

NEWSDAY OP-ED
THE WAR ON AMERICA'S CHILDREN

For decades, Americans have stood out for their compassion for children. As a nation, we have understood that the best investment in our future is the one we make in young people. Today, however, that spirit of caring and concern has given way to a disregard for the neediest and most vulnerable among us and frustration with the choices for change presented to us.

While millions of children are happy, healthy and flourishing in America today, millions of others are in crisis. Twenty-three percent of our children live in poverty and too many go hungry every day. Young children increasingly are bearing children of their own. Drugs, violence, and abuse claim the lives of our young before they reach adulthood. Children from middle class and wealthy families suffer from the effects of divorce and the excesses of consumerism.

Although it is tempting to dismiss these problems as a crisis of the poor, or of some else's family, every family in America feels the ripple effect when children in our society are deprived of basic life necessities or alienated by their lives. We feel it in higher health care costs, increased crime, and a less productive workforce. We feel it in the deterioration of our civil life -- the breakdown of family, a weakening of social and civic institutions and, most tragically, an erosion of values that for two centuries have defined us as a people.

Given the urgency of our social problems, we need a thorough and honest debate about how society can best help children and families. But that discussion is not taking place in Washington today. There is no exchange of ideas. There is simply a mean-spirited attack on nearly every government program designed to help poor and disadvantaged children.

The President has described recent actions in Congress as "a war on the children of our country." The war takes many forms: cuts in current funding, elimination of programs, and block grants in the name of state flexibility. It is a war whose devastation will be felt far beyond \$40 billion in cuts for children's programs over the next five years. Along with Big Bird, school lunches, summer jobs, and aid for poor handicapped children, our notion of what we stand for as a society is in jeopardy.

Many of these short-sighted budget decisions are billed as attempts to control spending and increase state flexibility. In

fact, eviscerating children's programs will not significantly reduce the deficit. The only people who will benefit are families earning more than \$200,000 a year who will be eligible for the Republicans' promised capital gains tax cut.

In only xx days, we have learned that the Contract With America is a financial arrangement -- one that assigns far more importance to the interests of the very wealthy and the very powerful than to the interests of the poor, the needy and the very weak. Any country -- or family -- that views its obligations to children as contractual, rather than moral, is heading in the wrong direction.

Lost in the blizzard of budget cutting and anti-government rhetoric is an appreciation of the vital role that federal programs play in helping children. While we all agree that government needs to be leaner and more efficient, we should remember that not all government programs are bad and not all government funding is excessive. Every day, government does profound good for millions of children and families throughout our nation.

Those who attribute the crisis among today's children to a failure of government miss the point. Government cannot and should not solve all of our social problems. Services alone will not lift a child out of poverty. A school lunch program can help a child's physical and intellectual development, but it can't provide shelter or parental attention. A nutrition program for pregnant women can increase the likelihood of a healthy baby, but it can't protect that baby from violence on the street or abuse in the home.

However, government can provide a safety net that protects our neediest children and families by giving them the opportunity they need to lift themselves out of poverty and become responsible, self-sufficient citizens.

Through federal guarantees of child care assistance for low-income families and those coming off welfare, grants for foster care and adoption assistance, family preservation and support, heating fuel for the disadvantaged, along with basic health and nutrition programs, government keeps the safety net from tearing apart.

And when the safety net is in place, fewer children fall into poverty. Consider the evidence: The child poverty rate declined from the mid 1960s until the early 1970s. It started rising again just after real wages fell in 1973. Then, in the 1980s, when the safety net began fraying, there was a dramatic increase in the percentage of children living in poverty. Not surprisingly, there was also a simultaneous increase in out-of-wedlock teen pregnancies, juveniles incarcerated for violent

Lissa - do you
keep these edits
for posterity? |
Dan

crimes, teenagers dying violently, and low birth weight babies.

The increase during the same period in divorce lowered the standards of living of many women caring for children turning economically stable families into marginal ones.

Congressional attempts to dismantle the safety net represent a total reversal of an historic commitment our nation has made to children.

Few Americans realize that the first federal effort at child care came in 1863, when the government sponsored a nursery for mothers working in Civil War hospitals. Food vouchers, an early version of food stamps, were given to freed slaves after the War. The first federal immunization program was launched at the beginning of the century. Congress established the Children's Bureau in 1909 to safeguard the well-being of children.

Aid for Families with Dependent Children, welfare, began in 1935 as a way to enable mothers, many of them widows, to stay home with their children. Children were protected by labor laws beginning in the 1930s. Congress appropriated funds for emergency maternal and infant care in 1943.

The National School Lunch Act was passed in 1946, after it became evident that many inductees into our Armed Forces in World War II suffered from poor nutrition as children.

Throughout much of our history, children's programs have enjoyed broad, bipartisan support. The most liberal Democrats and the most conservative Republicans have recognized that our nation is prosperous enough to assure all children the opportunity of medical care, education, and basic subsistence. Across party lines, politicians have agreed that early intervention saves money, and lives, and strengthens our time-honored values of opportunity and responsibility.

Together, members of both parties have fought to safeguard the rights of disabled, abused, and hungry children through programs such as WIC, Head Start, the Child Abuse Prevention Act of 1974, the Education of all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, and the Children's Welfare and Adoption Assistance Act of 1980.

Today, however, poor children are less likely to be viewed as objects of concern than as culprits for everything that goes wrong in society. And, in turn, poor children and families are being singled out for punishment.

What happened? There are many reasons.

* Social and economic changes rendered most Americans, particularly those in the middle class who have seen their

incomes stagnate more frustrated about their own situations.

- * Illegitimacy and family breakdown led not only to greater personal insecurity but also public consequences such as increased crime and violence perpetrated by younger teen-agers.

- * The politics of the 1980's focused on individual behaviors of the poor to divert attention from the massive transfer of wealth from the middle class to the rich both in the form of tax breaks for the wealthy and burdens for the middle class. That transfer went hand-in-hand with increasing economic power concentrated in the hands of companies with lobbying influence far greater than the average citizen.

- * The cultural influence of the mass media, ^{underrated} particularly with its emphasis on sex and violence, ~~a yearning for~~ parental authority, which led, in turn, to a yearning for more traditional "family values."

- * Disgust with the waste in government programs and the well-publicized behavior of some recipients, like the stereotypical "welfare queen," overwhelmed feelings of charity.

- * Frustration with the federal government to the exclusion of a political critique of any other institution in the country, such as big business, state or local government, or the mass media, fueled the anger and disappointment of many Americans about their own personal situations in only one direction. Children, especially poor ones, have no powerful lobby. And the guilt many Americans feel about their own children because of divorce, custody fights, longer work hours, shrinking family resources, and all the other kitchen-table issues that affect us is often projected onto other peoples' children.

Instead of scapegoating children, however, we should focus on strategies to help poor ones overcome poverty, and others the anxiety they feel about their futures. We know that every child needs the basic life essentials of food, shelter, health care, schooling, a strong family and love. They also need the security of a strong economy. As the National Council of Bishops stated in a pastoral letter in 1991 entitled, Putting Families First, ". . . many [families] are poor because of economic forces beyond their control: recession, industrial restructuring, erosion of real wages, unemployment and discrimination in hiring and promotion."

We must avoid an unbalanced approach that both denies children services and fails to address the broad economic and social forces that contribute to poverty and family break-up in the first place. Meaningful deficit reduction, the creation of nearly 6 million new jobs, investments in the skills and training of our people are structural changes the President has fought for

because they will help lift children and families out of poverty.

In addition, the bureaucracies delivering services to children must be streamlined and, in some cases, eliminated in favor of ensuring the aid intended is provided. Every change proposed in Congress, whether it affects welfare, nutrition, education or health must be judged in light of the impact it will have on children. We do environmental impact statements to decide if action can be taken in areas where endangered species live. We have areas in our country now where healthy, happy children are themselves endangered and deserve similar concern.

Rather than a contract, we need, as the President has advocated, a New Covenant, a sacred trust between government and the American people and among Americans themselves particularly among adults and children.

Finally, we cannot make progress on behalf of children if parents don't do a better job of assuming responsibility within their own families. Parents must provide love, discipline and nurturing to their children. They must be willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to create a family environment in which children can thrive. Young men and women must delay having children until they have the means to provide love, support, and responsible care. And men who bring children into the world must take responsibility for supporting them whether the children are born out of wedlock or in a marriage that terminates.

In that same pastoral letter I mentioned, the Bishops also wrote that the most important work on behalf of our children "must be done in our homes and our neighborhoods and our community organizations. No government can love a child, and no policy can substitute for a family's care. But at the same time, government can either support or undermine families as they cope with the moral, social and economic stresses of caring for children."

When it comes to safeguarding our children, personal values and national policies both play a role.

###

NEWSDAY OP-ED
THE WAR ON AMERICA'S CHILDREN

For decades, Americans have stood out for their compassion for children. As a nation, we have understood that the best investment in our future is the one we make in young people. Today, however, that spirit of caring and concern has given way to a disregard for the neediest and most vulnerable among us and frustration with the choices for change presented to us.

While millions of children are happy, healthy and flourishing in America today, millions of others are in crisis. Twenty-three percent of our children live in poverty and too many go hungry every day. Young children increasingly are bearing children of their own. Drugs, violence, and abuse claim the lives of our young before they reach adulthood. Even children from middle class and wealthy families suffer from the effects of divorce and the excesses of consumerism.

Although it is tempting to dismiss these problems as a crisis of the poor, or of some else's family, every family in America feels the ripple effect when children in our society are deprived of basic life necessities. We feel it in higher health care costs, increased crime, and a less productive workforce. We feel it in the deterioration of our civil life -- the breakdown of family, a weakening of social and civic institutions and, most tragically, an erosion of values that for two centuries have defined us as a people.

Given the urgency of our social problems, we need a thorough and honest debate about how society can best help children and families. But that discussion is not taking place in Washington today. There is no exchange of ideas. There is simply a mean-spirited attack on nearly every government program designed to help poor and disadvantaged children.

The President has described recent actions in Congress as "a war on the children of our country." The war takes many forms: cuts in current funding, elimination of programs, and block grants in the name of state flexibility. It is a war whose devastation will be felt far beyond \$40 billion in cuts for children's programs over the next five years. Along with Big Bird, school lunches, summer jobs, and aid for poor handicapped children, our notion of what we stand for as a society is in jeopardy.

Many of these short-sighted budget decisions are billed as attempts to control spending and increase state flexibility. In

fact, eviscerating children's programs will not significantly reduce the deficit. The only people who will benefit are families earning more than \$200,000 a year who will be eligible for the Republicans' promised capital gains tax cut.

In only xx days, we have learned that the Contract With America is a financial arrangement -- one that assigns far more importance to the interests of the very wealthy and the very powerful than to the interests of the poor, the needy and the very weak. Any country -- or family -- that views its obligations to children as contractual, rather than moral, is heading in the wrong direction.

Lost in the blizzard of budget cutting and anti-government rhetoric is an appreciation of the vital role that federal programs play in helping children. While we all agree that government needs to be leaner and more efficient, we should remember that not all government programs are bad and not all government funding is excessive. Every day, government does profound good for millions of children and families throughout our nation.

Those who attribute the crisis among today's children to a failure of government miss the point. Government cannot and should not solve all of our social problems. Services alone will not lift a child out of poverty. A school lunch program can help a child's physical and intellectual development, but it can't provide shelter or parental attention. A nutrition program for pregnant women can increase the likelihood of a healthy baby, but it can't protect that baby from violence on the street or abuse in the home.

However, government can provide a safety net that protects our neediest children and families by giving them the opportunity they need to lift themselves out of poverty and become responsible, self-sufficient citizens.

Through federal guarantees of child care assistance for low-income families and those coming off welfare, grants for foster care and adoption assistance, family preservation and support, heating fuel for the disadvantaged, along with basic health and nutrition programs, government keeps the safety net from tearing apart.

And when the safety net is in place, fewer children fall into poverty. Consider the evidence: The child poverty rate declined from the mid 1960s until the early 1970s. It started rising again just after real wages fell in 1973. Then, in the 1980s, when the safety net began fraying, there was a dramatic increase in the percentage of children living in poverty. Not surprisingly, there was also a simultaneous increase in out-of-wedlock teen pregnancies, juveniles incarcerated for violent

crimes, teenagers dying violently, and low birth weight babies.

The increase during the same period in divorce lowered the standards of living of many women caring for children turning economically stable families into marginal ones.

Congressional attempts to dismantle the safety net represent a total reversal of an historic commitment our nation has made to children.

Few Americans realize that the first federal effort at child care came in 1863, when the government sponsored a nursery for mothers working in Civil War hospitals. Food vouchers, an early version of food stamps, were given to freed slaves after the War. The first federal immunization program was launched at the beginning of the century. Congress established the Children's Bureau in 1909 to safeguard the well-being of children.

Aid for Families with Dependent Children, welfare, began in 1935 as a way to enable mothers, many of them widows, to stay home with their children. Children were protected by labor laws beginning in the 1930s. Congress appropriated funds for emergency maternal and infant care in 1943.

The National School Lunch Act was passed in 1946, after it became evident that many inductees into our Armed Forces in World War II suffered from poor nutrition as children.

Throughout much of our history, children's programs have enjoyed broad, bipartisan support. The most liberal Democrats and the most conservative Republicans have recognized that our nation is prosperous enough to assure all children the opportunity of medical care, education, and basic subsistence. Across party lines, politicians have agreed that early intervention saves money, and lives, and strengthens our time-honored values of opportunity and responsibility.

Together, members of both parties have fought to safeguard the rights of disabled, abused, and hungry children through programs such as WIC, Head Start, the Child Abuse Prevention Act of 1974, the Education of all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, and the Children's Welfare and Adoption Assistance Act of 1980.

Today, however, poor children are less likely to be viewed as objects of concern than as culprits for everything that goes wrong in society. And, in turn, poor children and families are being singled out for punishment.

There are many reasons.

What happened? Social and economic changes rendered most Americans, particularly those in the middle class who have seen their incomes stagnate more frustrated about their own situations. Illegitimacy and family breakdown led not only to

~~That transfer~~ ^{and went hand-in-hand with}
greater personal insecurity but also public consequences such as increased crime and violence perpetrated by younger teen-agers. The politics of the 1980's focused on individual behaviors of the poor to divert attention from the massive transfer of wealth from the middle class to the rich both in the form of tax breaks for the wealthy and burdens for the middle class, as ~~worded~~ well as increasing economic power concentrated in the hands of companies with lobbying influence far greater than the average citizen.

~~Anxiety about~~ The cultural influence of the mass media, particularly with its emphasis on sex and violence, and a yearning ^{for} to return to more traditional "family values."

Disgust with the waste in ^{government} programs and the well-publicized behavior of some recipients, like the stereotypical "welfare queen," ^{lost any sense of authority, which led, in turn, to} ~~was~~ ^{an} ~~entire~~ ^{feeling of} ~~charity.~~

~~The disrespect displayed by many youth toward adults and authority.~~

Frustration with the federal government to the exclusion of a political critique of any other institution in the country, such as big business, state or local governments, or the mass media fueled the anger and disappointment of many Americans about their own personal situations in only one direction. Children, especially poor ones, have no powerful lobby. And the guilt many Americans feel about their own children because of divorce, custody fights, longer work hours, shrinking family resources, and all the other kitchen-table issues that affect us is often projected onto other peoples' children.

Instead of scapegoating ^{poor ones} ~~poor~~ children, ^{however,} we should focus on strategies to help ~~them~~ overcome poverty. ^{and others the anxiety that they feel about their future} We know that every child needs the basic life essentials of food, shelter, health care, schooling, a strong family and love. They also need the security of a strong economy. As the National Council of Bishops stated in a pastoral letter in 1991 entitled, Putting Families First, "... many [families] are poor because of economic forces beyond their control: recession, industrial restructuring, erosion of real wages, unemployment and discrimination in hiring and promotion."

We must avoid an unbalanced approach that both denies children services and fails to address the broad economic and social forces that contribute to poverty and family break-up in the first place. Meaningful deficit reduction, the creation of nearly 6 million new jobs, investments in the skills and training of our people are structural changes the President has fought for because they will help lift children and families out of poverty.

In addition, the bureaucracies delivering services to children must be streamlined and, in some cases, eliminated in

favor of ensuring the aid intended is provided. Every change proposed in Congress, whether it affects welfare, or nutrition or education or health must be judged in light of the impact it will have on children. We do environmental impact statements to decide if action can be taken in areas where endangered species live. We have areas in our country now where healthy, happy children are themselves endangered and deserve similar concern.

Rather than a contract, we need, as the President has advocated, a New Covenant, a sacred trust between government and the American people and among Americans themselves particularly among adults and children.

In that same pastoral letter I ~~just~~ mentioned, the Bishops also wrote that the most important work on behalf of our children "must be done in our homes and our neighborhoods and our community organizations. No government can love a child, and no policy can substitute for a family's care. But at the same time, government can either support or undermine families as they cope with the moral, social and economic stresses of caring for children."

Finally, we cannot make progress on behalf of children if parents don't do a better job of assuming responsibility within their own families. Parents must provide love, and nurturing to their children. They must be willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to create a family environment in which children can thrive. Young men and women must delay having children until they have the means to provide love, support, and responsible care. And men who bring children into the world must take responsibility for supporting them whether the children are born out of wedlock or in a marriage that terminates.

When it comes to safeguarding our children, personal values and national policies ~~must~~ both play a role.

###

PHOTOCOPY
HRC HANDWRITING

**NEWSDAY OP-ED
THE WAR ON AMERICA'S CHILDREN**

For decades

Americans ~~always~~ have stood out for their compassion for children. As a nation, we have understood that the best investment in our future is the one we make in young people. Today, however, that spirit of caring and concern has given way to a ~~callous~~ disregard for the neediest and most vulnerable among us. *and frustration w. the ~~over~~ The choices for change presented to us.*

While millions of children are happy, healthy and flourishing in America today, millions of others are in crisis. Twenty-three percent of our children live in poverty and too many go hungry every day. Young children increasingly are bearing children of their own. Drugs, violence, and abuse claim the lives of our young before they reach adulthood. *Even children from middle class and wealthy families suffer from the effects of divorce and the excesses of consumerism.*

Although it is tempting to dismiss these problems as a crisis of the poor, every family in America feels the ripple effect when children in our society are deprived of basic life necessities. We feel it in higher health care costs, increased *teenage suicide +* crime, and a less productive workforce. We feel it in the deterioration of our civil life -- the breakdown of family, a weakening of social and civic institutions and, most tragically, an erosion of values that for two centuries have defined us as a people.

Given the urgency of our social problems, we need a thorough and honest debate about how society can best help children and families. But that discussion is not taking place in Washington today. There is no exchange of ideas. There is simply a mean-spirited attack on nearly every government program designed to help poor and disadvantaged children.

The President has described recent actions in Congress as "a war on the children of our country." The war takes many forms: cuts in current funding, elimination of programs, and block grants in the name of state flexibility. It is a war whose devastation will be felt far beyond \$40 billion in cuts for children's programs over the next five years. Along with Big Bird, school lunches, summer jobs, and aid for poor handicapped children, our notion of what we stand for as a society is in jeopardy.

Many of these short-sighted budget decisions are billed as attempts to control spending and increase state flexibility. In fact, eviscerating children's programs will not significantly reduce the deficit. The only people who will benefit are families earning more than \$200,000 a year who will be eligible for ~~a~~ the capital gains tax cut.

In only xx days, we have learned that the Contract With America is a financial arrangement -- one that assigns far more importance to the interests of the very wealthy and the very powerful than to the interests of the poor, the needy and the very weak.

Any country or family - that views its obligations to children as contractual rather than moral, is heading in the wrong direction.

Lost in the blizzard of budget cutting and anti-government rhetoric is an appreciation of the vital role that federal programs play in helping children. While we all agree that government needs to be leaner and more efficient, we should remember that not all government programs are bad and not all government funding is excessive. Every day, government does profound good for millions of children and families throughout our nation.

Those who attribute the crisis among today's children to a failure of government miss the point. Government cannot and should not solve all of our social problems. Services alone will not lift a child out of poverty. A school lunch program can help a child's physical and intellectual development, but it can't provide shelter. A nutrition program for pregnant women can increase the likelihood of a healthy baby, but it can't pay the rent ~~or~~ protect that baby from violence on the street or abuse in the home.

However, government can provide a safety net that protects our neediest children and families by giving them the tools they need to lift themselves out of poverty and become responsible, self-sufficient citizens.

Through federal guarantees of child care assistance for low-income families and those coming off welfare, grants for foster care and adoption assistance, family preservation and support, heating fuel for the disadvantaged, along with basic health and nutrition programs, government keeps the safety net from tearing apart.

And when the safety net is in place, fewer children fall into poverty. Consider the evidence: The child poverty rate declined from the mid 1960s until the early 1970s. It started rising again just after real wages fell in 1973. Then, in the 1980s, when the safety net began fraying, there was a dramatic increase in the percentage of children living in poverty. Not surprisingly, there was also a simultaneous increase in out-of-wedlock teen pregnancies, juveniles incarcerated for violent crimes, teenagers dying violently, and low birth weight babies.

Congressional attempts to dismantle the safety net represent a total reversal of an historic commitment our nation has made to children.

Few Americans realize that the first federal effort at child care came in 1863, when the government sponsored a nursery for

The increase during the same period in divorce lowered the standards of living of many women caring for children turning ~~poor~~ ^{economically} stable families ~~that had been~~ into marginal ones.

mothers working in Civil War hospitals. Food vouchers, an early version of food stamps, were given to freed slaves after the War. The first federal immunization program was launched at the beginning of the century. Congress established the Children's Bureau in 1909 to safeguard the well-being of children.

Aid for Families with Dependent Children, welfare, began in 1935 as a way to enable mothers, many of them widows, to stay home with their children. Children were protected by labor laws beginning in the 1930s. Congress appropriated funds for emergency maternal and infant care in 1943.

The National School Lunch Act was passed in 1946, after it became evident that many inductees into our Armed Forces in World War II suffered from poor nutrition as children.

Throughout much of our history, children's programs have enjoyed broad, bipartisan support. The most liberal Democrats and the most conservative Republicans have recognized that our nation is prosperous enough to assure all children the opportunity of medical care, education, and basic subsistence. Across party lines, politicians have agreed that early intervention saves money, and lives, and strengthens our time-honored values of opportunity and responsibility.

Together, members of both parties have fought to safeguard the rights of disabled, abused, and hungry children through programs such as WIC, Head Start, the Child Abuse Prevention Act of 1974, the Education of all Handicapped Children Act of 1975, and the Children's Welfare and Adoption Assistance Act of 1980.

Today, however, poor children are less likely to be viewed as objects of concern than as culprits for everything that goes wrong in society. And, in turn, poor children and families are being singled out for punishment.

Instead of scapegoating poor children, we should focus on strategies to help them overcome poverty. We know that every child needs the the basic life essentials of food, shelter, health care, schooling, a strong family and love. They also need the security of a strong economy. As the National Council of Bishops stated in a pastoral letter in 1991 entitled, Putting Families First, "... many [families] are poor because of economic forces beyond their control: recession, industrial restructuring, erosion of real wages, unemployment and discrimination in hiring and promotion."

We must avoid an unbalanced approach that both denies children services and fails to address the broad economic and social forces that contribute to poverty in the first place. Meaningful deficit reduction, the creation of nearly 6 million new jobs, investments in the skills and training of our people

and family breakup

① What happened? Social and economic changes rendered most Americans, particularly those in the middle class who have seen their incomes stagnate despite more frustrated about their own situations. Family breakdown led to not only to ^{ill health and} ~~increased~~ ^{greater} personal insecurity but also public consequences such as increased crime and violence perpetrated by ~~our~~ young teenagers. The Politics of

③ Anxiety about the cultural influence of the mass media particularly with its emphasis on sex and violence and a yearning to return to more traditional "family values."

Disgust with the waste in programs and the well-publicized behavior of some recipients like the stereotypical "Welfare Queen." The disrespect displayed by many youth toward adults and authority.

Frustration with ^{the federal} government to the exclusion of ^{any} political ~~reasoned~~ critique of any other institution in the country such as big business, state or local government, or the mass media fueled the anger and disappointment of many Americans about their own personal situations in only one direction. Children, especially poor ones, have no powerful lobby. And of the guilt many Americans feel about their own children because of divorce, custody fights, longer work hours, shrinking family resources, and all the other kitchen table issues that affect us is often projected onto other people's children. ~~also~~

④ The 1980's focused on individual behaviors of the poor to divert attention from the massive transfer of wealth from the middle class to the rich that political strategy is both in the form of tax breaks for the wealthy ^{and} burdens for the middle class as well as ~~and~~ increasing economic ^{power} concentrated in the hands of companies with lobbying influence far greater than the average citizen.

are structural changes the President has fought for because they will help lift children and families out of poverty. (1)

Finally, we cannot make progress on behalf of children if parents don't do a better job of assuming responsibility within their own families. Parents must provide love and nurturing to their children. They must be willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to create a family environment in which children can thrive. In some cases, young men and women must delay having children until they have the means to provide love, support, and responsible care. And men who bring children into the world must admit paternity and take responsibility for supporting them whether the children are born out of wedlock or in a marriage that terminates.

When it comes to safeguarding our children, personal values and national policies must both play a role.

###

(3)
Insert
p. 5
(X)

In that same pastoral letter I just mentioned,
the bishops also wrote that the . . .

Every change proposed in Congress
whether it affects welfare or
nutrition or education or
health must be judged in light
of the impact it will have on children.
We do environmental impact statements to

(1)
In addition, the bureaucracies delivering
services to children must be streamlined and,
in some cases, eliminated in favor of insuring
as much as possible that the aid intended is
provided. Rather than a contract, we need
as the President has advocated a New
Covenant, a sacred trust between government and
the American people and among Americans themselves
particularly among adults and children.

themselves, including and because of their own.

PHOTOCOPY
HRC HANDWRITING