private agencies. This fiscal year, we plan to provide \$1 million to an additional nine projects, six in rural areas and three in urban jurisdictions. To provide a greater emphasis on the domestic violence problems of the poor, the Community Services Administration is contributing \$125,000 to the program and will join us in supporting five of these projects.

The response to our family violence program has been positive. The level of interest is indicated by the fact that we received approximately 1,400 requests for copies of the guidelines. Formal applications were submitted by 130 organizations.

The family violence program is built upon the premise that physical and sexual assaults on family members are crimes and that the criminal justice system therefore has an important role to play in the resolution of these problems. The program focuses on the role of the criminal justice system in preventing and controlling violent and abusive behavior in the home.

By concentrating its resources on the criminal justice system, LEAA does not imply that the part which criminal justice agencies play in the resolution of family violence should be expanded. Instead, we are seeking to define the appropriate responsibilities of the criminal justice system and improve the system's response to crimes in the home.

The approach is termed comprehensive because it foresees the need for cooperative interaction with social service agencies and community-based groups. The tension which normally exists between the

punitive nature of the justice system and the treatment models of the social service system must be eased in order to meet this need.

The family violence program is the outgrowth of several grants made in earlier years under the victim/witness assistance program. Through that program, LEAA sought to encourage local governments to improve their response to crime victims and witnesses. Special attention was given to the victims of rape, sexual abuse (including incest) and spousal abuse because victims seldom reported these "sensitive crimes" and were reluctant to cooperate with authorities.

By 1977, it was clear to LEAA that the problem of spouses and children being injured and sexually exploited by family members required new approaches. Grants were made to two hospitals carrying on programs for sexually abused children and four organizations providing shelter and other services for battered women. The experiences of these projects and others like them show that the people who come for assistance are often from families where more than one member is being abused and needs help.

The American Humane Association, in a 25-State study funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, recently reported that the physical abuse of a spouse has been documented in nearly 20 percent of all validated cases of child abuse and neglect. For this reason, the family violence program focuses on the several forms of victimization that occur in the home, including, but not limited to, child/adolescent abuse, interspousal abuse, and abuse of the elderly.

In June 1977, a grant was made to the Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., to establish a newsletter and clearinghouse for information-sharing among people concerned with the problems of intra-family violence and sexual assault, as well as to provide technical assistance to community groups interested in initiating and/or improving services for victims of sensitive crime. The grant has since been extended.

The Center sends the newsletter to 20,000 individuals and organizations interested in the field and responds to over 500 requests for information each month.

LEAA is working closely with other Federal departments and agencies in implementing domestic violence programs. I have already mentioned our joint effort with the Community Services Administration. We participate in the Interdepartmental Committee on Domestic Violence formed by the President this year.

LEAA personnel are also working with the staff of HEW's Office of Domestic Violence on several collaborative efforts. That office may join us in sponsoring the clearinghouse and newsletter of the Center for Women Policy Studies. A coordinated government response to domestic violence should increase the effectiveness of all agency programs.

The LEAA family violence program has demonstrated to the States the need for more effective responses to the problem. More and more jurisdictions are moving to initiate projects relating to domestic violence, spouse abuse and child abuse and neglect with LEAA subgrants. The types of programs vary widely. Kingstown, R.I., is using funds to provide in-service training on family crisis intervention for police

officers. Newark, Ohio, is sponsoring a night prosecutor program to help resolve family disputes in a nonjudicial setting. New York City is using funds to provide services to families in crisis situations, including legal assistance, education and vocational services, health care, and housing assistance.

Large and small jurisdictions are using block subgrants to support special shelters for victims of domestic violence. These are just a few of nearly 300 projects implemented across the country at local initiative. I mention these to give you an indication, Mr. Chairman, of the scope of programs being used by different areas to meet their particular needs.

As you know, the United Nations has proclaimed 1979 as the International Year of the Child. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention at LEAA is responsible for developing and coordinating all Department of Justice activities in support of the IYC. These activities focus on four important issues, all of which are related to family violence. These issues are—

Children and youth as victims of violence;

Sexual abuse and exploitation of children and youth;

The effects of advertising and media programming on drug use and violence among young people;

Children in custody, including the institutional placement of children as a result of family violence.

In structuring these activities, special attention has been given to family violence as the cause of juvenile violence, as well as the relationship between family violence and the serious problems of runaways, especially those runaways who become victims of sexual exploitation.

In addition, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in sponsoring and coordinating a number of activities pertaining to the rights of children and youth. There are few instances when the protection of the rights of young people is more important than in situations of family violence, especially when, as is too often the case, the child is the victim or captive observer of violence.

Domestic violence is one of the most hazardous police assignments. The outcome—not only for the disputants, but for the police as well—is often serious injury or death. Because of the seriousness of the problem, LEAA's National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice has supported efforts to develop improved techniques to help police handle these problems.

The police crisis intervention program is based on established psychological principles. Activities have included conceptual development, feasibility examination, controlled experiments, intensive evaluation, multicity demonstration programs, and nationwide training for police.

A major goal of the program is insuring prompt and effective police intervention, with long-term assistance from social service agencies where appropriate. Reducing the immediate potential for violence and avoidance of future violence are also priorities. Besides minimizing the possibility of serious violence, crisis intervention also prevents a drain on police resources caused by repeated visits to troubled families, formerly a customary police experience.

We will be pleased at this time to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of J. Robert Grimes follows:]

STATEMENT OF J. ROBERT GRIMES, ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM, LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for inviting me to appear today before this Subcommittee on behalf of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to discuss programs designed to prevent domestic violence and provide services to victims of domestic violence. This is an area in which LEAA has been quite active. I am pleased to report that the Administrator of LEAA, Mr. Henry Dogin, has a strong personal interest in victim assistance programs, and has given high priority to our efforts in this regard.

Family and domestic violence has become increasingly recognized as a problem of national scope. Intra-family difficulties may manifest themselves as physical violence against spouses or children, psychological abuse, or neglect of basic needs.

Instances of domestic violence have become well documented in recent years as authorities have become more sensitized to the problem. Just as it is apparent that domestic violence takes many forms and has many implications, it is also clear that governmental agencies and private organizations must work to develop more effective prevention and treatment mechanisms.

LEAA recognizes that family violence is both a social and legal problem. A cooperative community effort is essential to combatting the violence which is present in our society today. Not only must the obvious institutions, such as the police, prosecutors, hospitals, mental health and social service agencies be involved, but so must legal and professional organizations, the media, neighborhood groups, and schools. LEAA funding activities have built upon this premise.

Domestic violence programming is an area where the Federal Government can provide important leadership. Several Federal agencies are engaged in activities aimed at various aspects of the problem. It is satisfying to note that LEAA was the first Federal agency to initiate a comprehensive response to domestic violence and to have a specifically designated national program office responsible for addressing the problem.

THE LEAA PROGRAM

It is the mission of LEAA to provide leadership and financial and technical assistance to state and local governments, as well as private nonprofit organizations, in order to increase their efficiency and effectiveness in dealing with criminal and juvenile justice issues. LEAA is not an operational agency and does not itself directly provide services. LEAA funds are, however, used to support the operations of state and local agencies.

The major share of LEAA funds is distributed to the states in block grants on the basis of population. Funds are allocated to each state contingent upon approval by LEAA of an annual comprehensive state criminal justice plan. These funds are subsequently awarded for individual projects through state planning agencies which administer the program.

LEAA neither approves nor disapproves subgrant applications under the jurisdiction of the state planning agencies. Each state makes those decisions on the basis of its own evaluation of needs and priorities. Projects which address domestic violence are eligible for LEAA funding and numerous states have used portions of their block grant funds for just that purpose.

LEAA is also authorized to award a relatively small portion of its appropriation in the form of direct grants and contracts. These discretionary grants support innovative and experimental programs of national scope.

THE FAMILY VIOLENCE INITIATIVE

In the fall of 1977, LEAA announced a major new discretionary initiative aimed at reducing and preventing domestic violence and sexual abuse. Subsequently, \$1.8 million in fiscal year 1978 funds was awarded to support eleven local demonstration projects which adopted a comprehensive approach and provided for the active involvement of all relevant public and private agencies.

This fiscal year, we plan to provide \$1 million to an additional nine projects, six in rural areas and three in urban jurisdictions. To provide a greater emphasis on the domestic violence problems of the poor, the Community Services

Administration is contributing \$125,000 to the Program and will join us in supporting five of these projects.

The response to our Family Violence Program has been positive. The level of interest is indicated by the fact that we received approximately 1,400 requests for copies of the guidelines. Formal applications were submitted by 130 organizations.

The Family Violence Program is built upon the premise that physical and sexual assaults on family members are crimes and that the criminal justice system therefore has an important role to play in the resolution of these problems. The program focuses on the role of the criminal justice system in preventing and controlling violent and abusive behavior in the home.

By concentrating its resources on the criminal justice system, LEAA does not imply that the part which criminal justice agencies play in the resolution of family violence should be expanded. Instead, we are seeking to define the appropriate responsibilities of the criminal justice system and improve the system's response to crimes in the home.

The approach is termed comprehensive because it foresees the need for cooperative interaction with social service agencies and community-based groups. The tension which normally exists between the punitive nature of the justice system and the treatment models of the social service system must be eased in order to meet this need.

The argument for intervention by the criminal justice system in family violence extends beyond the immediate needs of the victim for protection. Early research suggests a correlation between the abuse of children and their subsequent truancy, running away, drug and alcohol abuse, suicide, and other acts which have the potential to lead to criminal behavior. Furthermore, some evidence suggests that children who witness violence between their parents are more apt to engage in violence themselves than children who are not subjected to such experiences; as spouses and parents, they will become role models for another generation of children.

BASIS FOR THE PROGRAM

The Family Violence Program is the outgrowth of several grants made in earlier years under the Victim/Witness Assistance Program. Through that program, LEAA sought to encourage local governments to improve their response to crime victims and witnesses. Special attention was given to the victims of rape, sexual abuse (including incest) and spousal abuse because victims seldom reported these "sensitive crimes" and were reluctant to cooperate with authorities.

By 1977, it was clear to LEAA that the problem of spouses and children being injured and sexually exploited by family members required new approaches. Grants were made to two hospitals carrying on programs for sexually abused children and four organizations providing shelter and other services for battered women. The experiences of these projects and others like them show that the people who come for assistance are often from families where more than one member is being abused and needs help. The American Humane Association, in a 25-state study funded by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, recently reported that the physical abuse of a spouse has been documented in nearly 20 percent of all validated cases of child abuse and neglect. For this reason, the Family Violence Program focuses on the several forms of victimization that occur in the home, including, but not limited to, child/adolescent abuse, inter-spousal abuse, and abuse of the elderly.

CENTER FOR WOMEN POLICY STUDIES

In June 1977, a grant was made to the Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, D.C., to establish a newsletter and clearinghouse for information-sharing among people concerned with the problems of intra-family violence and sexual assault, as well as to provide technical assistance to community groups interested in initiating and/or improving services for victims of sensitive crime. The grant has since been extended.

The Center sends the newsletter to 20,000 individuals and organizations interested in the field and responds to over 500 requests for information each month. Through this grant, the Center has developed the following materials which are available without charge:

Comprehensive bibliographies on "Child Sexual Abuse," "Domestic Violence," and "Spousal Abuse;"

Guides on "Federal Funding for Family Violence," "Resources for Program Development," "Program Planning for Child Sexual Abuse Programs," and "Interviewing the Child Witness;"

The monthly "Response" newsletter on family violence issues, a well-received and highly respected document;

A listing of contact persons for legislation in each state, and copies of enacted and pending state legislation affecting battered women;

A listing of recommended audio-visual materials on domestic violence;

A national directory of shelters and other services, by state, including sources of funding;

Legal memoranda to assist attorneys representing women who defend themselves against assault.

OTHER CURRENT ACTIVITIES

A number of other activities designed to prevent domestic violence or assist victims are receiving direct LEAA support. These include the following:

In Brattleboro, Vermont, \$91,000 has been provided for a project which provides shelter, social services, counseling, and criminal justice advocacy to women in a rural area;

In New York City, the Family Abuse Project is utilizing a \$148,000 award to provide assistance to victims of family abuse at the intake and assessment stage of the Family Court process;

Alaska has received \$261,000 to implement a statewide Family Violence Program which services eight communities, some extremely isolated.

In Miami, Florida, \$167,000 has been awarded to the Domestic Violence Victims Assistance Program, which provides shelter care and other services to the victims of family violence;

The National Association of Counties has held three meetings to provide training to rural planners interested in family violence programs;

In early May, a National Symposium on Services for the Battering Spouse was held in Belmont, Maryland; this will result in a major publication giving guidance to program personnel;

In September of 1978, a national meeting for district attorneys was held in Memphis, Tennessee, on "The Role of the Prosecutor in Family Violence;"

A grant to the Police Executive Research Forum will result in development of a monograph on "Improving Police Practices in Dealing with Family Violence;"

The Center for the Family of the American Home Economics Association is utilizing LEAA funds to develop family violence educational materials.

Two additional projects receiving LEAA support are aimed at assisting the victims of child sexual abuse:

In Seattle, Washington, \$256,000 has been awarded for the Harborview Hospital Sexually Abused Child-Victim/Witness Project to aid in the provision of assistance to the victim and his or her family, as well as to help improve police and prosecution handling of these cases: the project has resulted in development of a training film entitled "Double Jeopardy" which is used to provide on-site technical assistance to grantees and others;

In Washington, D.C., the Children's Hospital Child Sexual Abuse Victim Assistance Project is using a \$316,000 award to improve the management of child victims by medical, legal, and social service organizations.

INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

LEAA is working closely with other Federal departments and agencies in implementing domestic violence programs. I have already mentioned our joint effort with the Community Services Administration. We participate in the Interdepartmental Committee on Domestic Violence formed by the President this year. LEAA personnel are also working with the staff of HEW's Office of Domestic Violence on several collaborative efforts. That Office may join us in sponsoring the clearinghouse and newsletter of the Center for Women Policy Studies. A coordinated government response to domestic violence should increase the effectiveness of all agency programs.

BLOCK GRANT PROGRAMS

The LEAA Family Violence Program has demonstrated to the states the need for more effective responses to the problem. More and more jurisdictions are moving to initiate projects relating to domestic violence, spouse abuse, and child abuse