

U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 25

SEPTEMBER 20, 1971, TO SEPTEMBER 27, 1971

(PAGES 32413 TO 33574)

and accurate and consistent. Draft resolutions, for example, which take into account the unverified allegations of one side only do not provide adequate factual basis for the UN's peacemaking processes.

We are particularly sensitive with respect to actions taken pursuant to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. This is the Chapter under which the Security Council has the power to take decisions binding on member nations. We regard that chapter of the Charter as a most precious thing. It might some day make the difference between world peace and holocaust. We are most concerned, therefore, that actions voted by the United Nations which in any way involve Chapter VII should be clearly related to threats to the peace or breaches of the peace. On this matter we have been especially scrupulous.

Specifically, much as we deplore apartheid in South Africa and other forms of racial discrimination, or the denial of majority rule, we cannot agree that they automatically constitute a "threat to the peace", in the sense of Chapter VII, Article 39, of the Charter which says that the Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations or decide what measures shall be taken to maintain or restore international peace and security.

In our policy and in our actions we cannot be indifferent to our relations with non-African nations involved in these issues.

We have friendly relations, for example, with the Portuguese. We cooperate with them in NATO, but this a cooperation confined to Europe. We have made clear our basic disagreement with them on their African policy. We believe that the people inhabiting these territories are entitled to the right of self-determination. However, we are not ready automatically and without clarification of facts to jump to conclusions regarding the responsibility for incidents between Portugal and African states—as we are often pressed to do.

We have long had relations with South Africa. Although we strongly oppose racial discrimination, we recognize the complexity of the problem South Africa faces. We fully agree that the present situation must change, but we cannot subscribe to oversimplified solutions to complicated and intensely human problems.

Moreover, based on our experience, we cannot agree with the African assumption, often expressed, that we could exert significant influence on these areas, if only we wished to do so. Rarely can one nation, any nation, however powerful, so affect basic attitudes in another society if that society clings to its vested interests and resists change.

In the broader context, we are also concerned over the impact of these issues on the specialized agencies of the United Nations such as the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization and Economic Commission for Africa. The constant pressure to inject political considerations into technical bodies—and to expel members on political grounds—adversely affects their efficiency and the effectiveness both of their administration and of their field work. We do not believe it is in the interests of the Africans, who are among the principal beneficiaries of UN specialized agency work, thus to politicize what began as essentially technical organs.

In conclusion, our differences with the African nations are essentially over how change in southern Africa will be achieved—not whether. It is over how the United Nations can be most effectively used—not whether. In general, the Africans seek support for three broad approaches: isolation of the offenders, economic measures against

them, and the use of military force. We have problems with each approach.

We believe change will come in southern Africa. Economic and demographic pressures make this inevitable. In South Africa itself there is a lessening of rigidity. Change is a central theme of discussion; there is psychological and intellectual ferment within the Afrikaner community; there have been isolated instances of acceptance of multiracial activities; there is a growing realism among businessmen that Africans are important to them as skilled workers and as a market. They are beginning to focus on the need for improvement of working conditions for non-whites. We cannot expect change to come quickly or easily. Our hope is that it will come peacefully.

Isolation can breed rigid resistance to change. Open doors can accelerate it. We believe the idea of expelling or suspending South Africa would represent a dangerous precedent, a move toward isolating South Africa's black population, and a move away from that universality of membership which the United Nations is gradually approaching.

Punitive economic measures are unpopular in this country. We have had experience in the problems of enforcement and control. These experiences do not encourage us to believe that such measures are workable against countries which are important economic entities. By their wealth such entities are able to cushion themselves against economic pressures and encourage non-compliance by others to weaken and thwart these pressures.

We have supported the economic sanctions against Rhodesia, but this is a special case. We have supported them as a feasible, if difficult, short term measure to create pressures for a settlement with the United Kingdom. Despite incomplete compliance by many nations, we feel this boycott is achieving its objective. We do not see it as a precedent for other, different-situations.

We can understand the impatience which leads to demands for the use of force. Nevertheless, we see little prospect of its effective use in bringing change in southern Africa and we cannot favor its use.

The United States is most unlikely to be involved in military intervention on any side in Africa. Moreover, actions of the UN itself to support force would not accord with the basic purposes of the organization.

This catalogue of potential differences is long. I have set it forth in order to put our response to the African issues in perspective. I have set it forth, also, as a means of frank communication with our African friends themselves. I have found they appreciate and respond to this type of diplomacy.

We do not expect the Africans to cease pressing their viewpoints on these issues. The United Nations represents one of the few means they have of continually mobilizing world opinion on their behalf. We, further, agree with them that the absence of substantial change in southern Africa will continue to create tensions and ultimately threatens the peace.

We do seek and hope for continuing discussions with the Africans on these issues and continuing cooperation in finding acceptable and effective courses of action. We hope that, in this way, the substantial influence of the United Nations can be preserved and exercised so as to generate not the appearance of solutions, but fair and workable progress toward human rights and self-determination for all in southern Africa.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT IN MINNESOTA

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the St. Paul Pioneer Press ran a five-part series on Headstart and Child

Development. This series of perceptive articles, written by Ann Baker, traced the history and discussed the experiences of the Headstart program in Minnesota generally and the Twin Cities specifically. It focuses on the key issue in day care: Whether these programs will be truly developmental or purely "cold storage" custodial operations.

The articles' analysis of the need for parental involvement in these programs; their review of the benefits both children and their parents have derived from child development activities, and their balanced assessment of the problems and potentials in development day care, provide an extremely useful insight into existing and proposed day care programs.

In addition to the five articles, the series included a very knowledgeable discussion of child development legislation pending before Congress and a review of the history of Headstart in Minnesota.

As one who has been working on child development legislation in the Senate, I found the articles to be extremely useful. I commend them to the attention of Senators and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADSTART DAY CARE HAS HEART—PART I (By Ann Baker)

Some of the most ardent supporters of day care have begun to worry they may be creating a monster.

What good will thousands of centers do for millions of children, they are asking, if instead of helping kids grow and learn the children are simply kept in "cold storage" till their parents pick them up?

And what about the parents? Will they lose all influence over kids who spend the whole day in the care of strangers?

The number of day care centers in Minnesota alone has doubled in the past two years. Except for Head Start and a few smaller efforts, most of them are built, planned and operated without consulting parents of the children who are put into them.

"Parents today, far from not caring about their children, are more worried about them than they have ever been in the course of recent history," child psychologist Bruno Bettelheim recently told a Senate committee considering child development legislation.

"The crux of the problem is that many parents have become powerless as forces in the lives of their children. A child often spends more time with a passive babysitter than a participating parent."

The answer, Bettelheim went on, cannot be sought in trying to halt the spread of day care centers. "There can be no doubt that day care is coming to America. The question is what kind?"

To Bettelheim the only kind of care that will "retain and rededicate our commitment to the family" is something that will join parents with professionals in efforts to help young children learn at school and at home.

Growing numbers of educators and psychologists agree. As an example of how that can be done, they have begun to examine Project Head Start.

When Head Start began six years ago as summer enrichment classes for 5-year-olds, it was designed to provide an experimental "intervention" in the environment of poor children, an environment that was seen to be unstimulating, restrictive, and in some areas lacking even the bare necessities for growth and survival.

Poverty in some places, including the slums of Washington, D.C., and southern Mississippi, has been proven to have disastrous effects on children. Babies with superior intelligence capacities at 3 months dropped to retardation levels by the age of 3 years (from IQs of 120 to 85).

Their bodies were weak from a diet of one meal a day, usually without protein. They were discouraged from crawling about because they might hurt themselves on broken furniture or open stair wells. They were discouraged from talking or asking questions because their families were convinced that would get them "in trouble" with society. They had no books or toys.

Today many educators in Minnesota and across the world are doubtful that poverty, except in such severe instances, necessarily cripples a child's ability to learn.

Generally they agree that the biggest single influence on a child's learning ability is not the size of his family's income per se but rather the attitude of his parents—(although the income often affects the attitude).

"We can't separate children from the problems of the families," said Dr. Reginald S. Lourie, president of the Joint Commission on the Mental Health of Children, to the Senate committee.

"We are asking that the schools do superman types of jobs with almost impossible situations, very often, that are the result of the neglected early years . . . the apathetic, passive, dependent, hopeless, helpless child who grows up into the hopeless, helpless adult and can end up as the unavallable mother or father."

If parents are interested in a child's learning and expect him to succeed, he has a head start from the minute he is born, an advantage that will continue during his early growing years, when proportionately he learns more than in all the rest of his life.

Day care advocates, anxious for something better than the "custodial" care that is given most of the nation's five million preschoolers whose mothers work, have begun to take a hard look at the importance of parental influence.

More and more of them are expressing fears that nursery school classes, however well planned and taught, may in fact help children learn very little if parents have nothing to do with the programs.

Some day care promoters have ignored those fears in the rush to build centers that will at least seem to provide some kind of "educational component" for the millions of little children who have to be somewhere doing something while their parents are at work, and the millions more who will be needing some kind of care if and when the President's Family Assistance Plan is enacted, adding the country's welfare mothers to the work force.

But while developers build, pleas have been growing from the civic groups, psychologists and parents who have been spurring them along: "Don't leave the parents out of it."

Again and again, testimony before Senate committees in the past two years has echoed those pleas.

University of Chicago education professor Benjamin Bloom said. "The basic unit with which we must deal more and more in education, and especially in early childhood education, is not the child alone but an adult, preferably the mother, and the child. I would make this almost the central case—how to find ways of helping parents do a better job."

Black Civil Rights activist Marian Wright Edelman said, "We must assure that we do not separate the child from his family nor usurp the parents' responsibilities for his development. If parents cannot influence the operation of these programs, the programs become competitors with parents, not co-operators."

Dr. H. Jack Geiger, chairman of preventive medicine at Tufts University in Boston, said. "I think we have had just about enough of programs that meet the needs of professionals and may be grossly irrelevant to people who are supposed to be served."

In response to the chorus of warnings from more than a dozen child care specialists, parents and representatives of minority groups, Sen. Walter Mondale said he felt that without parent involvement, his legislation (described on this page) could become just "another paternalistic strategy."

Witness after witness asked the senators to look at the way Project Head Start encourages a "family centered" approach.

"It has taught even the professionals the value of this method," said University of Illinois pediatrician Dr. Robert Mendelsohn.

"After all, most of our American institutions tend to be anti-family in orientation. Hospitals usually discourage parents from staying with their children . . . Schools have traditionally tried to keep parents at arms' length . . . Day care legislation is sometimes designed to force mothers to leave their home and children and go to work. While this anti-family bias works against all our population, it is especially cruel to families living in poverty.

"Project Head Start is almost unique in American life—along with the church—in recognizing that, while the individual is important, the family is the primary unit."

From the beginning, Project Head Start has included parents as an "essential" part of its program at every level, from policy making to dish washing—at least in theory.

In reality, it has often been extremely difficult to coax parents to participate. And when they do, conflicts sometimes erupt with administrators impatient at having to gear down their efficiency to the pace of a democratically elected, untrained parents advisory council.

The difficulties have nearly killed some Head Start programs and reduced the degree of parent involvement in others to a token gesture.

But the problems of enlisting parents in some cities have been overshadowed by the successes in others, to the point where a year ago a firm directive went out from the Office of Child Development to every Head State office across the country, demanding greater efforts to involve parents and enable them to progress from simple contributions, like escorting children on walks and baking cookies for the school carnival, to the complex job of deciding how the whole program is run.

"Unless this happens," said the instruction notice, "Head Start . . . will remain a creative experience for the preschool child in a setting that is not reinforced by needed changes in social systems into which the child will move."

Up to now only a few Head Start parents in St. Paul or anywhere else actually have much say about how the program is run. Their opinions are asked, but in the majority of Head Start programs that's about it; parents may advise teachers and administrators but they don't set policy.

Examples where parents do control Head Start, though, are growing. In Minneapolis, for instance, parents were virtually excluded from participation for two years while Head Start was directed by the public schools.

In 1969 the parents asked to set up a governing council of their own, and the schools turned over the program to them.

Funds and direction continued to be channeled through the MOER Board, Minneapolis OEO agency, until that board was dissolved last year. Now the parents' council manages the funds, as well as the policy.

According to regional Head Start training coordinator Estelle Griffen, Minneapolis has

the strongest parents' participation in the state.

Many mistakes have been made but they've taught their lessons, and parents have been eager to learn. Last month parents spent two days with the staff, studying the differences between policymaking and administration, so that both could agree on their proper responsibilities.

St. Paul's Head Start parents have not assumed that much authority, but there seems to be a growing commitment among most Head Start administrators in the Ramsey Action Program (OEO) offices to draw out more involvement from parents than ever before.

"I feel the whole education of this country depends on people having a say about it," says St. Paul Head Start director, Mrs. Sue Williams. "Parents still don't realize they're important. They still think paid staff know more than the mother in a home—when all the education comes out of the home."

Last year parents of the 340 Head Start children in St. Paul spent over 20,000 hours in classrooms and meetings. Several have got jobs as teachers aides, cooks and social service aides. Most of the active parents say Head Start has changed their lives in one way or another. Most parents, whether active or not, say they are very fond of the program and anxious for it to continue and grow.

What parents do for Head Start in St. Paul and what they feel it has done for them will be described in the next four parts of this series.

HEADSTART: ITS 7-YEAR HISTORY

Project Headstart was planned by the Office of Economic Opportunity in the fall of 1964 as an experimental preschool program for about 100,000 poverty children in some 300 communities.

Immediately it became the most popular part of the poverty program. Before the plans were off the drawing board President Lyndon Johnson declared Head Start should serve no fewer than half a million children.

In 1965 the first classes opened for 561,000 prekindergartners in 2,400 communities, urban and rural, at a cost of \$97 million. Classes ran for eight weeks and included dental and physical examinations.

Parents were not involved in the planning stages, according to the first national Head Start director, Dr. Julius B. Richmond, because local administering agencies, assumed they were uninterested and unable to play a part.

St. Paul public schools ran Head Start classes for 680 children in eight schools that first summer, with funds administered by Ramsey County Citizens Committee (the local OEO agency now called Ramsey Action Program). The director was public school teacher Karen Johnson.

The summer before, a forerunner of Head Start had been operated at McKinley school by the Council of Jewish Women and the public schools. Women from the council worked in it as volunteers. McKinley Pre-school continued for the next two summers, teaching 30 children in the mornings, another 30 in the afternoons, then was absorbed by the public schools Head Start.

In May, 1966, the North Central Voters League opened three year-round day care centers for 120 children, directed by Mrs. Sue Williams. The following spring the centers became funded by Head Start through the local OEO office.

Head Start in the St. Paul public schools continued half days for preschoolers from fall 1965 until fall 1966. They were then closed till summer 1967 because of a shortage of OEO funds. Then they opened again for 465 children in eight schools at a cost of \$330,000 till January 1968 when fund shortages once more caused them to close.

In summer, 1963, operation of the three

Voters League centers, which had continued for two years was taken over by the local OEO and expanded to seven centers with 225 children. Cost was \$340,000. The late Mrs. Evelyn House became director.

By that time parents from all the centers had joined to form a citywide Parents Advisory Council with rights to advise and consent over major decisions, including staff hiring.

The program has run continuously since then, except for a few days in June, 1970, when parents and administrators failed to agree on the appointment of a new director. Sue Williams, the parents' choice, withdrew her application and former Honeywell employee Seymour Levanthal was appointed. Six months later local OEO administrators asked him to resign and Mrs. Williams became director.

Today there are 11 year round, full day centers, in St. Paul with a 75 percent staff serving 340 children. The budget is \$450,000 and Ramsey Action Program is the administrative agency. In St. Paul and nationally, Head Start officials estimate they enroll only one in 10 of all children below poverty level.

CHILD CARE VOTE DUE IN SENATE

A sweeping child development plan, to provide day care, health, education and social services for American children of all ages and income groups, is scheduled to be debated on the floor of the Senate Wednesday.

Sponsored by 32 senators of both parties and backed by a coalition of 90 national labor, mayors, church, civil rights and education groups, the League of Women Voters and the National Organization for Women, the Comprehensive Child Development Program is included in a bill amending the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Senate File 2007).

Among the principal sponsors are Sen. Walter Mondale (D., Minn.) and Sen. Jacob Javits (R., N.Y.). Supporters expect the Senate to vote on the bill by the end of this week.

It provides free services for children from families whose income falls below \$6,900 for a family of four (Bureau of Labor Statistics "lower living standard"). Higher income families would be charged fees based on ability to pay.

Two-thirds of the budget would be spent on the lower income children.

Enrollment policies would give priority to children of working mothers and single parent families. A mixture of incomes would be encouraged at each center.

A companion child development bill (House File 6748), sponsored by Rep. John Brademas (D., Ind.) and 119 other representatives, is pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor.

The Senate bill states that it is modeled on the "successful experience" of Project Head Start. It authorizes \$2 billion appropriations in fiscal 1973 for services to children from infancy through age 14. New projects would merge with Head Start under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Locally, they would be sponsored by cities, counties or clusters of towns and villages. The locality must demonstrate that it will spend no more than five per cent of the funds on administrative overhead and that it will provide links with local health, education and social services.

Parent participation would be based on Head Start guidelines. Local program policy would be directed by child development councils consisting half of parents and half of appointments by the mayor. At least half the mayor's appointments would need to be approved by parents.

Where coordinated community child care councils exist, they have asked to be named

the child development councils, if the bill is passed. In St. Paul that would be the newly formed Greater St. Paul Council on Coordinated Child Care.

Each center or project's policy would be made by a project policy committee with half its members parents, the other half community representatives.

Among the projects would be:

Day care combined with education, health, social and nutritional services,

Learning programs for preschool through grade 3,

Child development training for parents, including at-home services,

Staff training,

Child advocates to help families secure full access to local programs,

Research on child development and the effect of programs.

The bill requests greater attention to handicapped children, asking they be included in regular rather than separate programs wherever possible.

It also makes special provisions for Indian and migrant children, requiring that all programs with Spanish-speaking children stress both English and Spanish.

If the bill passes, a committee to draw up standards for all federal child care programs will be formed three months later. Half the committee will be parents. Final approval of standards will be made by the secretary of HEW.

The Brademas bill in the House is like the Senate version in most respects. But it provides for no policy committees at individual centers. Instead local policy councils, with a purely advisory role, would represent large neighborhoods or entire towns.

Programs could not be sponsored by a small city or county, only by states, cities of over 100,000 or regional clusters of communities. Child development councils, with half their members parents, would make policy for the program. Parents would not have veto power over the mayor's choice of other members.

Existing Head Start centers could continue, but the bill makes no provision for guaranteeing they would.

One issue expected to be debated in the Senate this week over the Mondale bill is the question of sponsorship—whether it can be by a small town or only a state, large city or region.

Another is the provision of free services to children from families with incomes up to \$6,900 (OEO poverty level is placed at \$3,800 for a family of four).

Sponsors also believe there may be an effort to separate the child development program from the other OEO amendments, which would send the bill back to committee for further study.

In the meantime, a day care bill sponsored by Sen. Russell Long (D., La.) will open committee hearings on Sept. 14.

It calls for establishing a partially public federal childcare corporation under the Department of Labor, paid for initially by a \$500 million Treasury loan.

The corporation could contract with existing public and private day care agencies and build new centers of its own. Programs would eventually have to become self supporting from fees (including public assistance for poverty children).

Long's bill includes its own day care standards, calling for one adult to supervise every 10 children. That would supersede current standards for federally financed day care centers, which call for one adult to every five children aged 3 or 4, and one adult to every seven children aged 5 or 6.

Long's bill would not require that day care centers provide developmental services, but he lists a number of services that could be offered.

READING STORIES, BUILDING SHELVES, SQUEEZING TOOTHPASTE: HEADSTART RELIES HEAVILY ON HELP OF PARENTS—PART II

(By Ann Baker)

Head Start parents help the classes in a hundred ways.

They read stories, lead singing, mix paints, help prepare meals, supervise children on the playground or on trips to the library, the fire station, the gas station, the beauty parlor, the Capitol.

At one center, a father built a set of shelves, on wheels, for toys. At another, a mother who works during the day washes and irons all the sheets and blankets for the children's naps.

When parents volunteer in the classroom "it gives more time for individual attention to the children," says David Allen, head teacher at West Side Head Start Center.

"Besides, they're their kids. I feel they should have a lot to say about who is working with the kids and how. There can be a give and take.

"Parents can learn things from the staff. I've learned things about individual children by talking with parents."

"If a parent is involved, the child takes more interest," says Mrs. Ruthella West, a mother at St. James.

And to Mrs. John Vaughn, head teacher at St. Mark's: "If you don't feel close to the parents you don't have anything going for you."

Parents at St. Mark's are "always available when we need them," she says. "And we're wide open for suggestions from them."

It was the parents who decorated the center for the Christmas party and who planned the graduation. Each agreed to bring \$1 a month for "extras" and they bring outgrown clothes for kids who might need them.

The "worst" project ever undertaken by Mt. Zion parents, says mother Mrs. Harold Harris, was a tour of the Tonka Toy factory. "The tables were too high for the children to see what was going on. Then their eyes popped out when they saw the finished product—and we couldn't buy them any."

What's "great," she says, is Christmas—"the most wonderful parties; so many people contribute things, it touches you." And Easter—"We pack socks for all the kids."

Mrs. Victoria Rangel, who supervised children on the bus to Mt. Zion every day for six weeks last winter, then stayed till noon to read stories, play games, squeeze toothpaste on brushes, set tables and help wash up, said it was easy for her to be a volunteer.

"I ask what I can do. But some parents feel they don't want to be pushing, so they end up feeling in the way. They'd like to be told."

Ideas for projects come from parents at nearly every center. At St. Stephanus, they suggested a blueberry pancake day.

"We made 150 that morning," head teacher Mrs. Dee Dee Ray recalls. "The kids were flipping them up in the air."

Parents there also suggested a tasting day. The class walked to the store, bought pineapple, strawberries and bananas and went back to the center for a feast.

"Kids would say 'I don't like that.' When they tasted it, they changed their minds."

At two centers, parents' requests that naps be optional were followed. At Roosevelt, parents asked if children could dish up their lunch buffet style as an exercise in manners.

After the fifth plate of beans went on the floor, a meeting was called and a compromise reached. Kids now help themselves, but only to bread pickles and celery sticks.

Says Mrs. Ray: "I don't think I'd like it if parents ran the whole curriculum. Teachers would have a rough time."

Each of the 11 Head Start centers in St. Paul has 30 children (Unity has 45), a head teacher, a teacher, a teacher aide, a cook and

a social service aide who is usually shared between two centers.

Most are in church basements. Some have six or seven rooms, with lots of opportunity for individual instruction, especially when parents volunteer or when, during the summer NYC and REAP teenagers are available to help.

Other centers have only one or two rooms and a kitchen.

About one third of the mothers are volunteers. The occasional father who helps in the classroom is usually a man out of work ("and then they're more active than the mothers," says Mrs. Harris).

Mt. Zion was cited at a tea for volunteers last spring as the center with the most volunteers, St. Philip's and St. James, where nearly all mothers either work full time or are in school, have the fewest.

Parent coordinator is Mrs. Marie Wilson.

It's her job to create liaison between parents, centers and the community, to coordinate classroom activities, encourage participation in policy making, make sure needs are met, visit inactive parents and help teachers set up schedules for volunteers and plans for training them.

"The job gets bigger and bigger every day," she says.

To hear head teachers describe their teaching methods, you'd think they were all pretty similar. They try to give general preparation for school rather than "school."

They describe their classes as "unstructured" with an emphasis on helping kids learn to get along with each other and with adults.

A typical comment is Roosevelt head teacher Diane Danko's: "My philosophy is to let kids be kids. They learn their numbers and alphabet indirectly.

"They have lots of music, art, stories, and a chance to talk and sing. We try to build their self confidence so they won't think 'I'm a nobody.'"

Children arrive at the centers at staggered times, depending on when their parents must be at work.

They have breakfast, brush their teeth, sing or do exercises all together, then break up into small groups for art, games, work on letters or numbers, followed by "free play," with walks, puzzles or playground till lunch. Then naps and more free play.

Yet there's a great variation between centers. It shows up in teachers' attitudes toward discipline.

Former Mt. Zion head teacher Mrs. Gaynell Ponder used to hug and kiss each child as he arrived, and she hung up a punching bag for the children to attack when they got angry, instead of each other.

Naughty children were sent to a "thinking chair" for a few minutes.

"You don't spank," said Unity teacher Mrs. Winifred Smith when she was interviewed for the job by the parents personnel committee. "You can't get upset or grab and shake a child. When you punish him you've got to let him know why."

"I believe in spankings," says Elaine Benner, St. Philip's head teacher. "I've just read three books on child psychology, and I think Dr. Spock is too lenient."

Administrators downtown in the Ramsey Action Program offices are aware of the variation between centers.

"Some are too strict, some are too nebulous," says director Sue Williams of the curricula.

A few head teachers say they wish they had more direction from "downtown." At least three say their centers were not visited for as long as six months last year except by persons bringing food or paychecks.

Children take home report cards that read: "I am learning to take turns. I can count numbers. I can tell a story and share ideas with others..."

Grades are A (always), S (sometimes) and N (not yet).

"I tell parents what we're doing—like learning the names of local streets—and they say they'll concentrate on the same thing at home," says DeeDee Ray.

Most parents and teachers speak enthusiastically of the children's progress.

"Kids become more verbal," says First Christian head teacher Nancy Grahen. "Some are real shy or at home they haven't played much or done many things. They come out of their shell. I like to think it's something we've done."

Parents tell of Spanish-speaking children who learn English, children with stutters or hearing problems who are referred for treatment and improve, abnormally quiet children who learn to socialize, hyperactive children who calm down.

Most parents seem proud that their kids have learned their colors and their numbers. But not all.

"I don't think my son Gregory's getting much out of it," says Evergreen (Mrs. Maurice) Evans, a St. Stephanus mother who is also a substitute teacher for the public schools.

"I feel the program has not been flexible enough to accommodate all the kids."

Another St. Stephanus mother, Mrs. Antoine Berryman, says her 5-year-old daughter Kim is going right into first grade, can count to 100, do simple addition "and she draws beautifully."

Teachers sometimes change as much through Head Start as do the children.

"At first I thought the parents who didn't come to meetings or to help just weren't interested in their kids," says Elaine Benner.

"Then one mother told me, 'Sometimes it's more important to work and feed the kids,' and I understood."

Mrs. Diane Danko, a former White Bear Lake school teacher, frankly admits the reason she accepted a job as head teacher at Roosevelt Head Start was because after her baby was born she couldn't get any other.

"I never worked with poor people before, parents burdened with problems or children from broken homes.

"I thought I was really good because I'd been to college. When I first came here I wouldn't even sweep the floor. And I was really prejudiced against poor people, blacks and Mexicans.

"Now, I've learned a lot. Mrs. Arnoldo Garcia, our teacher's aide, is so fantastic. I never knew anyone like her."

IN HEADSTART: PARENTS DISCOVER THAT THEY COUNT—PART III

(By Ann Baker)

"We have to work with these people. We have to be concerned with who is taking over my child."

That's how the late Jeanette (Mrs. Conway) Bolling summarized her feelings about Head Start parent-teacher contacts two days before she was killed in a boating accident last July.

Mrs. Bolling had two grandchildren in Head Start and was one of the program's most active "parents."

She was the outspoken chairman of the parents group at Mt. Zion Head Start center and vice president of the citywide Parents Advisory Council (PAC).

She proudly wore the nickname "Big-mouth" pinned on her dress at a leadership training course last spring.

"What we need is communication," was her constant plea.

"That's growing," says parent coordinator Mrs. Marie Wilson. "Parents have become more active, especially in the last two years. Bureaucrats and bigwigs have had to realize the parents' position."

Mrs. Wilson spends her days between the downtown office, the centers and homes, and about half her evenings at meetings.

"You can't force participation," she says. "You're trying to encourage parents to work and go to school, too."

"I think parents have found they do count," says McDonough parent Mrs. Mary Worley. "In public schools there's this stay-out-of-the-way bit. In Head Start parents are wanted."

Mrs. Worley, recording secretary for PAC and a delegate to the state parents organization, spends almost as much time volunteering for Head Start as anyone else would spend in a full-time job. Maybe a dozen other parents are as active.

Last winter, for the first time, parents and staff together wrote the annual work program, at the initiative of Crystal (Mrs. Antoine) Berryman, who was then PAC chairman.

"In the past there was a lot of confusion," Mrs. Berryman says. "There seemed to be a lot of issues lying around that were never settled, a feeling that decisions were handed down."

"Parents were hesitant to talk with downtown staff, and the staff seemed to feel parents weren't informed about what was happening."

The program was written in one weekend, just in time for the annual grant proposal deadline. ("This year we plan to start earlier," says Unity mother Mrs. Martha Tolefree.)

Among parents' suggestions that were incorporated was a summer day camp and full days at all centers—before, several had been open for half days only.

But often "nothing happened" to suggestions made at monthly PAC meetings, says Mrs. Berryman. Current St. Mark's PAC delegate, Mrs. Audrey Brown, says that is still a problem. "There's often a general feeling of not knowing what's going on."

PAC is made up of two parents elected from each of the 11 centers and seven at-large delegates appointed by Ramsey Action Program's board.

Discussion at the July and August PAC meetings concentrated largely on how to stretch the food budget, which had been cut to compensate for costs of keeping the centers open all day.

In August, program assistant Mrs. Ruth Benner asked the group to agree to buying food from a new, chapter supplier (which they did) and to decide whether or not they wanted to continue giving lunch to all parent volunteers (which was left somewhat up in the air).

"Housekeeping" decisions, as one staff member puts it, seem to dominate PAC meetings. One reason, she feels, is that the budget is tight and a lot of time has to be spent "scrounging" for equipment and repairs.

Many of the staff hope this year there will be greater attention to policy matters and curriculum. Parents' training, they feel, is an essential prerequisite.

A few parents already influence teaching methods indirectly as members of the PAC personnel committee who interview job applicants for every level of the program.

At an interview last month the committee quizzed prospective teachers on their approaches to discipline and their techniques in developing individual responsibility.

"You can have education up to the eyebrows," says committee chairman Mrs. Connie Pierce. "But for teaching young children, experience is more important."

She adds: "Parents do have a say in the program, but a lot don't fully understand that they do."

Four out of five Head Start parents feel the program is "very good" and "very helpful," according to a recent survey of low-income

families made by University of Minnesota political science student Richard Shingles for a doctoral thesis.

Just as many parents feel able to influence Head Start decisions.

"The more involved they get, the more they think it's a good program," says Shingles, who interviewed 100 parents over an 8-month period. "Most of the criticisms were 'We need more.'"

Of the 100 parents, Shingles found 24 "very active," meaning they attended three or more meetings in the eight months.

About the same number attended one or two meetings, and just over half the parents attended none.

As for volunteer work in the classroom, Shingles found that 28 put in eight hours or more a month, 40 less than eight hours and 32 none.

The people who were least apt to volunteer or attend meetings were parents with jobs and those who indicated a sense of complacency by their answers to dozens of questions.

Parents who are active, in contrast, are either people who already were involved in other groups or those whom Shingles describes as previously "alienated."

"They have a low sense of efficacy, competence and self esteem. They're confused about what society expects of them and tend to be ticked off with the 'system.'"

It is these people, says Shingles, who have most puzzled social scientists, because nothing ever seems to draw them out into the community, except a dictator or an opposition movement.

"Here in Head Start is a case where the alienated come out—only FOR something, instead of against it."

HEADSTART FOR CHILD WAS MOTIVATOR FOR MOM: THE PROGRAM IS DESIGNED PRIMARILY FOR THE CHILDREN, BUT HEADSTART HAS DONE SOME MINOR WONDERS FOR PARENTS AS WELL—PART IV

(By Ann Baker)

Audrey Wright, 42, had a seventh grade education, nine children and no work experience.

For 15 years she and her husband William received welfare income supplements.

"I didn't know there was another world. My parents were the same as myself. My father had laboring jobs; he worked when he could. We knew a lot of hungry days. I felt schooling was just for someone who thought he was smart."

But she insisted that her children get as much schooling as they could. When Head Start came along, she enrolled her youngest child, and four years ago Audrey began working for Head Start as a teacher aide.

Before long, she got her GED (high school equivalency certificate).

The past year she has been a teacher at First Christian Head Start and this month will receive a 45-credit certificate in early childhood studies from the University of Minnesota.

Her husband has a better job now than before. ("He was an orphan and a school dropout—if he'd had something like Head Start he could have learned to cope with a lot of things he never did.")

Recently the Wrights received notice they'll have to find a new home because they're "over income" and cannot continue living in Mt. Airy public housing.

Wouldn't they be better off without the better income?

"Financially, yes," Audrey admits. "But this is a lot better. We're more independent. You eat crow for so many years.

"Now I'm not staying home feeling sorry for myself. From where I am, I can take care of myself and go on."

Her oldest daughter Ruth (Mrs. Ronald Bozway), with a daughter of her own in the First Christian Head Start class, was chair-

man of the center's parents group until last month when she became a teacher aide there.

She hopes to follow her mother's footsteps all the way to a teacher's degree.

For the past nine months, parents and other low-income people have filled all of St. Paul Head Start's entry-level jobs—teacher aides, cooks and social service aides—jobs that have no "paper" qualifications.

Their training is given on the job and through workshops, under the direction of career development coordinator Mrs. Mary Lou Gilstad, and at University Extension Division classes organized by William Hoffman, director of the university's program for continuing education in social work.

Thirty-five St. Paul Head Start employees attend the evening classes, which Hoffman describes as "adapted to Head Start needs, but not watered down."

The students, he says, "are doing amazingly well—better than they thought they could do."

"You see a former washroom attendant go to school with a textbook in one hand and a dictionary in the other—they care that much," says Mrs. Gilstad.

"They gain the confidence to go out looking for a job, to say 'I can do this and that. . . .'"

Sometimes as many as 25 to 50 persons apply for one Head Start job. Salaries are \$4,400 for a teacher aide, \$4,800 for a social service aide, \$5,000 for an assistant teacher—all work eight-hour days.

Teachers earn \$4,875 and head teachers \$5,700 for six-hour days, and cooks earn \$3,840 for six and a half-hour days.

"There's not a lot of money in this job," says one cook. "You've got to love kids or else you wouldn't be here."

While only a few parents can find jobs in Head Start, all of those who volunteer in the classroom have a chance to pick up new ways of working with children—"Little things, different techniques," as St. Stephanus headteacher DeeDee Ray puts it, adding, "There isn't a perfect way, but this gives an advantage."

Parents personnel committee member Maurice Evans feels many homes tend to be "dictatorial," so when he interviews job applicants he tries to determine whether they will provide chances for the children to explore and discover and learn to think for themselves.

Seeing that approach in the classroom has affected some parents.

"You learn to let a child do more for himself," says Mrs. Audrey Brown, a St. Mark's mother.

"If I'm building or painting something, I let my children help. Before, I'd hurry up and do it myself. Also, I notice a lot of mothers didn't use to let their kids use scissors. Now they've taught them how."

One Mt. Zion mother, whose son had frequent temper tantrums, used to respond either by ignoring him or throwing water on him, according to former headteacher Mrs. Gaynell Ponder.

Then she began working with another child who had similar tantrums. The teachers' response was to pick the child up, take him out in the hall and talk with him, and the mother tried the same thing.

And, says Mrs. Ponder, "she found that by not lifting her voice and not getting angry—by controlling her own feelings—it was easier to control her child's."

Some parents take home a sense of achievement themselves.

"I really get a satisfaction of knowing I've done something outside the house," says McDonough mother Mrs. Lucille McKinley. "I never had a chance to before."

"It's also a chance to get out and meet people," says West Side mother Mrs. Carol Ballard. "A lot of people when they're poor don't have any transportation. They've been stranded inside for years—I know I was.

"Now I get out a lot. There are parties, picnics, a going-away for a former teacher."

When a younger sister of one Head Start child died last spring, staff and parents rallied to the family's side.

They collected money for expenses not met by insurance, bought a headstone, clothes for the little girl to be buried in, new shoes for the older children and shoes for the father to wear to the funeral (he had only a pair of boots).

Another family, new to St. Paul, was called to the attention of First Christian and McDonough social service aide, Mrs. Donna Haley, because they spoke no English, had no furniture and slept on the floor.

Mrs. Haley informed the parents, who gathered up beds, clothes, and held a "welcome shower" for the family at First Christian. Church members and neighbors came too, and the 3-year-old son was enrolled.

When social service aides visit families, "You don't walk in and tell them what to do. You wait till they ask you," says Mrs. Haley. "Parents are really looking for someone they can unload their problems on. Not someone from welfare. A friend," says Margaret James, social service aide at St. James and St. Philip's.

West Side's aide, Mrs. Richard Kittleson, was especially requested for the job by other parents at the center because of her knowledge of Spanish and English. Every morning she brings a few children to the center who live too far away to walk; teacher aide Beth Gaston brings another carload.

West Side mothers and fathers have met regularly since last winter organizing bake sales and dinners to raise money for a school bus.

All Head Start children are given medical and dental exams when they enter the classes, and their height and weight is checked monthly.

Mrs. Helen Stafsholt, the nurse, says about 100 children were referred for dental treatment in the last year and another 100 to Ramsey Action Program emergency and prescription foods.

All children are given red measles vaccine. Immunization for polio, German measles, mumps and diphtheria-tetanus has just been started at each center.

Mrs. Stafsholt says 17 per cent of the children are found to have visual defects and 10 per cent hearing defects. All are referred to doctors.

Maybe a dozen children a year are referred to Wilder of St. Paul Rehabilitation Center for psychological treatment.

One boy was losing his hearing because both his parents are deaf and the only language in the home was sign language.

"We wouldn't give him something if he said 'Ah-ah' for it," say teachers at the center he has attended for six months. Now when you ask him the colors of objects, he answers clearly.

"Both parents are active volunteers; the father often helps the children with carpentry; the mother accompanies them on walks. And they too have made many friends through Head Start."

HEADSTART HAS ITS SHARE OF CRITICS—PART V
(By Ann Baker)

In the six years Head Start has served St. Paul children and parents, there have been many critics who say it hasn't done enough.

Some say it starts too late—usually at age 4—and ends too soon—on entry to kindergarten.

Some point to the uneven quality of the teaching and accuse the program of being strong on providing jobs but weak on educating children.

Some, including the Head Start Parent Advisory Council (PAC) chairman, Mrs. Harold Harris, say it is not well enough known among the poor families it is designed to serve.

Biggest single problem in St. Paul's Head Start seems to be that parent involvement does not go far enough.

Talks with parents and with staff at every level of the program reveal that parents are not sufficiently informed or aware of the role they are asked to play.

One critic puts it: "A bunch of people are thrown into a room and told, 'Here's what you have to decide.'"

Some of the most active parents complain they're "kept in the dark." Some of the least active parents seem to have no idea of how much involvement they could have.

One active father says, "They need to be trained to demand the program be responsive to them."

The dangers of tokenism have been dramatized by a study of a Los Angeles poverty council whose members went through the motions of making decisions that had in fact been already made by administrators.

The experience of sitting on a policy council measurably increased the members' sense of self-worth. Some went on to pick up basic education they'd dropped in their youth. Some went out to get jobs they'd never dared apply for.

But as soon as they realized their "power" on the council was only a formality, they lost interest in the program itself; some even became hostile.

In St. Paul, Head Start administrators do not want parents' involvement to be a token thing.

Certain difficulties are inevitable: more than 500 parents are a huge group to organize by anyone's standard, especially when most families are in Head Start for only one year and about one in three mothers works all day.

Furthermore, poor persons whose budgets force them to plan from day to day have to make considerable adjustments when they sit down to tackle yearly budgets and program plans.

But in Head Start people tend to feel those problems can be licked. Last week all the centers were closed as staff—administrators, teachers, cooks—and a handful of parents met to criticize the program as they never have done before.

Teachers said they desperately want more training in childhood development and teaching methods and more chances to meet together.

Parents—one with tears in her eyes—begged for more training in procedures, group dynamics and organization.

Downtown administrators made soul-searching examinations of how they sometimes jealously guarded their own jurisdictions, at the expense of efficiency and effectiveness. They made a number of concrete plans to divide their duties better and to coordinate their efforts.

Two new staff members were hired this summer to beef up the teaching. Mrs. Kathleen McNellis, education director, is working out a curriculum outline which she will take to centers for teachers to adapt to their needs.

A language specialist, Mary McAloine, will put special stress on reading readiness.

Last week's meeting agreed that parents and teachers with talents in music, art or carpentry, should be given some time each week to visit each center.

During the summer, teachers and head teachers have met regularly: now teacher aides and cooks will too.

There was a lot of talk at the meeting about helping parents play a stronger part—especially helping them move into the driver's seat instead of concentrating on "house-keeping" the program.

In November, for the first time a two-day training session for parents will be held at the University of Minnesota. Eventually, Head Start people hope parents and teachers can be trained together.

Staff say there is no room in the budget, which has been the same for two years, for additional training. They would welcome contributions of training seminars from any agencies in the community that could provide them.

The fact that Head Start people have not gone out asking for that kind of help could be taken as one sign of an isolationist atmosphere that seems to characterize the program, and that has been another target of criticism, usually from people on the outside.

Another sign of isolationism has been Head Start's apprehension about the new Greater St. Paul Council on Coordinated Child Care. Head Start director Mrs. Sue Williams says she is afraid the council may try to control all day care in the city, and somehow jeopardize Head Start, especially its emphasis on parent involvement.

That fear seems unjustified for the council stresses voluntary coordination, prohibits interfering in program policy and requires parent membership on its policy board.

"Parent involvement is the most important thing in day care," says Mrs. Harvey Bream, interim chairman of the council.

Two months ago, David Berres, an executive of Wilder day care centers, became an at-large member of PAC on his own request. Other representatives of the community have been conspicuously absent from PAC meetings.

Head Start's weak contact with the rest of the community is particularly serious, considering that one of its primary goals is to create needed changes in other institutions.

The schools have been changed somewhat by Head Start, according to Karen Johnson, who directed Head Start when it was in the schools and since then was principal at Groveland Park elementary school.

She credits Head Start with introducing teacher aides to the schools. There are now 400 paid aides and 300 volunteers.

And, she says, "We learned from Head Start that we needed smaller classes—we realized that before, but Head Start brought it more into focus."

Some Head Start parents vow they will insist on the same kind of open contact with public school teachers that they have had with Head Start teachers. Many feel the schools are far more responsive than they were five years ago.

"Kindergarten teachers at first were skeptical," recalls parent coordinator Mrs. Marie Wilson. "They said Head Start was a waste of money, a waste of time. They said they couldn't see a difference in the children."

"Now all we get from them are good remarks. They want to know what we'll be doing, so they can adapt their curriculum."

MIGRATORY LABOR SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS ON FARMWORKERS IN RURAL POVERTY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee (Mr. STEVENSON) has announced a series of hearings and investigations on the problems of farmworkers in rural poverty. As the first chairman of that subcommittee, I shall never forget the great difficulty involved in securing the vital legislation which would assure justice and dignity to those who travel the face of this Nation to harvest our agricultural products.

For 10 years we attempted to focus on the migrants' problems, and proposed solutions for both the short and long run. Many new laws and programs were enacted—minimum wage, and child labor coverage, crew leader registration, and funds for health care, education, housing,

and day care. Yet the painful fact is that these farmworkers are still excluded from the benefits of so much of our legislative programs.

In view of continuing economic and political powerlessness faced by farmworkers, I think the new chairman has established a most important and significant direction of the subcommittee. In his opening remarks before his first hearings on July 22, he said:

The problems of the most severely disadvantaged people in rural America—migrant and seasonal farmworkers—can't be described, much less solved, unless we examine them in the light of the larger difficulty in agricultural America: rural poverty.

I agree with my distinguished colleague. It is clear that urban areas are unable to absorb the flow of people from rural areas; and it is impossible to obliterate urban poverty without removing its rural causes. I have long been committed to the principle that by making rural areas more attractive, we could reduce or arrest the rural to city movement of poor people. And we can significantly improve the quality of their daily lives.

It is unfortunate, but imperative, that the work of the subcommittee must continue. But so it must, for only through continued legislative action and oversight will progress come. Furthermore, while Federal, State, and local efforts have shown some improvement, we have still failed to meet the needs of the broader rural community. To date, major efforts are still focused on urban poverty, and not nearly enough emphasis has been placed on poverty in rural America. Yet, the Nation does have the resources to meet the needs of every rural citizen through support of the public and private sectors of our economy, giving respect and dignity to the individual, with equal access to opportunities for economic and social advancement.

In view of the significance of the remarks of the new chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, and their importance to all Senators, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ADLAI E. STEVENSON III

Chairman, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (on the scope and purposes of Migratory Labor Subcommittee hearings during the 92nd Congress, at the first hearing on July 22, 1971).

FARMWORKERS IN RURAL POVERTY

In 1813, Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to his fellow statesman John Adams, expressed his conviction that America, the new nation, with its vast uncultivated lands and the opportunity they promised, would bring forth in the world not only a new form of government but a new kind of man: self-reliant, free and prosperous.

"Here," he wrote, "everyone may have land to labor for himself if he so chooses . . . Every one, by his property, or by his satisfactory situation, is interested in the support of law and order. And such men may safely and advantageously reserve to themselves a wholesome control over their public affairs, and a degree of freedom which, in Europe, would be instantly perverted . . ."