

U.S. Congress.

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 19

JULY 17, 1972 TO JULY 25, 1972

(PAGES 23915 TO 25346)

ETOWAH MAN RODE \$20 TO U.S. CAREER

(By James Free)

WASHINGTON.—Just before the Alabama bank was forced to close in the "bank holiday" declared in the depths of the economic depression in 1933, the First National Bank of Attalla cleared a final loan—for \$20.

With this modest but hard-to-get stake, Elmas E. (Red) Cox bought a one-way ticket to Washington, D.C., and arrived here, flat broke, on a blustery March day.

He considered himself lucky and relatively rich, for he had the promise of something that millions of able-bodied adults badly needed at the time—a job.

Cox began his career in the federal government at \$100 a month. He is best known to Alabamians for his 20 years as top aide to former Rep. Albert Rains, D-Ala., from 1945 to 1956.

For these past two years, he has been special assistant to the Comptroller of the Currency—an office that functions under the Treasury Department. And, appropriately for Cox, it is the one in which he started at the bottom of the Civil Service ladder and progressed to the highest, so-called "supergrade" (18) at \$26,000 a year (now \$36,000).

Fortunately for Red Cox, his two decades on Capitol Hill, to a considerable extent, were related to his earlier and later work in the executive branch.

His legislative boss, Rep. Rains, was an active and most effective member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, which deals with many fiscal and banking problems.

Red, a husky, gregarious six-footer, is known as a man with friends in many places—particularly in Congress—as a fellow who can get things done.

His friendliness and talent for getting along with people in difficult situations helped him get going in the first place.

He had hoped to go to Howard College (now Samford University) after his graduation from Etowah County High School. In fact, he went to Birmingham to enroll, but had to withdraw. The economic stagnation had engulfed the Cox family, too, and his mother was ill.

So back in Attalla, Red attended classes of the Alabama School of Trade. "I thought I might become an electrician," he said. "But it didn't take. My wife says I can't even fix an electric plug in our house, and I guess she's right."

Before long young Cox got into something less technical. He became a room clerk at a local hotel, which no longer exists. One of the residents, when Congress was in recess, happened to be then Rep. Miles Allgood.

He liked Red, and promised to help him land a job in Washington. He kept the promise.

After a few weeks with a temporary agency, Cox—thanks to Rep. Allgood—latched on to a position as file clerk in the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. He remained with this sub-agency of the Treasury Department until Dec. 16, 1937.

It aided in setting up the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in September 1933. His next job was with the Federal Housing Administration, until he went to Capitol Hill in January, 1945, to join newly elected congressman, Albert Rains, in a post now classified as administrative assistant.

In addition to the friends met through his work with Rep. Rains, Cox's acquaintanceships were widened through his marriage to the former Miss Josephine Frick of Houston, Tex., who had served as secretary to Reps. Albert Thomas and Olin Teague of Texas.

When Rep. Rains retired to private law practice in 1965, Cox had a number of job offers. One of the best came from Aerojet General, one of the giants in the "space" program.

He chose to go back to the agency where he started—the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency. "I figured it would be easier to work with banks than to get a man on the moon," said Red.

The present comptroller, William R. Camp, is a career man that Cox knew in the same shop when both were new to Washington.

The Coxes live at Lake Barcroft in suburban Virginia. They have two sons, Barry, a senior in civil engineering at the University of Alabama; and Lee, 13.

Red likes to fish, when he gets the chance. And he can do it on short notice, since he lives on a lake. His main recreation is politics. "I'm a damn good Democrat," he says.

ALCOHOL AND HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, more than 50,000 Americans are killed on our highways each year. This is an alarming death toll particularly when we consider that a majority of these accidents could be prevented.

Alcohol has a significant influence on highway accidents. Approximately one-half of all deaths on the road are a result of the drinking driver. He causes an estimated economic loss in highway mishaps of \$8 billion annually.

The National Safety Council reported last month that the first 4 months of 1972—

Have been among the worst for traffic safety in the history of the United States. A total of 16,320 persons have died nationwide since January 1. There were 4,440 in April alone, making it the deadliest April for traffic ever.

Also in its report, the NSC urges that some portion of the Federal alcohol beverage tax receipts be utilized to help finance better highway safety programs. Several States have approved new legislation to allow 18-year-olds to purchase and consume alcoholic beverages, therefore, the revenues collected from the Federal tax could exceed \$5 billion in the years to come.

Since alcohol is so directly related to highway accidents and deaths, it would seem reasonable to suggest that some portion of these receipts be allocated to highway safety. I have proposed such a plan. In the bill (S. 2719) which I introduced last year, I recommend that as much as 10 percent of the Federal alcohol tax be utilized to improve highway safety and get the drunk driver off the streets. Based on the 1970 revenues, 10 percent would have amounted to \$475 million. This figure is more than five times what is currently being spent.

In May of this year I was privileged to testify before the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Senate Public Works Committee on my proposal. I urged the committee to make highway safety spending a higher national priority and to assure adequate funding through the use of the Federal alcohol tax. Other witnesses, including the National Safety Council, also testified to the inadequacies of current programs and funding levels.

The problem of the drinking driver is so serious and the deaths that result so senseless that I believe the longer we hesitate the more irresponsible our indifference becomes. If we had moved earlier to implement stronger programs in the

States and assure Federal funding for them, perhaps many of the 16,000 persons who died in the first part of this year would have been saved.

WINDOWS ON DAY CARE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from "Windows on Day Care: A Report Based on Findings of the National Council of Jewish Women." This excellent and perceptive report was released by the council last week.

I invite the attention of Senators to the study because it relates directly to legislation now under consideration by the Senate—the bipartisan child development bill agreed to last week by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, and the day care provisions in H.R. 1 now before the Committee on Finance.

The report of the council documents the disgraceful inadequacy of existing day care services in this country. By now most of us have heard the statistics: that there are almost 6 million children under the age of 6 whose mothers are working, but only 700,000 licensed day-care slots available to serve them.

What this report adds to the picture is the firsthand experience of parents who have desperately tried to find quality day care and have been frustrated in this effort in one way or another.

Here is a description of one of the centers visited for the study:

This is an abominable center. It was very crowded. In charge were several untrained high school girls. No adults present. No decent toys. Rat holes clearly visible. To keep discipline, the children weren't allowed to talk. This mass custodial center couldn't have been worse.

This description summarizes well the problems highlighted in the study: lack of standards for physical condition of many centers; lack of enforcement of standards concerning the ratio between children and staff; lack of stimulating educational experiences in many programs; lack of trained staff; and lack of adequate funding.

But the study also includes a most encouraging set of findings on the quality of Headstart—the most creative federally supported preschool program. "The Headstart centers evoked warmer praise on the part of the survey participants than any other group of centers observed," according to the report.

Of the Headstart centers studied, the council found that:

Ninety-three percent had parents on their boards.

Eighty-three percent employed parents as aides in the center.

Ninety-five percent had medical or nursing services available.

In addition, Headstart directors were found to have greater training than most directors or other programs.

A Headstart center in the Pacific Northwest was singled out by the researchers as an example of a program of superior quality. Compare this de-

scription with that of the center I referred to earlier:

The center was open from seven in the morning until six at night. The director, professionally trained in the field of early childhood education and with a college degree, received a salary of \$10,000. Four full time non-professionals . . . a part time aid and four volunteers also assisted. There were thus fewer than five children to each adult. The service of a nutritionist, cook, nurse and social worker were shared with a public school . . . Parents were actively involved as board members . . . There was a good playground as well as good indoor and outdoor space and equipment. The observer was impressed by what she regarded as an excellent program.

The importance of this finding with respect to the quality of the Headstart programs cannot be overemphasized. In what this study shows to be an otherwise disappointing nonsystem of day care, Headstart is a promising example of what good can be done. That is why the legislation I introduced last year—which was vetoed by the President—and the new bill I have introduced in this session build upon the best elements of the Headstart approach—the provision of a quality program including educational, medical and social services, with parental involvement, adequate training and decent standards, and those elements which have been retained in the bill reported last week by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty.

That bill speaks in many ways to the recommendations of the Council report. The Council calls for free services for poor families and partially subsidized services for families with higher incomes. The Council stresses that "child care programs must provide the educational, nutritional, health, psychological and social and other services necessary if children are to realize their potentials."

Other council recommendations include the expansion of Headstart and the upgrading of standards to assure that centers provide quality programs.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD chapters I and IX, which describe the methodology of the study and the recommendations emanating from it. I sincerely commend it to the attention of Senators and to members of the public who share our concerns about children and child development.

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

CHAPTER I. THE PLAN OF THE REPORT AND HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This Windows on Day Care Report tells the story of what members of the National Council of Jewish Women in 77 of their local Sections saw when they examined existing day care needs and services in their communities.

To put Council findings in the perspective of the national scene, Chapter II summarizes highlights of what is now known about the arrangements made by mothers who obtain day care services for their children. It also indicates the extent to which present child care facilities throughout the country fail to meet existing and anticipated needs.

What did the need for day care in their own localities look like to Council members participating in the Windows on Day Care Project? Their findings are presented in Chapter III. Chapters IV, V, and VI summa-

rize what survey participants saw when they visited proprietary and non-profit day care centers and day care homes.

Chapter VII reports what Council members learned when they talked with mothers about their own day care needs and problems.

Chapter VIII offers illustrations of what Council Sections are doing in their communities to help expand and improve day care services.

Chapter IX presents recommendations for action at the national, state and local levels. They are offered for the consideration of all who share the Council's conviction that a country as well endowed as ours can no longer ignore the fact that millions of our youngsters are today denied the developmental opportunities which should be the birthright of every American child.

A FEW HIGHLIGHTS OF FINDINGS

With respect to the national scene, many groups of children are urgently in need of developmental day care services:

CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS

Six million children under the age of six have working mothers. Most of them work for compelling economic reasons. About a million of the children whose mothers are employed are in poverty; another million are in families living close to the poverty line. Most of the families of these two million children would be on welfare if their mothers weren't earners.

Only a very small percentage of the children whose mothers are employed now benefit from developmental day care services. The large majority are cared for in their own homes or the homes of others and most of them receive only custodial care. Well under ten percent are enrolled in licensed day care centers. Of the centers visited by Council members only about a quarter provided developmental care including educational, nutritional and health services, the essential components of quality care. Survey participants found that far too many children of working mothers were grossly neglected latch-key children on their own, children who went with their mothers to their places of work because no other arrangements could be made for them, children in day care centers and homes of such poor quality they may suffer lasting injury. The first five years of a child's life are the period of the most rapid mental, personality and physical growth. Deprivation in the early years can have disastrous effects.

The number of children of working mothers in need of care has been rising considerably more rapidly than the supply of services available.

Children of mothers who do not work and are in poverty

A second group of children no less in need of good day care are the two and one-half million children under the age of six whose families are in poverty and whose mothers are not employed. Most of these children are economically, educationally, and physically seriously disadvantaged. Part-day care could give these children the head start they so greatly need. The many people Council members interviewed in their communities, closest to day care needs, agreed that we are doing far, far less than what we should be doing for these children.

Other children who need care

There are many others whose need for good day care is urgent: infants, for whom little quality care is available; handicapped children whose special health and other needs could be met by competent day care specialists but who now receive little assistance; children whose mothers are ill or handicapped; children whose mothers are studying or in work training, or whose voluntary services in the community make a vital contribution. In need of day care are all the addition-

al children whose parents desire it for them at a price they can afford.

The acute shortage of quality day care facilities today is depriving millions of children of the opportunity to get a good start up the ladder of life. For many it will forever deprive them of the chance to realize their potentials.

Acute local shortages reported

In their local communities participants found mounting concern with what can only be called a day care crisis in most of the areas in which the survey was undertaken. In community after community the people most knowledgeable about day care needs and existing services told Council interviewers that an eight or ten fold or even greater expansion of quality day care would not suffice.

The growing day care shortage hit all income groups hard. That the poor suffered especially was obvious. Federal funds for day care now help provide services for fewer than 5 percent of the children of economically disadvantaged families most in need.

Most parents who want quality care for children are not eligible for care that is subsidized and they cannot find affordable, unsubsidized quality care. Developmental day care services are expensive. They cost as much as \$2,000 to \$3,000 a year a child. Few families can afford that. Thus millions of parents make do with inferior and often harmful arrangements.

Council findings about day care centers

All licensed proprietary and non-profit centers in the United States had an enrollment capacity in 1970 for about 625,000 children, many of whom were cared for only part day. This number included children of preschool age, and those of school age who received care only after school. Council members visited 431 centers throughout the country caring for about 24,000 children.

It was found that the great majority of the children cared for in the centers observed had working mothers. Proprietary centers primarily served middle- and higher-income families. The non-profit centers largely enrolled children from low-income families although some of them did accept children from middle income families which were charged fees scaled to income.

Children from one-parent homes headed by working mothers were a small minority in most proprietary centers. Most of the proprietary centers visited were too expensive for most mothers without husbands. Most non-profit centers gave these children top priority. In two-thirds of such centers visited by Council members, children from one-parent homes were a sizeable majority.

About three-fourths of the day care centers observed were largely segregated institutions, serving only white or predominantly white families, or only black or predominantly black families.

Findings about proprietary centers

Here are a few additional findings about the proprietary centers seen:

The average fee charged was about \$18.50 a week per child. Council members felt that this was all that the great majority of families served could afford to pay, yet they recognized that fees at this average level do not and cannot possibly buy developmental care.

Because the average fee charged was less than half what quality care actually costs, parents got what they paid for. In more than half the proprietary centers the size of classes exceeded generally accepted standards and the adult-child ratios were far too low.

Salaries paid center directors and other professional staff were, on the whole, very much lower than those paid elementary school personnel. The great majority received less than \$4,000 a year with many paid sub-minimum wage rates. With salaries so low,

as was to be expected, the majority of the staff were people with little or no training in early childhood education or development.

On the basis of the wide range of information collected, the proprietary centers visited were rated as to whether they seemed to be providing care which might be called "superior," "good," "fair," or "poor." Only one percent of the proprietary centers visited were considered "superior." 15 percent were regarded as "good." An additional thirty-five percent were essentially custodial, providing "fair" care in the sense of meeting basic physical needs with very little, if any, by way of developmental services. Half were considered to be rendering poor care and in some cases this was found to be very bad indeed. Many illustrations in the Report demonstrate this to the hilt.

Findings about nonprofit centers

The non-profit centers presented, on the whole, a more encouraging picture. About 15 percent of the non-profit centers visited were Head Start projects; about the same percentage were other programs wholly financed by public funds. About one quarter of all non-profit centers observed were jointly financed by public and private funds and another one quarter were centers run by philanthropic agencies. A few were hospital based. Many of the remainder were church operated, usually run on a fee for service basis.

On the whole, of all centers seen, the best of the Head Start Centers elicited the most praise on the part of Council members.

While Head Start and most of the other publicly financed programs provided service without cost or at a nominal fee, a large majority of the other non-profit programs scaled their fees from nominal amounts upward, according to the income of the parent (fees averaging about \$11 a week), or charged a flat fee (averaging about \$14 a week).

While non-profit centers catered primarily to working mothers, the majority of whom headed their own families, their hours were not as well adjusted to the needs of employed mothers as might have been expected. None of those visited were open around the clock and very few were open long enough to meet the needs for women who got to work very early or who worked late or on week-ends.

Qualifications of directors of non-profit centers were far higher than those who headed centers under proprietary auspices, although there was relatively little difference as to the degree of training of other staff members.

Salaries paid were far better in non-profit than proprietary centers for both professional personnel and aides. In a far higher proportion of non-profit centers than proprietary ones, adult-child ratios met generally accepted standards; and non-profit centers were considerably more likely to provide the full range of services considered necessary for developmental care. For these, among other reasons, the services of the non-profit centers were, on the whole, rated much higher than those of the proprietary centers visited. This is understandable. Costs of services ran far higher in the former than the latter. Services in many publicly financed centers were reported to cost well over \$2,000 a year per child; in some the cost exceeded \$3,000.

Of all non-profit centers seen, nearly a tenth were regarded as "superior," providing care as good as any found. Somewhat more than one quarter were considered "good," and about half were rated "fair," meaning that while they provided for basic physical needs they were essentially custodial. Somewhat more than a tenth were considered "poor." Council members felt that some of the poor centers shouldn't have been permitted to go on functioning.

Family day care homes observed

Turning to a few observations about family day care homes, it is estimated that, in the

nation as a whole, as many as 2 million children may be receiving care in homes other than their own while their mothers are away at work. Fewer than five percent of these homes, it is estimated, are licensed or supervised.

Council members, seeing family day care homes at their best felt they sometimes offered development opportunities fully equal to that available in superior centers. While nine percent of the homes observed were thought to be providing "superior" care, 28 percent were regarded as "good." Half were custodial in nature providing no educational or other services beyond the mere meeting of physical needs. An additional 11 percent were regarded as "poor" or very poor. Some of the latter provided the worst horror stories encountered.

What mothers had to say

The interviews with mothers reported by Survey participants were particularly interesting. A large proportion of the mothers receiving welfare assistance with whom Council members talked said they had searched to no avail for free or low cost care for their children in order to be able to look for work. Mothers in work training programs often said the free or low cost care being provided their children wouldn't be available once they found employment. They didn't see how they could take jobs since the cost of child care would bring their earnings below welfare levels.

Working mothers comprised a large majority of the women interviewed. Most of them shared day care related problems including finding good enough care at a low enough price, arranging for transportation, and finding facilities open early and late enough to accommodate job schedules. While a few mothers received free care, fees for others ranged from \$2 to \$100 a week, with their weekly outlays averaging \$15.

Of all child care arrangements used by the mothers interviewed, center care evoked the warmest response particularly because it was more apt than other types of service to include educational components.

Among the mothers not at work who were interviewed some said that were it not for day care difficulties they would be at work, or in study or work training programs. Others said they did not wish to join the labor force believing their young children needed their full time attention.

What council members are doing

Section reports included accounts of what members were doing to expand and improve day care in their communities. At present, 131 of the Council's 176 Sections are active in day care, many in more than one way. A number of other Sections are considering various day care projects. At least 32 Sections are now sponsoring or co-sponsoring day care centers. An additional 58 Sections are trying to set up centers, some of which are on the verge of opening; others are looking into the possibility of doing so. Twelve Sections which had initiated day care centers have turned them over to others to run. Thirty Sections contribute volunteers on a regular basis to day care centers sponsored by others. At least 23 Sections contribute services to day care centers other than providing regular volunteers. In the areas of coordinating and/or stimulating day care in their communities or states, 26 Sections are or have been specifically concerned with the 4-C Program (Community Coordinated Child Care). Some 38 Sections have been taking a leading part in helping to coordinate and stimulate day care in their areas through programs other than the 4-C Program. Five Sections are or have been active in efforts to expand and improve family day care and three in the training of day care center workers.

A significant contribution to the Sections' work in the day care field emerged from the

work undertaken to make this Report possible. Many Council members reported that this had enlarged their understanding of day care needs in their localities and had stimulated them to seek additional means to help meet them. For many it opened up new, constructive roles in various day care activities. For all it deepened the conviction that ours, the richest of all nations, can and must rise to the day care challenge that confronts us.

HIGHLIGHTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Comprehensive developmental child day care services should be available to all families who wish their children to benefit from them.

2. Federal appropriations of at least \$2 billion are recommended for fiscal year 1973, rising by \$2 billion annually well into the 1970's, to expand and improve quality day care services. Program funds should be allocated only to public and private non-profit programs and to the upgrading of family day care homes.

3. Day care should be provided without charge for children in low income families, with fees scaled to income for others. Economically disadvantaged children should have priority.

4. Head Start programs should be continued and expanded.

5. Day care should not be regarded as a "welfare" service. It is needed by families at all income levels. All publicly assisted day care programs should be integrated racially, ethnically, and with respect to socio-economic groupings.

6. State and local matching funding requirements should be reduced to 10 percent and waived as necessary.

7. Existing appropriations under Title IV of the Social Security Act and other existing programs should continue uncut.

8. All Federal day care programs should be coordinated. Consideration should be given to the extent to which funds under these programs might flow to the States and localities through a single channel.

9. A clearinghouse should be established in the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to provide state and local groups information as to the sources of all Federal funds available for day care services and procedures to be followed in applying for them.

10. Neither work training nor employment should be a mandatory requirement for public assistance eligibility of mothers. The right to choose whether to work or to take care of their own children is one to which all mothers are entitled.

11. With respect to the delivery of expanded day care services, we recommend the establishment at the local governmental level of an Office of Child Development, or its equivalent, where such an agency does not now exist, to coordinate the full range of publicly assisted child care and related family service programs. We also recommend the establishment of representative, local child and family service policy councils, with a high degree of parental participation. It is recommended that Federal funds be allocated to help support these functions. This mechanism would provide a useful means for utilizing those local 4-C (Community Coordinated Child Care) Committees which meet accepted criteria.

A similar mechanism is recommended at the State governmental level.

12. Concerted effort is needed in all communities to:

Survey needs for comprehensive child care services.

Prepare local plans for meeting needs.

Eliminate overlapping efforts.

Expand care for infants and toddlers, for bilingual children, for handicapped children, and for other children with special needs.

Provide early morning, late day and night

care for children of mothers whose working hours require such services.

Expand day care services in the neighborhoods where children live.

Expand transportation services relating to day care.

Cluster day care centers to effect improved common services.

Satellite day care homes around day care centers.

Provide day care jobs for parents and others with provision for career ladders.

Expand training opportunities for day care workers, both professional and non-professional.

Encourage volunteer participation in day care programs and training opportunities.

Eliminate substandard wage scales and excessively long hours of day care personnel and make professional salaries commensurate with those in elementary education.

Improve state and local licensing statutes and procedures and improve the quality of enforcement and its effectiveness.

Assure better continuity between day care and elementary education.

Expand all types of quality care in the community, public and private.

Develop educational programs for parents relating to day care needs and available services.

Include in the high school curriculum courses in family life and child development that provide opportunities for volunteer service in day care centers.

Educate the public as to the magnitude of day care needs and the soundness of a large scale public investment in comprehensive child care and related family services.

CHAPTER IX. RECOMMENDATIONS THE GOAL

Our ultimate goal as a nation should be to make available comprehensive, developmental child care services to all families that wish to use them. These services should be provided without charge to low income families (defined as families of four with incomes of less than \$4,320 a year), and to families with incomes above that level for fees on a sliding scale based on family income.

The diversity of need for child care services should be recognized. Full-day developmental child care services should be greatly augmented for the preschool children of mothers who are employed and mothers in work training and study programs. Priority should be given to children of mothers who head their families, and to other children in economically disadvantaged families. Part-day services of a developmental quality need to be greatly expanded for other children whose mothers are not employed and whose parents wish them to benefit. Here, too, economically disadvantaged children should have priority.

This report focuses on the need for day care services for children of preschool age. Our recommendations, are, therefore, addressed largely to the needs of those children, although we recognize fully that an even larger number of school age children whose mothers are employed are in no less urgent need of care before and after school.

FEDERAL LEGISLATION CALLED FOR

1. We recommend that sufficient Federal funds be authorized for fiscal year 1973 to provide developmental day care services on a full day basis for an additional 200,000 children, one half of them to be fully subsidized, and one half to be partially subsidized, with fees scaled to income; and, on a part-day basis, for an additional 200,000 children, one-half to be fully and one-half to be partially subsidized.

It must be recognized that comprehensive child care services cost money; they cannot be skimped if they are to provide adequately

the range of services essentially to the mental, emotional, and physical development of children. Child care programs must provide the educational, nutritional, health, psychological, social, and other services necessary if children are to realize their potentials.

In hearings in January 1971 before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on S. 1512, the Comprehensive Child Development Act (subsequently passed by both Houses of Congress but later vetoed by President Nixon), Dr. Edward Zigler, Director of the Office of Child Development, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, submitted estimates of the costs of group care. The cost of full-day group care of "acceptable quality" was placed at \$1,862 per child, per year and of "desirable quality" at \$2,320 per child, per year, based on 1967 cost data. By the end of 1971, those cost estimates, adjusted for subsequent price rises, would have been \$2,292 and \$2,856, respectively.

A study funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity examined the costs of 20 quality child care centers and day care homes sponsored by Head Start affiliates, other publicly financed agencies, and by private proprietary and private non-profit groups. It placed costs, as of November 1970, at an average of about \$2,350 per child per year for a program for 25 children, at \$2,250 for 50 children, and at \$2,200 for 75 children. These figures would have been \$2,442, \$2,340, and \$2,285 respectively at December, 1971 prices.

Assuming approximate costs of \$2,300 per child, per year for full-day, fully subsidized child care and \$1,200 for part-day fully subsidized care, and then adjusting those figures for the fees scaled to income that some parents might be expected to pay, a Federal outlay of at least \$700 million would be required to provide direct services for 400,000 children of preschool age, on the basis recommended.

We recommend, in addition, that outlays for Head Start programs, which are estimated to total about \$350 million in fiscal 1972, be expanded to at least \$500 million in fiscal year 1973.

We recognize that the suggested expansion of services—which in our judgment is a modest target—would require outlays for administrative costs, training, technical assistance, planning and coordination, family participation and involvement services to families, construction and renovation of facilities, establishment of a mortgage insurance system, and research, among other essential purposes. We believe that an appropriation of \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 1973 to expand developmental child care services for preschool children only would be insufficient to attain the suggested goals. Even a \$2 billion Federal appropriation for fiscal 1973 for developmental child care services for children of preschool and school age, before- and after-school, would hardly suffice. Such an amount is the least that should be appropriated.

Program funding should be limited to public and private non-profit programs and to activities directed toward the upgrading of family day care homes.

We recommend that Federal legislation for the expansion and improvement of child care services drop the prevailing requirement for state and local matching at 70/30 or 75/25 levels, and instead place matching on a 90/10 basis, with procedures to waive the 10 percent state and local matching requirement as necessary.

If programs are to be increased to reach those most urgently in need of developmental child care, Federal outlays should rise by at least \$2 billion more every year, to \$4 billion in fiscal 1974, and \$6 billion in fiscal 1975, and so on well into the 1970s.

Given the clearly demonstrated magnitude of need, as we have seen it in our commu-

nities, we cannot afford to do less. The suggested \$2 billion authorization for fiscal 1973 would represent less than one fifth of one percent of the value of our total output of goods and services. It would be equivalent to less than a fifth of what is spent each year for tobacco, and less than one eighth of what is spent for alcoholic beverages. We can afford this modest \$2 billion investment in our children. We cannot afford the continued neglect of children—neglect we can document throughout the United States—the cost of which is huge in both human and economic terms.

PRESENT FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS SHOULD BE SUSTAINED

2. It is our recommendation that the appropriation suggested above be a supplement to present outlays for other Federally supported day care programs. We strongly recommend that funding under Title IV-A remain open-ended, as at present.

INTEGRATION IS VITAL

3. Day care should not be regarded as a "welfare" service, any more than public education. Day care is a service needed and wanted by families at every income level. We strongly recommend efforts to assure that all publicly assisted child care programs be integrated racially, ethnically, and in terms of socio-economic groupings.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

4. We recommend that the Office of Child Development of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare be designated as the agency to be responsible at the Federal level for the administration of the suggested new programs. We also recommend the establishment of a National Policy Council composed of representatives of parents, members of public and private agencies involved in the provision of day care services, and other acknowledged leaders in the fields of early childhood education, health and development.

It is vital that existing Federal programs which provide funds for a multiplicity of uncoordinated child care programs be effectively coordinated. The present lack of coordination stimulates grantmanship at the local level. A good grantsman may tap Federal funds from many agencies, each unaware of the allocations of others, while some communities, no less urgently in need, may receive little or no funding.

There is need for more than a clearinghouse to apprise each agency of the actions of others. Federal funds for child care services should flow to states and localities in accordance with sound state and local plans for action. There is need, too, for consideration of the extent to which Federal funds for child care services might be provided to the states and localities through a single channel.

NEEDED—A CLEARINGHOUSE OF INFORMATION ON FUNDING

5. Pending the development of a more effective coordination mechanism at the Federal level, the Office of Child Development should provide a clearinghouse in the Federal Government to serve as a single, central point for information on the sources of funds and the procedures that local groups and agencies might follow in applying for them.

REVIEW OF PRESENT ALLOCATIONS NEEDED

6. We recommend that an intensive review be made of the present use of Title IV-A funds. The review should be made by a committee appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, with a representative membership. As discussed in Chapter IV of this report, releases of the Department indicate that of the \$300 million in Federal funds allocated in fiscal 1971 to the states and localities for day care under Title IV of the Social Security Act, nearly 60 percent of the total provided child care services in homes of welfare-assisted mothers; about 30

percent, provided care in family day care or group care homes; and only about 10 percent, provided care in centers.

NEEDED—IMPROVED REPORTING SYSTEMS

7. Another change needed at the Federal level is the improvement of the reporting system relating to day care and preschool educational facilities. Data are collected by the Office of Child Development on current enrollment in licensed day care homes and centers; statistics on enrollment in kindergartens and nursery schools are reported by the Office of Education. The two series overlap and there are serious deficiencies in both. There should be a single reporting system, providing information on the availability of day care and educational services for preschool children, both public and private, showing full-day and part-day enrollment capacities.

MANDATORY WORK REQUIREMENTS OPPOSED

8. An additional recommendation set forth, relating to Federal responsibilities, is that neither work training nor employment be required to make mothers eligible for public assistance. We believe all mothers should be free to decide whether to work or to take care of their own children. We regard this choice as a fundamental right in our society, a right which must be preserved.

We would emphasize that our investigations and those of others convince us that if quality day care services were to become increasingly available, a large proportion of AFDC mothers would elect to use them and to enter training programs or accept employment. We are strongly opposed not only to mandatory work requirements, but also to the development of a second rate care system for the children of welfare-assisted mothers. Disadvantaged children, even more than others, need developmental opportunities of high quality if they are to have an equal chance with the more fortunate; they must not be segregated as they are today in many publicly subsidized programs.

STATE AND LOCAL COORDINATION IS NEEDED

9. Not only should day care program activities at the Federal level be better coordinated; the Federal government has a major responsibility to encourage and assist more effective coordination of child care services at the State and local levels. The 4-C program (the establishment of state and local Community Coordinated Child Care Committees) was initiated toward this end. While the program is potentially a very useful one, it has failed to achieve its declared objectives, with some notable exceptions, because of inadequate staffing and support, and lack of directional clarity and of interagency coordination at the Federal government through the regional offices to the state and local committees. Very little Federal funding has been available except for a limited number of pilot projects.

An original impetus to the establishment of 4-C committees in some areas had been the hope that these committees might be the recognized channels through which child care funds would flow from Washington. When this failed to materialize, some 4-C committees broke apart as local groups completed to become grant recipients.

Because 4-C committees have lacked common guidelines and have been largely dependent on very limited sums of local money, there has been great variation from locality to locality in 4-C organization and function. Some committees have promoted training opportunities or served as informational centers. Others have regarded themselves as child service advocates. A few have been involved in actual planning and coordination activities; a few have assumed roles with respect to fund administration, having obtained contracts to do so; and a few have been directly involved in program operation.

Local coordination is, we believe, essential to the accomplishment of many vital tasks. It is highly desirable in most communities that comprehensive surveys be conducted of local child care service needs, and of the availability and location of existing centers and homes in relation to those needs. There should be coordinated planning for facility and service expansion. Especially needed, if larger amounts of child care service funds were to become available, would be coordinated determination of where and how and for whom these funds could best be used. There are many other common purposes at the local level which can best be advanced through the coordinated efforts of all agencies involved, public and private.

Because effective coordination of all child care programs is vital, it should be encouraged and supported. It is not enough to provide, as has been proposed in some recent child care bills, that local governmental organizations (prime sponsors) and Child Development Councils coordinate and monitor only such new programs as the legislative proposals would authorize.

It is recommended that a small proportion of all Federal funds for child care and preschool educational services be earmarked for allocation to those communities which establish in their governmental structures an Office of Child Development, or its equivalent, as an intragovernmental mechanism for the coordination of the full range of child care and development, early education services, and related family service programs. Also as a requirement for such allotments, we recommend the establishment of local child and family service policy councils made up of representatives of parents who should constitute one third to one half of the members; of members of public and private agencies and organizations concerned; and of qualified community leaders. Neither the governmental unit nor the policy council should be identified as "welfare" oriented.

The establishment of such an agency and policy council could provide a much needed coordination mechanism with respect to the full range of public funds, Federal, state and local. This would offer an opportunity to use existing 4-C organizations to the extent they meet the eligibility requirements agreed upon, or they could be modified to do so. In other localities where 4-C committees or their equivalents do not exist or cannot be built upon, the suggested Federal allotments for coordination would serve as an incentive for establishment of coordinating policy councils. It is suggested that these councils should be policy making and not operational bodies with respect to the actual delivery of services.

State prime sponsors and policy councils are similarly desirable. There are essential coordination, planning and policy functions to be exercised at the state level.

EXPANDING AND IMPROVING SERVICES

10. We recommend the development or expansion of free or low cost training programs. Staff members of private and public centers and day care home operators can be encouraged to participate through a point accreditation system or similar mechanism. The courses should also be open to parents, especially those who are Child Development Council or project board members.

Concerted efforts are needed to assure the availability of day care services for the children of employed mothers who work at night or at early morning or late day hours, for infants and toddlers, for bilingual children, for handicapped children, and for other children with special needs.

It is important that comprehensive day care services be available in the neighborhood. Mothers strongly prefer not to transport small children long distances. Pending availability of sufficient care in neighbor-

hood, steps must be taken to provide more adequately transportation as an essential component of child care service.

Role of the day care center in the community

We need to enlarge concepts of the role of the day care center in the community. This was well put by a committee appointed at a conference called by the Office of Child Development, in cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity, in the summer of 1970. This committee was chaired by Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, distinguished professor of psychology and child development at Cornell University. The committee's "Statement of Principles—Day Care USA," published by the Office of Child Development, said:

"The day care center should become the focus of social and service programs involving families, neighbors, local businesses, civic organizations, and any other agencies in the community. This enables the entire community to become aware of and actively concerned with the children in its midst. The day care program has the responsibility of serving as a bridge to the larger community in which the child lives."

We share these concepts and hope they will be more generally accepted.

There is need for intensive exploration of the possibilities for clustering day care centers, or grouping them into area systems. Economies and improved services could emerge in many instances from shared professional direction, staff interchange, common or cooperative purchasing, and other central services.

Day Care Homes

Another challenge relates to the difficult problem of how standards of family day care homes might best be improved. As has been discussed in Chapter VI, perhaps fewer than five percent of the immense number of day care homes are licensed or supervised. They are too numerous and too small in scale to be brought universally into compliance, even if more of them could be brought within the licensing system. Too vast an army of inspectors would be required. While we recommend that efforts be continued to license a larger proportion of family day care homes, there are many steps communities might take in the meantime to help upgrade the quality of these facilities. They include establishment of free or low cost courses in early childhood education and development in local community colleges and other educational institutions which day care home operators might be encouraged to take. Special child care centers should be established which might work in conjunction with satellite family day care homes in the neighborhood, at the option of the operators. The centers could provide workshops and film presentations and serve as lending libraries and lenders of educational materials, toys and equipment. Children in the homes might come to the centers for a number of hours a week to participate in group activities under skilled direction. Operators might visit classes. Center staff might visit family day care homes, at their operators' request, to consult and advise.

Day Care jobs for parents and others

The quality of child care services could be further enhanced through the large scale expansion of training opportunities for parents and others who desire them, both through on-the-job experience and/or through academic courses, to enable them to become day care aides, with ample provision for career ladders to further their advance.

Wage scales and hours

Another essential element in the upgrading of day care services is the elimination of substandard wage scales and excessively long working hours. No Federal funds should be allocated for programs in which day care

personnel are paid less than the Federal minimum wage. Far higher salary scales for non-professionals should be encouraged. Professional salaries should conform with accepted standards for elementary school teachers and administrative personnel.

Linking pre-school and elementary education

Both day care and elementary schooling will benefit to the extent that there can be a closer interrelationship of and continuity between these educational services.

Others can help

A responsibility that all of us concerned with day care, its expansion, and its improvement should accept is to encourage, to the fullest extent feasible, the expansion of every possible type of quality day care in our communities, in addition to what is now being assisted or may be in the future, by public funds. Employers need to appreciate that the provision of child care services is a wise business move. It can greatly help curtail excessive rates of turnover of personnel and absenteeism, and promote the efficiency of mothers on the job. This includes employers in private industry as well as Federal, state and local agencies. Colleges and universities, hospitals, and other institutions could and should, on a far wider basis, provide child care services for students, trainees, and employees. Only one major trade union in the country has succeeded in including the provision of day care services on a sizable scale in its collective bargaining agreements. Why should not many other unions seek to do so? There is much that can be done to give greater impetus to these and other potential sources of day care service expansion.

IMPROVING STANDARDS AND THEIR ENFORCEMENT

11. Another key challenge to action is the improvement of the regulation and enforcement of child care program standards. We recommend that any legislation to expand funding for child care services provide for the development of Federal child care standards which local programs would have to meet to be eligible for funding, no less comprehensive than the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Labor.

Recent joint efforts on the part of the Office of Child Development and the Office of Economic Opportunity to involve child care leaders in the development of a suggested Model State Licensing Statute are commendable. It is recommended that such a code, if it is to be a "model," be consistent with the high standards already set by several states, and not be geared to the lowest or middle common denominator of practice.

It is recommended that NCJW members work with representatives of other organizations in their states to urge their Governors to establish licensing review panels where they have not recently done so, to update and improve state licensing standards and administrative procedures, and to make them consistent with a recommended Model Statute. Steps are needed to bring local regulations and procedures into conformity as well, to eliminate overlapping jurisdictions and conflicting requirements, to find means to reduce the number of steps applicants for licenses must take, and to eliminate unnecessary delays and obstacles in the licensing process.

Standards are no better than their enforcement. In this area we are failing miserably due to inadequate appropriations as well as to unwieldy regulations. A vital role for Council members and others concerned is to press for adequate appropriations for enforcement and for the development of guidelines or manuals which outline clearly procedures to be followed.

We need a more humanized and service

oriented concept of licensing enforcement. Inspectors must be more than police officers. They should be service oriented, and service trained, able not so much to crack down as to take a constructive part in the task of helping facilities to come into compliance. We recommend that Federal legislation for the expansion of child care services include allocations for the states and localities to help in the upgrading of licensing and enforcement.

EDUCATING THE COMMUNITY

12. Needed far more universally are educational programs at the local level to inform parents more fully about desirable standards for day care centers and family day care homes, to assist them in playing a more effective role through their own greater involvement and participation. Parents need especially to have sufficient information as to the kinds of services available from which they may choose, as best suited to their own needs and their children's.

Another educational activity recommended is the inclusion in the high school curriculum of courses relating to family life and child development, with opportunities afforded young people to participate as volunteers in high quality day care programs.

Community education programs are also needed to help the public appreciate more fully the magnitude of day care service needs, the stake of the community in the large scale expansion of quality services, and the soundness of an investment in comprehensive, developmental child care and related family services.

TRIBUTE TO ALABAMA'S ROY D. HICKMAN, PRESIDENT OF ROTARY INTERNATIONAL

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, one of life's great pleasures is to see recognition come to a man or a woman who daily gives generously in time and effort, as well as money, to help his fellow man.

For many years I have watched my fellow Alabamian, Roy D. Hickman of Birmingham, go about the daily tasks related to his business, Alabama Engraving Co., in Birmingham, and in a vast number of civic activities to which he not only gave use of his name, but which benefited from his active participation. The entire State of Alabama has served as a field in which he sowed the seeds of generosity. Roy Hickman's integrity as a businessman is matched by his reputation for doing for others with no thought of gain for himself.

Among the many activities to which he has given so freely has been the Birmingham Rotary Club and Rotary International. Since becoming a Rotarian in 1935 at the age of 33, he has served as president of his home club, as district governor, as aide to past Rotary International President Frank E. Spain—also of Alabama—and in many other capacities.

While conducting a successful business and taking a leadership role in his civic club, Roy Hickman also made time to work in an impressive array of community tasks, including serving in the presidency of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, the Sales Executive Club, the American Ordnance Post, the Executives Club and the Downtown Club. He has served local community chest and united fund organization, as an adviser to the Salvation Army, president of the Alabama Tuberculosis Association and

director of the American TB Association, in addition to many other worthy causes.

He has amassed a vast array of honors, including the William Booth Award for distinguished service in civic and philanthropic activities bestowed by the Salvation Army.

And now, Mr. President, Roy Hickman has attained the highest honor that his fellow Rotarians can bestow—that of the presidency of Rotary International for the years 1972-73.

I think that my feeling of pride and pleasure at this new and great honor for Roy Hickman reflects the feelings of all of my fellow Alabamians. We are proud of and for him.

Mr. President, the July 1972 edition of the Rotarian includes an article on Roy D. Hickman, the 62nd President of Rotary International. This story of a modern day Horatio Alger hero is recommended reading. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEET ROY HICKMAN: WORK MADE THE MAN

(The 62d President of RI is a commonsense Rotarian who strongly values vocational dignity and Rotary's Object)

It has been said, "When you want to find out how high a man has climbed, you have first to learn where he started from." For the measure of how far Roy D. Hickman has travelled to become the 1972-73 President of Rotary International, one must look back to 1935, when he first became a Rotarian and beyond to his boyhood days in Chattanooga, Tennessee, where he learned the virtues of self-reliance, hard work, and the determination to succeed against adversity. Today he is the board chairman of Alabama Engraving Company and its affiliate Platemakers, Incorporated, both located in Birmingham.

A tribute to the 62nd President of Rotary International was read into the United States Congressional Record last November from the U.S. Senate floor by Alabama Senator James B. Allen, who stated: "Roy Hickman came up the hard way. He learned the meaning and value of work at an early age and worked to help put himself through college. His refreshing attitude toward work is expressed in these words: 'Working was the best thing in the world that could have happened to me. It teaches you to appreciate things more if you work for them than if they are handed to you on a silver platter.'"

Certainly the invitation to become a Rotarian was not presented on a silver platter, but hard earned. He first became interested in Rotary in 1926, when he arrived in Birmingham, Alabama, as a salesman for Alabama Engraving Company. In his field of selling photo engraving, especially for high school and college yearbooks, he called on every printer in town. He came to know the late John C. Henley, Jr., president of the Birmingham Publishing Company, charter member of the Rotary Club of Birmingham, and a Past District Governor of Rotary International. Rotarian Henley took an interest in young Roy and told him that in due time—when he had matured and was ready—he wanted him to become a Rotarian.

Nine years passed before John Henley, with some trepidation and confessed misgivings, proposed for membership in that staunchly conservative Club the name of Roy D. Hickman. As a customer of Roy's company, John had been impressed over the years by the integrity and intelligence of Roy Hickman, who was then far below the average age of the Club members. He was only 33—a mere stripling in the eyes of the Club grey-heads.

The Birmingham Rotary Club takes pride