

HB

631

**REQUEST**

Bill/Resolution No. HB 631

Title: Relating to runaway children

Sponsor: icka

Requestor: \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Request: 2/23/84

**FISCAL DETAIL**

Agency Affected: Dept. of Health & Social Services

Program Category Affected: Social and Economic

Assistance for the General Population

BRU, Program or Subprogram(s) Affected:

Youth Services BRU/McLaughlin Youth Center

**EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)**

	FY 84	FY 85	FY 85	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89
<b>OPERATING</b>						
100 PERSONAL SERVICES				907.5	952.9	1,000.5
200 TRAVEL				25.2	26.5	27.8
300 CONTRACTUAL				122.6	128.7	135.1
400 SUPPLIES				113.8	119.5	125.5
500 EQUIPMENT				23.3	24.5	25.8
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS				98.2	103.1	108.3
800 MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>			-0-	1,290.6	1,355.2	1,423.0
<b>CAPITAL</b>			15,442.0			
<b>REVENUE</b>						

**FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)**

GENERAL FUND		15,442.0	1,290.6	1,355.2	1,423.0
FEDERAL FUNDS					
OTHER					
<b>TOTAL</b>					

**POSITIONS:**

FULL-TIME			16.0	16.0	16.0
PART-TIME					
TEMPORARY					

**SOURCE OF FUNDS TO OFFSET FISCAL IMPACT OF BILL:**

**ANALYSIS:** Attach a separate page for analysis

Prepared By: Michael Price, Director *JCC*

Phone: 465-3170

Division: Family and Youth Services

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by Commissioner: Robert Gordon Smith

Date: 3/1/84

Agency: Department of Health and Social Services

Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note):

Legislative Finance

Legislative Sponsor

Requestor

Office of Management and Budget

Impacted Agency(ies)

# Alaska State Legislature

## COMMITTEES

Vice Chairman — Judiciary  
Vice Chairman — Legislative  
Regulations Review  
Resources  
Finance Sub Committee on Labor



While in Session  
Pouch V  
State Capitol  
Juneau, Alaska 99811  
(907) 465-3733

Home - District 15  
Star Route Box 421  
Eagle River, Alaska 99577  
(907) 688-2526

## House of Representatives

John J. Liska

May 11, 1984

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Rep. Bussell, Chairman - House Judiciary Committee

FROM: Rep. John J. Liska

SUBJECT: HB 631, "An Act relating to runaway children."

The purpose of this bill is three fold.

- a. Section 1 - is an attempt to require by law a minor to be accountable to either parents at home or a guardian at a foster home or be placed in an appropriate institution.

Presently, if a minor runs away from home, and he is not breaking any laws, he is free to do as he wishes. The intention behind our bill is - The child does not have the maturity to exist in today's society without becoming a subject of prey for a variety of undesirable types of people. If you will refer to item D, Article number 1 - in your packet, it clearly describes what happens to these run away children.

While it is not the intention to violate the rights of any child, we feel it is the responsibility of either the parents or the State to be in control of the minor because at this stage in their life they are not mature enough to be able to function in society on their own.

And the last section of the bill states that a peace officer shall make a reasonable effort to locate a minor who is evading his guardian. Presently the police can, if they want to but they don't have to, try to locate a run away child.

Additionally, it is essential in my opinion that these children not be allowed to remain on the streets, even for a couple of days or long enough to decide at a court hearing whether or not they are to be picked up.

I refer to item D, Article number 2, the longer they are on the streets the more likely they will become involved in situations that will have a life long effect on them. We feel they are incapable of protecting themselves from this involvement and therefore it is the states responsibility to protect them.

May 11, 1984

Page two

In your packet you will find the following for your information:

- A. Copy of HB 631 and committee substitute.
- B. Memorandum from Jos Mapranath, Director-Division of Administrative Services, Department of Public Safety.
- C. Article regarding runaway children.
  - 1. From USA Today March 1979, Life in America, "The Adolescent Runaway: A national Problem"
  - 2. Newsweek Oct. 18, 1982, Life/Style, "A Nation of Runaway Kids"
  - 3. "A second look at the National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth." By Caroline Croft and Mary Jolly.

JJL/tm

# MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska <sup>JAN 11 1984</sup>

TO: Jay Hogan, Associate Director  
Division of Budget Review  
Office of Management and Budget  
Office of the Governor

DATE: January 6, 1984

FILE NO:

TELEPHONE NO:

465-4322

FROM: *Jos*  
Jos Mapranath, Director  
Division of Administrative Services  
Department of Public Safety

SUBJECT: Criminally Exploited  
Children

We have reviewed the materials submitted on criminally exploited children in Alaska and wish to express our support for the formation of a special law enforcement unit in Anchorage to deal with this serious problem. The unit would be a joint State and local cooperative effort similar to the successful Anchorage Metro Drug Unit. The cost is estimated at \$375.0 for FY 85 and would include one Anchorage P.D. Sergeant, one Anchorage Police Officer, one Anchorage clerical position, and one State Trooper Sergeant.

While we recognize the seriousness of criminal exploitation of children and that this is a growing problem, it is not feasible at this time for either the Anchorage Police Department or the Division of Alaska State Troopers to divert limited existing resources to form the proposed special unit. We would, however, be pleased to participate in such an effort if funding is provided. Therefore, I urge your support of an appropriation in the amount of \$375.0 to fund a special investigative unit on criminally exploited children.

Further details are available upon request. Your consideration of the requested appropriation to deal with this problem is appreciated.

cc: Commissioner Robert J. Sundberg  
Commissioner Roger Endell  
Peter B. McDowell, OMB  
Brian Porter, Chief, APD  
Colonel Michael C. Kolivosky, AST  
Marroyce Hall, AK Juvenile Crime Commission  
Sandra Borbridge, Spec. Assistant to the Governor  
Allen Blume, Spec. Staff Assistant to the Governor

TO: Mrs Hall

FROM:

LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER KNOWLEDGABLE IN THE FIELD  
OF CHILD EXPLOITATION. OFFICERS NAME DELETED AS A  
POLICY OF THE ANCHORAGE POLICE DEPARTMENT

DATE: October 20, 1981

SUBJECT: Criminal Activities of Juveniles in Anchorage

The purpose of this brief letter is to state my opinion of the status of current criminal activity involving juveniles in the Anchorage area. As you know I have been a police officer for the past five plus years in the Anchorage area and have worked for two different periods as a counselor at McLaughlin Youth Center. What I am stating here is strictly my opinion and does not represent in any way the viewpoint of my employer, the Anchorage Police Department.

During recent years Anchorage, as well as other communities within the State of Alaska, has experienced a tremendous increase in the level and depth of juvenile criminal activity. I believe that this is in part due to the tremendous growth that this community and this State have experienced in recent years and also because of the ineffectiveness of the criminal justice system to deal with the problem. My opinion of the current status of this activity has developed because of my involvement with juveniles in the community and as a result of my involvement in numerous investigations dealing with some of these problems.

What has developed in this community, as is characteristic of other communities in other States, is a network of criminal activity of which juveniles play a substantial part. This has developed to the extent that many of our young persons so exposed actually are a part of a sub-culture existing in the same space but at different times within the mainstream of our society. This subculture has a set of values and morals that are substantially different than those of the mainbody of our society and paramount within this set of values is the belief that youth equates to victimization. When a young person in our community is, for a variety and combination of reasons, forced out of the home environment and onto the "streets" (so to speak), he is subjected to an elaborate system of victimization on the part of adults within the community who, in essence, use youth to their advantage in the perpetuation of their criminal activities and personal desires.

A young person finding himself/herself within this position is necessarily forced to first, survive. In order to do this, the youth must engage in activities which an adult can support. These activities extend from theft to drug usage/sales and prostitution. Adults involved in these activities will promote the involvement of juveniles to the advantage of the adult while at the same time providing for the juvenile, as a minimum, the basic needs of food, clothing and shelter needed by the juvenile to survive. Juveniles within this community are extensively involved in theft, drugs and prostitution and these activities are promoted and supported by adults within the community. The extent of the

problem is largely unseen, even by many persons within the criminal justice system who deal with these juveniles daily as a part of their jobs, because the juvenile does not often talk about depth of involvement to anyone, other than his/her peer group and in some cases, not even to them. The system tends to look at each individual act by itself, failing to realize that there is a much greater problem, individually and collectively, lurking below the surface of the individual act.

As an example of what I have previously stated, I would estimate that about 50% of all the boys admitted to McLaughlin Youth Center have had some contact with adults of a homosexual nature. I would further estimate that in excess of 25% of these have had what could be termed deep involvement with more than one adult. Often, this kind of activity, develops in relation to other types of activity including the adult using the juvenile for drug sales and to provide merchandise for fencing operations of small and large scale. It is not surprising then, that when the juvenile so involved is picked up for a property crime or drug related offense, the depth of his involvement is never revealed to those professionals within the system that later deal with him.

Any juvenile who, for whatever reasons, spends more than a short amount of time living away from a home and on the "streets" will become involved to a greater or lesser degree in the kind of activity I have just described. Since the adult(s) involved use the juvenile for their purposes, the normal role of adult guidance in the maturing process is severely distorted which in turn perpetuates the problem as the juvenile grows older and changes from being the victim to the user. Over a period of time of involvement in these kinds of activities the youth gradually begins to believe that the only thing that will change his being used to another's advantage is age and that when that age is attained the role can be reversed.

It is virtually impossible for a young person to survive away from home without becoming involved in these kinds of activities because of the inability of a young person to legitimately obtain the basic necessities of food, clothing and shelter necessary for survival. It is further, virtually impossible, for that young person to steal enough through burglary, robbery or theft to attain these necessities. As such, the young person in that position, must turn to other more profitable activities. These activities involve drugs and prostitution. The problem is further compounded, in most cases, because of the emotional problems that the youth is experiencing as the result of his necessity to leave the home or to replace the home needs with persons met outside the home and his resultant turn towards drug useage. Drugs are expensive and not within the reach of the average young person through legitimate earnings. Adults desiring use of juveniles for sexual purposes are well aware of the juvenile's problems and will frequently provide, either the basic needs of survival, or drugs or both in return for sexual favors. In many cases, the juvenile can provide sexual favors for a much higher than could be obtained through other types of criminal activity. Adults desiring these kind of favors are very perceptive in being able to identify those juveniles that are in a position to which they would be susceptible to such propositions.

All this exists on a large scale in the Anchorage area. The extent of this existence increases steadily because of the inability of the Criminal Justice System and the community to control it. I would estimate that the extent of the

problem in Anchorage is proportionately greater than it is in other comparable communities in the United States, again for a variety of reasons. It is common knowledge that large scale fencing operations exist within the Anchorage area as is evidenced by the very small percentage of stolen property that is recovered and the relatively high frequency of recovery of stolen property from Alaska in other states. The extent of drug sales operations and drug useage amongst juveniles in the Anchorage area, again, is particularly high to the extent that it is virtually impossible for any young person not to be exposed to drugs, and not just marijuana, beginning in junior high school. The extent of juvenile prostitution activities, particularly as it involves males, is also extremely high in the Anchorage area to the degree that virtually all juveniles living out of the home are exposed and many still living at home are exposed.

There exists, in Anchorage, houses where juveniles on the run can find temporary shelter. These houses are provided either directly or indirectly by an adult. Unfortunately, there are strings attached to the use of the house by the juvenile. There have been commercial pornography operations involving sexual involvement of juveniles in the most perverted kinds of sexual activity operating in the Anchorage area. These operations have been directed by organizations from without the State of Alaska. There have been commercial prostitution operations within the Anchorage area in which juveniles were the merchandise and in which the fees paid were extremely high. There have been large scale drug operations in which juveniles, many of them going to school and living at home, were involved as the primary pushers. There have been large scale fencing operations in the Anchorage area in which merchandise stolen by juveniles was fenced by adults to create huge profits.

The depth of this whole problem is really seen when one realizes what becomes of the juvenile that is involved in these kinds of activities. All young persons growing up need adult guidance and emotional support in order that a moral and value system can develop. If the child receives, for this need, guidance and "emotional support" from persons that only wish to use him, it is understandable how we are developing a subculture of increasing size within the mainstream of our primary culture, in which the value system is as foreign as one would be from a far Eastern country. The use of youth for personal gain is as foreign to the basis of our culture as is the crime of murder and yet we are allowing this to exist, and to in fact grow, within the Anchorage area to a massive degree. Much of this problem is a criminal problem and must be solved through enforcement means. To this end we are sorely lacking.

LIFE IN AMERICA

# The Adolescent Runaway:

## A NATIONAL PROBLEM

*"No one seems willing to accept clear responsibility for the thousands of children over 15 who stand outside the jurisdiction of family courts, criminal courts, and, in large part, the child welfare system."*

by Bruce Ritter, O.F.M.

OVER a decade ago I became involved, almost against my will, with one of the major problems of any large metropolitan area when 10 runaway children, from the ages of 14-17, sought my help, asking to sleep on the floor of my apartment in the East Village of New York City. I was exercising at that time a ministry of service to the poor. These particular 10 children had been sexually abused by some punks in the neighborhood, had been burned out of the abandoned building in which they were living, and before that had been forced to make a pornographic movie in order to pay for their room and board.

Because I could not find any place for them in the child welfare system, I kept them. They simply moved into my apartment. So many hundreds of homeless young people began knocking on my door that I and my friends were forced to begin a new child care agency. Since that time, over 10 years ago, Covenant House has sheltered

many thousands of runaway and self-emancipated kids, returning many to their homes and keeping many for long-term care. Hundreds upon hundreds were victims of child abuse.

Many people are unaware of the enormous dimensions of the problem of runaways and homeless children in our society—or what can happen to them. Over 1,000,000 juveniles run away every year in this country. According to a New York City Police estimate, there are at least 20,000 runaways under 16 in New York City at any one time. If you add to that number the many thousands of *self-emancipated* youngsters between the ages of 16-18 and even the greater number between 19 and 21, the numbers of children on the streets are staggering.

These numbers are not just pulled out of a rhetorical hat. In the first year after the Covenant House crisis center, Under Twenty One, was opened (April 1, 1977), well over 4,000 children have sought our help, over 500 of them were 15 and under, another 900 were between 16 and 17, and over 1,500 between 18 and 20. Covenant House expects to serve about 3,000 walk-in children under 18 at its Eighth Avenue center this year who should not be on the streets, but for whom no effective programs exist. As a result, these children are frequently subjected to the

grossest kind of abuse. About 7,000 children under the age of 21 had come to Under Twenty One for help during 1978.

### A question of responsibility

The very complex issues raised by these thousands of homeless young people cross a dozen different jurisdictions—states' rights, parents' rights, children's rights, family and criminal court questions, the nature of the child care system, etc. The thinking and practice regarding the rights of juveniles has been evolving so quickly over the past 10 years that legislators have had great difficulty keeping up with the changing status of juveniles in our country. The ambiguity and confusion and differences in statutes between one state and another and within the same state make it almost impossible on occasion to resolve the legal status of a runaway or homeless child. Until recently, the problem of runaways was always considered essentially a police matter. The juveniles were to be found and returned home. Yet, an overburdened New York City police force can no longer cope with the huge numbers (there is a seven man unit assigned for that purpose) and the police do not have any jurisdiction over children 16 and older.

*Editor Bruce Ritter is the Executive Director of Covenant House and Under Twenty One, a child care agency in New York City that specializes in caring for runaway and homeless children and urban youth.*

to problem, is especially acute for 16 and over since the law simultaneously permits a child of 16 to disempower himself and then effectively disfranchises that child. For the most part, a child can not get the medical care he or she needs, can not easily apply for public assistance, can not enter into contracts, and can not find a decent job. Children are free to wander the streets, panhandling, exploiting, and being exploited. No one seems willing, either, to accept clear responsibility for the thousands of children of 15 who stand outside the jurisdiction of family courts, criminal courts, or in large part, the child welfare system. Neither Special Services for Children, the Division for Youth, or the Department of Social Services will get into immediate jurisdiction and responsibility for a 16 year old boy or girl wandering up and down 42nd Street, so it is manifestly not in the best interest of the child or the general public to permit this to happen, *some jurisdiction must take the clear responsibility.* We operate on a principle, originally, of *caveat puer*—let the child beware. Covenant House can document an almost endless series of children of 15 for whom it can find no one to accept responsibility—no court, no family, no part of the child welfare system. The tangle of conflicting jurisdictions, of vague and ambiguous laws, a severe fiscal crisis, and the fact that most of these kids are black and panish make it easy to let them fall through the cracks. Many thousands of them become willing or unwilling victims of the \$1,500,000,000 sex industry that feeds on children in the Times Square area. They have few options—cold, hungry, homeless, desperate for attention, they fall easy prey to the sex merchants who know all too well how to exploit them. These children find it almost impossible to get help. Until Covenant House, with the help of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese, opened its Under Twenty One crisis center on April 1, 1977, there were absolutely no services for these thousands of children in the Times Square area. Covenant House is always understaffed, underfinanced, and overwhelmed by the numbers of children coming to us at all hours of the day and night.

During the first year that Under Twenty One was open, over 4,000 children came to us for help and over 60% of these had some contact, major or minor, with prostitution and pornography. The list of horror stories are both

- A 14 year old boy chased into our center by his pimp, a man of 40, who had a broken bottle. The man wanted to kill the boy, who had escaped after being held prisoner for six weeks in a Times Square hotel.

- A pimp who offered us \$500 for a young girl in our center.

- A 16 year old call boy with a contract on him. All he wanted to do was escape. He had made the mistake of ripping off one of his johns.

- A 14 year old girl, held prisoner, raped, and forced into prostitution, her hair dyed and with a false I.D. saying she was 18, who had gotten a job in an Eighth Avenue strip joint.

They are not bad kids and it is wrong to think that they are. They are good kids whose only crime is, for the most part, to be cold, hungry, and homeless, with no skills, no resources, cut off from jobs or the possibility of getting medical help or public assistance. Since they have nothing to sell, except themselves, they are easily victimized and abused by the so called victimless crime of prostitution.

There are many hundreds of juveniles caught up in a vicious, degrading life style that kills many of them. They are caught in a kind of quicksand and can not easily escape. Hundreds will come, have already come, to Under Twenty One this year. Under Twenty One stays open 24 hours a day and offers a kid no questions when he or she asks for help—food, shelter, protection from their pimp and exploiters, a chance to go home again if that is possible, a chance to get a job, to go to school, to begin to think that they might live. Many times I have heard a kid say "Bruce, I'm not going to make it, I'm going to die out there, the street is going to kill me." A 17 year old boy said to me recently,

"Bruce, can you give me one reason why I shouldn't jump off the Brooklyn Bridge?" It was hard for me to answer.

### What can be done

Why do we permit it? Why and how can such a wholesale abuse and neglect of children happen in our society? We seem both unable and unwilling to do anything about it.

There is much that can and must be done. It would be easy and unfair to attack the police for inadequate enforcement of existing laws. The police in New York City quite clearly have limited ability to achieve effective enforcement. At the same time, however, it is quite clear that the crime of child prostitution and abuse is not a priority for our police. Neither is it a priority for our district attorneys and the Attorney General, nor the judges of our

criminal courts, who could exercise a little more fortitude in handing out sentences, nor for our politicians, who only seem to discover the problem of child abuse and prostitution around election time.

Prostitution and this loathesome child abuse are big business and are obviously protected. What other reason could explain the apparent immunity with which this blatant, sick, savage destruction of children is carried on in our society?

We not only need more effective enforcement and more vigorous prosecution of the criminals that buy and sell children and more effective community action, we also need programs to help the thousands of juveniles on the streets that turn to prostitution simply in order to survive.

As I recently stated

"Last night 67 children came in off the street looking for a bed. Because we were able to provide one for them, they did not sleep on the street or in someone else's bed. We are almost without funds, our resources are still strained to the utmost. With the cold weather coming on, we estimate that as many as 80 or 100 kids a night will come to us for help. We are committed to not sending a child away without a bed. I did it once, and I can't do it again. As long as I live I can never forget the faces of the kids that knocked on my door every day, one night. One of them said, 'Are you Bruce?' and I said I was, and he said, 'Do you take kids in?' and I said, 'Yes,' and he said, 'Can we stay with you?' I said, 'No, because we have no room,' and he began to cry and he said, 'Where can I go and what can I do?' I said, 'You can go back into the street and look out.' And he stopped crying and looked at me and said, 'I can do that.' He did. They both went back onto the street. One boy was 15, the other was 14."

Our records can document hundreds of cases of child abuse and maltreatment, drawn at random from our files. Based on our experience at Under Twenty One, we can distinguish three broad categories of gross child abuse: abuse within a family setting, abuse on the street, and abuse by bureaucracy.

### Abuse within a family setting

In these cases, children came to Under 21 because of abuse by parents or guardians and because they did not have any other recourse. Typically, this is the tragic plight of thousands of runaway children who every year find themselves in a dangerous and punitive situation far from home. This type of child abuse is certainly the best known and considered the public attention has already been focused on it. The following are typical examples.

The program is financed by the New York State Office of Child Welfare, the New York City Board of Social Services, and the private contributions of individuals.

## LIFE/STYLE

## A Nation of Runaway Kids

Louis, 15, homeless, has long been lonelier than many a street-bounced among a drug-addict mother, an indifferent father and a savage stepmother who repeatedly hit the 15-year-old boy and tried to choke him to death. Nevertheless, Louis is a most reluctant runaway. His macho mask crumples as he sits in a cheerful Houston shelter—some what incongruously called Family Connection—and speaks softly of those he still loves. "I didn't want to leave her, but she said to get out and don't come back," he quavers, near tears whenever he mentions the mother who finally pushed him aside. Then, as other teen-agers return within earshot, Louis recoups his cool. "I learned the hard way," he says. "Ain't nobody going to do nothing for me but myself."

A new generation of American youngsters is on the run—often at a desperate pace. They resemble less their romantic predecessors, from Huck Finn to the flower children than refugees fleeing the wreckage of their families. Many are more truly castaways than runaways, forced from their homes by neglect, abuse or abandonment. "These kids are running from something, not to something," says Russell Frank, director of The Runaway Place, a Boston shelter. As many as 50 percent may be fleeing physical abuse, including sexual assaults. A growing number are economic refugees, evicted by jobless parents who can no longer support them. "This is one of the first times we've seen people voluntarily bringing their kids in," says Carol Frank of the Child Welfare League. "It's a dust-bowl kind of thing."

Others, without being told to leave home, may be driven out by violent arguments, drinking bouts, and other recession-related strains in the family. "A 14-year-old can't understand fully that his father may be depressed over losing his job," says Washington social worker Robbie Callaway. "As economic conditions get tougher, more and more kids are going to be out on the street."

**'Meat Rack':** The thoroughfares they travel include the likes of the infamous Minnesota strip located near Times Square—so named for the many blond nymphets from out of town who sell themselves there—and the "meat rack" on Hollywood's Santa Monica Boulevard where boy hookers are on display. Too young to work legally, a significant number support themselves by stealing, drug dealing or peddling sex. Like apprentice delinquents, they huddle in abandoned buildings, on

park benches or in the warm breeze from subway gratings. Many runaway kids display a pathetic ingenuity, fearful of pimps and muggers as well as policemen; one Philadelphia youth buried himself to his chin every night in a playground sandbox. But for most of the young nomads, there may be no place to hide: some 50,000 runaways simply disappeared last year.

There's no telling where they went, since



Way station: Seeking aid at New York bus terminal

the United States does not keep computerized track of missing children as it does missing cars. By the most conservative estimates, however, each year more than 1 million kids between 10 and 17 leave home. Until 1974 the government's main helping hand was an arrest for juvenile delinquency. Then Congress—disturbed by reports of deaths and maltreatment in jails, reform schools and other institutions—passed the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, to establish federally funded telephone hot lines and temporary teen-age shelters. But the 166 shelters—with their hopeful names like Halcyon House or Stepping Stone—serve only 45,000 kids in a year, roughly 5 percent of the runaway population, for a maximum stay of between two weeks and 30 days—and proposed Federal budget cutbacks threaten to cramp the space still more.

Fortunately for their survival odds, most runaways are relatively timid. According to juvenile welfare experts, mostly no further than a relative or friend, and 90 percent return home within 48 hours. The remainder, however, seem singularly ill-equipped for even a temporary life on the loose. A recent report from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, based on shelter admissions, indicates the average runaway is 15. That's a drop of one year from the 1976 average—and kids as young as nine are now turning up with alarming regularity. Most of the kids are white (70 percent) and female (56.7 percent, although the gaps are closing). Forty percent are school dropouts,

many of whom can barely read and have minimal self-esteem. They are scarcely a cadre of hardened criminals. HHS estimates that 60 percent have never been in any kind of trouble with police authorities before they run.

**'Flirters':** Left to their own devices, kids develop a distinctive subculture. Lark is scrupulously observed around Boston male prostitutes are expected to work near the bus terminal, while females work the notorious Combat Zone. Hard-core street kids are supposed to congregate on Boston Common, where the head-to-toe frog sits. "Flirters" in local jargon hang out in Herald Square. Some runaways try to create the communalism of the boys' club, but when one makes some money, many will rent a room for the night, splitting the wardrobe on wine, dope and food. In one northeast suburb of Philadelphia, teen transients even built their own haven in the woods with lumber stolen from construction sites, complete with escape tunnels. Survival lessons are willingly shared, to score a free restaurant meal with a minimum of fuss (a gambit sometimes known as "chew and screw"), leave the waitress a tip before you walk out without paying the check.

Time seems to be the greatest divider, determining which runaways can be salvaged. "If a kid has lived in the street for a month or so, it becomes very hard to reach him," says Father Bruce Ritter, founder of New York City's Covenant House for runaway youths. "If it's been six months, we've almost lost him, and if it's a year, he's gone. The poison works very, very quickly." In many cases, it takes only two days; beyond the 48-hour mark, one in 10 teen-agers is likely to become a prostitute. Incoming naifs are quickly spotted at such entry points as New York's Port Authority Bus Terminal by pimps or their scouts, sometimes called catchers. Blue-janed Marcia R., 13, remembers that she was barely off the bus from Ohio before a "man in one of those hats" approached her. He was headed off by a man and woman, two self-professed "good Samaritans."

# Do you know someone with ALS? (Lou Gehrig's disease)

If you do, then you know how devastating ALS can be. But, you may not know that throughout the country, friends and relatives of ALS patients are doing something about ALS by setting up Local Chapters of the National ALS Foundation.

Local Chapters are resource centers—places where ALS patients and their families can find out what services are available. They can get together for rap sessions, to share and ease the burden of ALS, and to find out that they are not alone.

Local Chapters can generate public awareness—raise money for the all important research—and bring us one step closer to finding a cure for ALS.

To learn how you can help set up a Local Chapter and to be part of a growing, nationwide organization that's doing something about ALS, contact the National ALS Foundation, 185 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, or call (212) 679-4016.

## LIFE/STYLE



Back home: Darcy Reeves (front) with mother and sister

tans" who offered to take her to their house. The Port Authority police were also converging on her and won the contest, she was soon on a plane headed home. "You soon find out that all those 'good people' who want to 'help you' want something in return," says a Philadelphia 16-year-old who was not so lucky—and is now pregnant by her newfound "friend."

**Pimps:** Hustlers operate in a netherworld all their own. In Hollywood, for instance, there's a wage scale of sorts. Attractive new arrivals can earn top dollar (\$250 or so, on up) from the homosexual "chicken hawks" who cruise Santa Monica Boulevard in search of young boys. "Everyone knows the regulars, so when they see a new face, they have to try you," explains one young denizen. "After they get to know you, though, you have to do more and more to earn your money." Times can be even tougher for girls, who usually have pimps to support, and staying straight is often well-nigh impossible. L.A. police detective Larry Broadhurst still shudders over one young victim from two years ago. "She was a real good-looking blond girl," he recalls. "A pimp approached her to work for him, and she refused. Told him she didn't want to have anything to do with his business." The pimp didn't give up; he followed her and pounded on her motel door. "When she opened it, this guy just stuck a knife right through her head."

Authorities are trying to provide more effective refuge. In Boston, the vans from Bridge Over Troubled Waters roll right up to the kids on the streets, offering dentists,

doctors and drug therapy. At many shelters the rules are stricter than those at the homes the kids have left. At Houston's Family Connection, residents must rise at 8:30 a.m., cook all their own meals, clean their rooms and request permission to stay out after 5:30. Generally, the shelters' goal is to identify family problems, begin counseling and return the runaways—except to parents who abuse them. The success rate runs anywhere from 50 to 70 percent. "We desperately need more places like this," says Sandra Reeves of Houston, whose 15-year-old daughter, Darcy, has run away three times, only to be reunited through family counseling. "Please tell mothers and fathers that their children can come home."

To help those children who resolutely won't—or can't—go home again, states and municipalities have also been changing their juvenile laws. At least a dozen states now allow courts to "waive juvenile" matters, so that they may hold jobs and

apartments on their own, in Connecticut, a 16-year-old can effectively "divorce" abusive parents and be treated as an adult. Some law-enforcement officials are less than enthusiastic about the liberalization trend, claiming they're now unable to step in and aid troubled runaways. But some frustrated parents are saying "good riddance" to incorrigible adolescents. Toughlove, the Pennsylvania-based parents organization, suggests families lock the doors behind difficult runaways until they promise to change—while providing them with a list of other Toughlovers who will act as caretakers. In several states, wits-end parents can also ask the courts to designate perennial trouble-makers "persons in need of supervision"; they can then be picked up for running away, and a judge can impose psychiatric care or other treatment.

**Rebels:** To be sure, not every vagabond child can be classified as either innocent or incorrigible. Some classic rebels without cause still take off from pure pique or boredom. Beth, 16, showed up at a shelter in Prince Georges County, Md., claiming she had been maltreated by her mother, the "abuse" turned out to be a failure to provide designer jeans. But many experts say such cases represent a declining minority. "There is the child who is just too big for his britches," concedes Alice O'Shea, chief of the child-advocate unit in Philadelphia's Office of the Public Defender. "But they are the minority." Experts say only 10 percent of runaways qualify as "spoiled brats."

Authorities worry that strained juvenile

Sinclair Lewis  
 John Galsworthy  
 Saul Bellow  
 Fitzhugh Benson  
 John Updike  
 E. V. Rieu  
 Ralph Waldo Emerson  
 William Faulkner  
 John Updike  
 William Faulkner  
 Ernest Hemingway  
 H. D.  
 Gertrude Stein  
 Thomas Mann

Jack Kerouac  
 Maxine Hong Kingston  
 Maxine Kumin  
 D.H. Lawrence  
 Marianne Moore  
 Annas Niska  
 Joyce Kilmer  
 Frank O'Hara  
 Kathleen Tegen  
 Ezra Pound  
 Gertrude Stein  
 Wallace Stevens  
 Dylan Thomas  
 William Carlos Williams  
 Richard Wright

The literary  
 magazines that  
 first published  
 these great writers  
 are going  
 out of business.  
 Unless you help

facilities won't be able to handle an influx of  
 teenagers who jump, or are pushed out on  
 their own. Financing for shelters is precar-  
 ious, although Congress authorized more  
 than \$20 million, the administration pro-  
 posed only \$6.6 million in the current budget.  
 Several senators managed to boost the figure  
 to \$18 million. Even that amount would pro-  
 vide less than \$18 per runaway—and the  
 budget battle must be fought again when the  
 current funding expires Dec. 15. "The pri-  
 vate sector cannot and will not pick this pro-  
 gram up," says Rep. Pat Williams of Mont-  
 ana. "This is a bedpan program, the kind  
 that no one wants to get involved in, and that  
 is why the Feds got into it in the first place."

**Ultimate Rejection:** Yet even if sufficient  
 money could be found to put counselors on  
 every street corner, more fundamental ques-  
 tions would remain. One's own home is, af-  
 ter all, supposed to be the place where they  
 have to take you in, no matter what, being  
 forced to leave it can be the ultimate repul-  
 sion. Sister Dolores Gattamatti of New  
 York's Noah's Ark shelter deplors "the Kleenex  
 mentality" that brings most young  
 charges to her door. "We live in a society  
 where we use things and just throw them  
 away," she says. "I swear, a lot of people  
 have this attitude toward kids." And so the  
 throwaway children pile up, from New York  
 to California, to be exploited and brutalized.  
 Sooner or later, those who cast them off must  
 realize that children are not so easily dispo-  
 sable. The longer they remain on the streets,  
 the less chance they can ever be reclaimed—  
 and the more they will cost everyone.

LYNN LANGWAY with JEFFREY MICHAEL  
 in New York. MARY LORDE with JEFF  
 HANSEN in Miami. JAMES EARL RAY with  
 JAMES EARL RAY with JAMES EARL RAY

*Lookout, Father Kitter in Times Square*



---

## A Second Look at the National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth

By Caroline J. Croft and Mary K. Jolly

---

### Introduction

Before legislative action by Congress and the President in 1974, it had been estimated that more than a million youth a year left their homes without parental permission — a finding later corroborated by *The National Statistical Survey of Runaway Youth*, completed in 1976 by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) under a Congressional mandate.<sup>1</sup> The 1976 study revealed that as many as 1.3 million juveniles ran from their own or foster homes each year, with 773,000 of these juveniles remaining at large overnight. This was creating a substantial law enforcement problem for the inundated communities and significantly endangering the runaway youth on the streets who were exposed to criminal, physical, sexual and drug abuse and exploitation. The tragedy in Houston which cost the lives of 28 children, all reported missing from home, aggravated the problem and heightened the concern of federal, state and local government leaders as well as private sector youth advocacy agencies.

In response to the growth and pervasiveness of the runaway problem, the Runaway Youth Act was signed into law by President Gerald R. Ford. Also known as Title III of the larger Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, the Runaway Youth

Act enabled HEW to establish a national program for the care of runaway youth. That law authorized the HEW secretary to award grants-in-aid to eligible agencies seeking to establish or to continue operating shelters for runaway youth.

This article details the salient aspects of the National Runaway Youth Program from its inception to the present. In addition to identifying the prominent features of the program from an historical perspective, it reports on an evaluation of the program performed by an independent contractor, a demographic profile of runaway and homeless youth and the future directions for the program. In addition, a new publication, entitled *The Legal Status of Adolescents*, is summarized at the end of this article.

### Runaway Youth Program: Historical Notes

Congress, in passing the initial Runaway Youth Act, placed the responsibility for locating, detaining and returning runaway youth outside overburdened police and juvenile justice agencies. Congress also defined the problem as one of an interstate nature and concluded that federal intervention was needed as well as a more reliable reporting system for runaway (not until 1977) youth and a more effective temporary shelter care system outside the law enforcement structure.

In addition to the funding of shelter facilities for runaway youth, the Runaway Youth Act provided funds for counseling and after-care services, for the provision of technical assistance to grantees, for the conduct of a National Statistical Survey of Runaway Youth in the nation and for the yearly submission of an annual report to Congress by the secretary of HEW on the status and accomplishments of the shelters (funded under the provisions of Section 315 of the Act). Other provisions included the setting of a maximum authorization level of \$10 million per year for the 1974, 1975 and 1976 fiscal years.<sup>2</sup>

In providing grants, Congress stipulated that priority consideration be given those applicants which could demonstrate each of the following factors: grant requests of less than \$100,000, documentation of a successful experience in serving runaway youth and applicants with program budgets smaller than \$150,000.

Congress delineated four goals in the initial law which remain unchanged and upon which the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has based its administration of the national program. These Congressional objectives for funded runaway programs, Section 315 of the Act, are set forth as follows:

- (1) their effectiveness in alleviating the problems of runaway youth;
- (2) their ability to reunite children with their families and to encourage the resolution of intrafamily problems through counseling and other services;
- (3) their effectiveness in strengthening family relationships and encouraging stable living conditions for children; and
- (4) their effectiveness in helping youth decide upon a future course of action.

In October 1977 the 95th Congress reauthorized the Runaway Youth Act, adding states and coordinated networks of runaway service providers to the list of eligible agencies. The 1977 legislation also expanded the service population for funded programs to homeless youth and provided for support of short-term training to Title III grantees. Congress raised the authorization level for

each of the three years of the extended life of the Act from \$10 million to \$25 million.

In November 1980 the 96th Congress enacted P.L. 96-509, the Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980, which President Carter signed into law on Dec. 8, 1980.<sup>3</sup> Title III of this legislation retitled the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, reauthorized the runaway and homeless youth program administered by HHS for an additional four years, maintained the annual authorization level at \$25 million and mandated that HHS alter its formula for distribution of appropriated funds for the support of programs for runaway and homeless youth on the statutory basis of the number of youth under 18 years of age in each state jurisdiction.

The program received \$11 million for each fiscal year 1981 and 1982. The Administration has allocated only \$6.6 million for fiscal year 1983, which begins Oct. 1, 1982. However, it is likely that Congress will not approve the budget by that date, and that the program will operate with \$11 million under a Continuing Resolution.

The 1980 Amendments, along with a revised formula for allocation of funds and new approaches with regard to the consolidation of social services administered by HHS, will impact the future nature and development of the National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth. In its reauthorization decision in November 1980, the Congress expressed unanimous bipartisan support for continuation of the program until 1984. Major problems, issues and needs remain, however, which are identified and discussed below. A more detailed review and analysis of these issues is available in HHS' Annual Report to the Congress for Fiscal Year 1980.<sup>4</sup>

#### Program Evaluation — Major Findings

In August 1979, HHS undertook the task of evaluating the National Program and published results of this assessment by an outside contractor.<sup>5</sup> The evaluation has provided the basis for requesting the President and Congress for reauthorization of the program in the spring of 1979 and, as already reported, Congress and the President then extended HHS' authority for continuation of the pro-

gram, w  
1980.

In the  
Evaluati  
containe

- The I  
has su  
of the
- In ad  
goals,  
have  
goals;
- The p  
extre  
struct
- A gro  
amon
- The n  
the Ni  
the p  
servic
- The N  
servin  
lation
- The N  
achiev  
levels;
- In ger  
achiev  
of clic
- The N  
tive re  
ation;
- The p  
expar  
cratin  
ing ve
- A var  
cerns  
vice r  
youth

The e  
HHS, th  
Family  
other or  
tional P  
would b  
clude th  
reduced  
found. /  
fies maj

gram, with several amendments, in the fall of 1980.

In the official report to HHS the *National Evaluation of the Runaway Youth Program* contained the major findings below:

- The National Runaway Youth Program has successfully operationalized the goals of the Runaway Youth Act cited above;
- In addition to addressing the legislative goals, the projects funded under the RYA have developed a number of additional goals;
- The projects funded under the RYA are extremely diverse both in terms of their structures and their client populations;
- A growing "professionalism" was found among the projects funded under the RYA;
- The most serious service limitations with the National Runaway Youth Program are the provisions of follow-up or aftercare services mandated in the Act;
- The National Runaway Youth Program is serving a widely diversified client population;
- The National Runaway Youth Program is achieving substantial positive client impact levels;
- In general projects funded under the RYA achieve similar success with a wide variety of clients;
- The National Evaluation found that a positive relationship exists between goals operationalization and positive client impact;
- The projects funded under the RYA are expanding their fiscal capabilities by generating new funding sources and developing volunteer programs;
- A variety of service, client and fiscal concerns are giving way to emerging new service models within the area of runaway youth services.

The evaluation was most encouraging to HHS, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, Congress and many other organizations which support the National Program. However, a great disservice would be done if readers of this article conclude that this major social problem has been reduced in scope and an acceptable solution found. Another section of this article identifies major needs, concerns and issues which

must be understood and addressed if a full decade of federal intervention with regard to runaway and homeless youth is to achieve success. Not all funded programs have succeeded. Some have closed because of financial, management or program shortcomings. Since several areas of the nation are underserved, the 96th Congress included in the reauthorized legislation a provision for distribution of appropriated funds on the basis of a state's youth population under the age of 18. This will generate a definite impact on the funding process. Unless larger appropriations are forthcoming, some programs will receive less than \$10,000 in grant funds from HHS for a year's program support.

*Extent to Which National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth has Reduced Involvement of Youth in Law Enforcement and Juvenile Court Systems*

While the reduction of the involvement of runaway youth in police-juvenile court processes are not a primary objective of the Runaway Youth Act, HHS found that one of the positive byproducts reported by many of the HHS-funded Title III programs has been a pronounced reduction in the number of runaway youth involved directly in community law enforcement and court processes. Not only has the number of youth handled by the police been substantially reduced in some communities, but the number of these youth who appear in court and undergo adjudication has decreased. The most successful programs are those in which police, court and runaway staff work together in a cooperative and coordinated way. Rather than taking a boy or girl into a detention facility they are taken instead to a runaway shelter by the local police. If the runaway programs did not exist the traditional pattern would be followed which would involve the issuance of a warrant and appearance in court for a series of jurisdictional, adjudicatory and dispositional procedures. An increasing number of runaway and homeless youth are being referred by the police and court officials to the runaway centers. In a few cases the centers have not won the confidence of police and court agencies, and have had difficulty devel-

oping the type of program and services which merit community support and respect. HHS is most sensitive to allegations that federally funded shelter-type programs are below standard. In its monitoring of the programs HHS stressed sanitation and other regulations which apply at either state or federal levels. A few programs have been closed and federal support withdrawn as a result of failure to operate on the basis of acceptable fiscal, licensing and regulatory practices.

#### Program Growth and Development Since 1974

Since the first 66 runaway houses were funded by HEW in 1975, the program has grown to 160 programs funded in 48 states, the District of Columbia, Guam and Puerto Rico. A National Switchboard, located in Chicago, has proved to be a vital element in the National Program. Congress recognized this importance by amending the legislation in 1980 to specifically authorize funding of a National Toll-Free Communications System. The number of youth served in HHS-funded programs approximated 43,000 a year as of 1980. In addition more than 200,000 calls were made to the National Switchboard in 1980 by runaway and homeless youth, parents and relatives.<sup>6</sup>

A new, four-year funding cycle was conducted in 1981 under the reauthorized legislation and HHS expected the demand for grant funds to be higher than the previous appropriation of \$11 million. Many worthy programs cannot be funded by HHS because of the severe limit on funds. Some geographic areas are underserved, thus creating concern at a time when federal grant funds are dwindling. One of the most encouraging developments since the passage of the Act in 1974 has been the success enjoyed by many of the Title III programs in securing financial support from local public and private sources. Modest successes have been achieved with the organization in some of the states of coordinated networks of runaway service providers, authorized by the 96th Congress in its 1977 amendments to the Runaway Youth Act. These networks or coalitions have improved the intra and interstate need for speedy com-

munications regarding the immediate care of runaway and homeless youth. They have led in some cases to more effective coordination of effort and expansion of services without additional expense, as agencies have pooled their limited resources.

Programs have actively sought non-federal financial support from a variety of sources. Their success in diversifying their funding base while reducing dependence on federal funds has had a stabilizing and strengthening effect.

#### A National Profile of Runaway Youth

A summary profile of runaway youth derived from the client forms submitted to the Youth Development Bureau by the programs funded under the Runaway Youth Act revealed that the types of youth who received services were diversified as to age, sex, ethnicity, school status, family-type problem and related case characteristics.<sup>7</sup> One major finding since the passage of the initial Runaway Youth Act in 1974 which the profile presents is that 45.2 percent of the youth in the national distribution were runaways in the legal-administrative definition of the term, 19.3 percent were youth involved in non-runaway crises, 15.5 percent were cases where youth and parents had mutually agreed to separate and the remaining cases were in the potential runaway or other categories. Females made up 59.7 percent of the population served, 40.6 percent were boys. The age range was from 4 to 20 years of age with the critical range 10-18 years. Eighty percent of the youth served were in this 10-18 age range with modal age being 16 years. As to racial-ethnic distributions, 74 percent of the youth served were white, 15.5 percent were black, not of Hispanic origin; 6 percent were Hispanic; with the remainder American Indian, Asian or unknown. Youth living with the parents or legal guardian before the runaway episode made up 82.4 percent of the population served; 4.1 percent were living in foster homes; the remainder with relatives, friends or unknown. In terms of school status before the runaway episode, 60.1 percent were attending school; 17.3 percent were drop outs; 10.5 percent were listed as truant; while the

remainder were graduated or graduated of the profile services by re of the runaways were too truancy was t percent felt t them emotion had been pu parent; 7.7 pe preceded by a the parents. were peer pr school grades

#### Future Directions

With the Washington, opened with reju tered by fede No definitive has been ann tion teams cre reviewed a wi grams. In his secretary of E into one bloc grams, inclu youth. The tinned suppo Runaway and million level

In its futur gram the Y established t 1. consolidat the runaw in further includes case and homeless networks coordinat local-priv 2. administr away and on the b: goals. Re play a mc of admin

mediate care of  
They have led  
e coordination  
ervices without  
es have pooled

ght non-federal  
cty of sources.  
; their funding  
nce on federal  
d strengthening

### Runaway Youth

Runaway youth  
submitted to the  
y the programs  
Youth Act re-  
h who received  
age, sex, ethnic-  
e problem and  
One major find-  
initial Runaway  
profile presents  
youth in the  
inaways in the  
k of the term,  
ed in non-run-  
re cases where  
ally agreed to  
ses were in the  
er categories.  
t of the popula-  
: boys. The age  
of age with the  
ghty percent of  
10-18 age range  
s. As to racial-  
nt of the youth  
ent were black.  
cent were His-  
nerican Indian.  
ng with the par-  
e the runaway  
of the popula-  
living in foster  
elatives, friends  
ol status before  
ercent were at-  
vere drop outs;  
uant; while the

remainder were shown as expelled, suspended or graduated. A final but important segment of the profile disclosed the reasons for seeking services by runaway youth. Eighteen percent of the runaway youth reported that their parents were too strict; 9.6 percent reported that truancy was the cause for seeking services; 9.8 percent felt that their parents had neglected them emotionally; 7.9 percent stated that they had been pushed out of their homes by the parent; 7.7 percent felt that the runaway was preceded by an inability to communicate with the parents. Among the remaining causes were peer problems, parental conflicts, bad school grades and youth emotional problems.

### Future Directions for National Program

With the change in administrations in Washington, a number of scenarios developed with regard to youth services administered by federal executive branch agencies. No definitive reorganization of these services has been announced but the various transition teams created by President Reagan have reviewed a wide range of human service programs. In his budget message to Congress, the secretary of HHS proposed the consolidation into one block grant of 12 social service programs, including runaway and homeless youth. The secretary also supported continued support for the National Program for Runaway and Homeless Youth Act at the \$10 million level for fiscal year 1982.

In its future planning for the National Program the Youth Development Bureau has established the following goals:

1. consolidation of the gains made to date by the runaway and homeless youth centers in further improving their services. This includes creating more effective systems of case and class advocacy for runaway and homeless youth; and the development of networks and coalitions for maximum coordination of effort at federal, state and local-private sector levels.
2. administration of the reauthorized Runaway and Homeless Youth Act until 1984 on the basis of Congressional and HHS goals. Regional and state jurisdiction will play a more prominent role in the process of administering the program.
3. development of a national policy for youth development. In this connection the Bureau is playing an active role in the planning of national, state-local and private sector conferences, seminars and workshops which deal with runaway and homeless youth.
4. the bureau will concentrate in the years ahead on the further diversification of services provided by the centers for runaway and homeless youth. Emphasis on family factors and processes, and the development of a more effective national system of aftercare services for runaway and homeless youth, will be integral parts of this endeavor.
5. the Bureau will continue to actively support the Federal Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention under the chairmanship of the attorney general. It will intensify its efforts to achieve more effective interagency and intragency collaboration at the federal level in areas such as substance abuse, youth employment, adolescent abuse and teen pregnancy. It will seek more active working relationships with federal agencies such as the departments of Justice, Labor and Education in the efforts being made to maximize federal resources available for youth programs.
6. within the funds available the Bureau will continue to fund service demonstration projects in the areas of adolescent health, family dysfunction, pregnancy, youth employment and substance abuse. It will continue to conduct studies of youth needs within HHS and will endeavor to develop a more comprehensive approach to the delivery of services to vulnerable youth and their families.
7. in its technical assistance and training initiatives for Title III grantees the Bureau will stress the development, at the program level, of maximum capability for service delivery, the accessing of non-federal funding sources and the further managerial improvements in the operation of these centers. An annual Youth Service Institute was planned in 1981 for selected Title III and federal agency staff with the

- emphasis on skills building and problem-solving training.
8. the Bureau will continue to fund a National Toll-Free Communication System to serve runaway and homeless youth and their families. Some expansion of this system is planned with one objective being a more efficient operation and wider geographic coverage of the nation.
  9. a primary objective for the 1980s is the continuation of the effort to further develop positive roles for youth at all levels of the program. A specific publication titled *Youth as a Resource* was made available in the summer of 1981.

#### The Legal Status of Adolescents<sup>8</sup>

In late 1980 HHS published a 500-page compendium and discussion of the laws and court decisions affecting minors titled *The Legal Status of Adolescents*. It is an updated and expansion of a 1975 publication *The Legal Status of Runaway Youth*, which members of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and a wide range of juvenile justice and youth-serving agencies and officials found extremely useful.

This document contains summary tables of laws affecting minors in each state with regard to emancipation, employment, hitchhiking, medical consent, truancy and other legal considerations which are important to juvenile and family courts, attorneys, youth agency officials, parents and guardians as well as the runaway and homeless youth themselves. *The Legal Status of Adolescents* was prepared for HHS under a contract with the Scientific Analysis Corp. of San Francisco and the Regional Institute of Social Welfare, Athens, Ga. This report clearly shows that the legal rights of juveniles are defined differently in different states and that the recognized capabilities of youth to make important legal decisions also varies considerably from state to state.

Until recently, the report notes, the law treated childhood as "an homogenous state," making no distinction between the capacities of younger and older children. According to the report, progress with respect to the rights of young people has frequently come through

the courts. The authors point to a series of court decisions in the past 10 years that have affirmed the Constitutional rights of children and carved out areas in which they can make decisions on their own. Among the Supreme Court cases cited are *In re Gault*, *Carey v. Population Services Int'l* and *Bellotti v. Baird* which concern, respectively, due process protection for juveniles in court proceedings, availability of contraceptives to minors and the right of a minor to have an abortion without her parents' consent.

In expanding children's rights, the report says state legislatures have often responded to court decisions or to mandates in federal legislation, such as the requirement in the child abuse and neglect law that an abused or neglected child be assigned a *guardian ad litem* to represent his interests in court.

Legislatures, the report says, have been slow in some areas to initiate changes to reflect "the progressively developing capacity of minors." In some states, changes have occurred largely in areas of high public health concern — venereal disease, pregnancy, drug abuse — areas in which the report says "the community benefits from having the child free to seek help on his own.

"As a society, we pay lip service to the idea that children are growing up faster than ever," the report says, but state legislatures and the federal government "have been reluctant to match that observation with statutory changes.

"A more worthwhile world for adolescents," the report concludes, "means more equity for them as a group vis a vis other age groups and at the same time more special recognition of their needs as a group facing the challenge of leaving childhood and becoming adults."

#### Author's addresses:

Caroline J. Croft  
4540 MacArthur Blvd.  
Washington, DC 20007

Mary K. Jolly  
National Rifle Association  
(Former Counsel, Senate Committee of the  
Judiciary, subcommittee on the Constitution)

Notes  
"Opin  
tional 2  
Depart  
1976).  
"The  
(Washin  
Educatio  
"Juven  
Runawa  
(Washin  
Human

series of  
that have  
f children  
can make  
Supreme  
Carey v.  
i v. Baird  
cess pro-  
ceedings,  
inors and  
ion with-

he report  
ounded to  
deral leg-  
the child  
bused or  
rdian ad  
vurt.

ave been  
anges to  
capacity  
ges have  
olic health  
ncy, drug  
says "the  
the child

o the idea  
han ever,"  
es and the  
luctant to  
statutory

r adoles-  
ans more  
other age  
re special  
up facing  
d and be-

the  
tion)

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup>Opinion Research Corp., *Comprehensive National Statistical Survey* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1970).

<sup>2</sup>*The Runaway Youth Act*, Title III, P.L. 93-415 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare).

<sup>3</sup>*Juvenile Justice Amendments of 1980*, Title III-Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, P.L. 96-509 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services).

<sup>4</sup>*Fiscal Year 1980-Annual Report to Congress-Runaway Youth* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services).

<sup>5</sup>*Executive Summary*, National Evaluation of the Runaway Youth Act (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1979).

<sup>6</sup>*Annual Report to Congress*.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup>*The Legal Status of Adolescents* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1979).

Revision Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**REQUEST**  
 Bill/Resolution No.: HB 631  
 Title: "An act relating to runaway children."  
 Sponsor: Representative Liska  
 Requestor: House HESS  
 Date of Request: 3/19/84

**FISCAL DETAIL**  
 Agency Affected: Public Safety  
 Program Category Affected: Administration of Justice  
 BRU, Program or Subprogram(s) Affected: Alaska State Troopers

**EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)**

	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88	FY 89
<b>OPERATING</b>						
100 PERSONAL SERVICES						
200 TRAVEL						
300 CONTRACTUAL						
400 SUPPLIES						
500 EQUIPMENT						
600 LAND & STRUCTURES						
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS						
800 MISCELLANEOUS						
<b>TOTAL OPERATING</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>CAPITAL</b>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>REVENUE</b>						

**FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)**

GENERAL FUND	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
FEDERAL FUNDS						
OTHER						
<b>TOTAL</b>						

**POSITIONS:**

FULL-TIME						
PART-TIME						
TEMPORARY						

**SOURCE OF FUNDS TO OFFSET FISCAL IMPACT OF BILL:**

**ANALYSIS:** Attach a separate page for analysis

Prepared By: Francis C. Allan G.C.A. Phone: 269-5691  
 Division: Alaska State Troopers MCK Date: 03/12/84  
 Approved by Commissioner: Robert J. Sundberg Date: 3/20/84  
 Agency: Public Safety

**Distribution (by Agency preparing fiscal note):**

- Legislative Finance
- Legislative Sponsor
- Requestor
- Office of Management and Budget
- Impacted Agency(ies)

12/1/83