

UNITED STATES

U.S. Congress.



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 18

JUNE 30, 1973 TO JULY 12, 1973

(PAGES 22479 TO 23744)

as well as to fulfill the velvet-and-steel role of the chief executive. And it has been well said that there can be no lasting penalty for creativity and courage.

NEED FOR DAY CARE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Robert Cassidy recently authored a very sensitive article which appeared in the June, 1973 Parents' Magazine and Better Family Living regarding the overwhelming need for quality day care centers throughout the country.

This article, entitled "The Crisis in Day Care," points out the history of the fight in the Congress to obtain legislation which would alleviate some of the many problems now facing families in which both parents are working. It also describes some of the more successful child development settings, such as the program now being run at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; as well as some of the depressing facts uncovered by the report of the National Council of Jewish Women.

Mr. President, because of the need for more public information on this matter and because of the factual material contained in Mr. Cassidy's investigation, I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CRISIS IN DAY CARE

(By Robert Cassidy)

The roof of the Health, Education, and Welfare building in Washington, D.C., may seem a strange place for a day care center, but the 60 children who play and learn there think it's great. When a visitor observed them one recent morning, the youngsters, aged two to five, were having a wonderful time. In one of the four classrooms, children worked with a teacher on an art project. Others were listening to a story. When lunch time rolled around, everybody got a healthy meal.

Following their afternoon nap, the children, supervised by several staff members, played outside in the fenced-in rooftop recreation area, complete with sturdy play equipment, tools and building materials, and lots of running room. After more indoor activity the youngsters were picked up by their parents at five o'clock.

This center, established in 1971 for the children of HEW workers, is intended to show what good day care is like. Children here are provided well-rounded developmental care—not just babysitting services—at a reasonable price. Parents pay according to their family income on a sliding scale: \$5 a week for a family with a \$6-7,000 income, for example; \$9 for families in the \$9,000-10,000 range; and \$23 for those in the \$15,000-17,000 group.

For this, the children get hot lunches and snacks, play activity, and individualized teaching (there are four professional workers and five assistants, plus support staff). According to the Director, Mrs. Constance Mair, a University of Maryland graduate, teachers set up an informal educational program specifically tailored for each youngster, then concentrate on the child's weak areas. The HEW center is run under contract by the educational development division of the Thiokol Chemical Corporation of Clearfield, Utah.

It would be a pleasure to report that all the country's day care centers (there were 16,600 licensed centers in 1970, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-

fare, plus numerous unlicensed facilities) were providing comparable or better services. But it is a shameful fact that many of the 625,000 children in centers throughout the United States are denied satisfactory educational, nutritional, and medical services—and these are not just poor children. Though the federal government will have spent some \$1 billion, 374 million on day care in fiscal 1973—and slightly more money is allocated for 1974—the needs of parents and children are far from being met.

In 1972 the National Council of Jewish Women released a lengthy, comprehensive report on day care in 77 cities, compiled from observations made at the local chapter level. (The report, *Windows on Day Care*, was supervised by Mary Dublin Keyserling, former director of the Labor Department's Women's Bureau. It is available for \$2.00 from the Council, 1 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10036.)

The national day care situation depicted in the report is not a pleasant one. There are six million children under the age of six with working mothers; only about ten per cent of these youngsters are in licensed day care centers. Many of the four and a half million employed women with preschool children are single, or are working to help their husbands keep the family off the welfare rolls. Some of the poorest families get day care services for their children through two federally supported programs, Head Start and Titles IV-A and IV-C of the Social Security Amendments of 1967. (Of the more than 60 federal programs which provide direct funds for day care services, these two are the most important.) Some of the funds available under the Social Security Amendments are keyed to the Labor Department's Work Incentive (WIN) program, which is designed to train welfare recipients so that they can go to work. Because the federal government requires matching funds from the states, however, this money has gone begging in some states. Too often, mothers participating in WIN have been forced to make their own child-care arrangements.

Money alone, however, doesn't necessarily buy good daycare. An observer from the National Council of Jewish women found on her visit to one of the most expensive private centers (charging some parents as much as \$45 a week) that the two- to five-year-olds were cared for by two school-aged children. The kitchen and bathroom were very dirty; one paper towel was used to wipe the faces and hands of all the children. Windows, doors, and outdoor play equipment were broken. Indoor play equipment was non-existent.

Much of the day care available in this country is not offered in centers at all. According to the Office of Child Development, about 40 per cent of all day care is provided in family day care homes where a mother takes in up to six children who may or may not be related to her. Because the vast majority of these homes are unlicensed, it is impossible to know exactly how many there are.

The National Council of Jewish Women included home arrangements in its "Windows on Day Care" study and reached two basic conclusions: 1) the majority of the mothers providing home care for groups of children were warm, affectionate, and well-meaning; 2) most of these women had no training in early childhood education and thus were handicapped in their efforts to provide the kind of developmental care and stimulation most authorities feel is needed. The solution to this problem seems to lie in an increased emphasis on licensing of day care homes and the provision of a broad-based training program for the women involved. In light of the present severe shortage of funds, such homes may be our best hope for significantly increasing the

capacity of the national day care system.

As inadequate as some day care homes and centers may be, they are better than nothing—which is what many children of working mothers are receiving. Experts estimate that as many as 100,000 children are cared for by other children under the age of sixteen. Another 100,000 are so-called latch-key kids, youngsters who carry keys to let themselves into an empty house after school. They must care for themselves until one of their parents gets home from work.

Obviously, after-school centers for school-aged youngsters whose mothers work are desperately needed. We also need more compensatory educational programs—Head Start is one model—and programs for the gifted. We need special programs for infants and for handicapped or retarded children. It seems almost fruitless to talk at present about providing space for the children of women who would like to have some time for themselves during the day, to work or continue their education.

The "Windows on Day Care" report called for federal funds to provide developmental day care services on a full-day basis for an additional 200,000 children, half of the programs to be fully subsidized, half to be partially subsidized; and similar subsidies for another 200,000 children who would receive partial day care. The report recommended a \$2 billion authorization for fiscal year 1973, to increase by \$2 billion annually through the 1970s.

Unfortunately, this dream will surely not be realized for the next four years, and perhaps never. The money is not there, nor is the commitment—despite the rhetoric from the White House about concern about the first five years of life. To fully comprehend the bleak future of day care in the United States, a lesson in recent history is necessary.

During the fall 1972 session of the Congress, considerable interest in day care was shown by two factions. One group, led by Senators Walter Mondale of Minnesota, Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin, Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut and Jacob Javits of New York, hoped to see legislation passed for adequate funding a stepped-up national day care program. The other group, led by Senator Russell Long of Louisiana and supported by the Nixon Administration, sought to keep spending for day care down, with the hope of reducing inflation. Caught between the two groups was the government's Office of Child Development, whose director at the time, Dr. Edward Zigler, a former professor of early childhood development at Yale, tried to find a compromise.

But such a compromise was not to come. Although the Nelson-Mondale Bill was passed by the Senate, it was never acted upon by the House of Representatives. President Nixon had vetoed the comprehensive child care bill passed by Congress in the fall of 1971. Further attempts to get a child development component into the Administration's Family Assistance [welfare] Bill failed. By the end of the 92nd Congress, no comprehensive child care measure had been passed. The prospects for getting one during Mr. Nixon's second term are remote.

Almost a year ago, Dr. Zigler resigned his post as director of the Office of Child Development and returned to Yale. In a recent interview, Dr. Zigler, himself the father of a nine-year-old boy, talked about day care. "We need a ten-year program to figure out what can and cannot be done." An increase of about \$300 million a year in day care funds would build up the system in a planned, orderly manner, Dr. Zigler thought. About the veto of the 1971 child development bill and the failure of the Family Assistance Bill, he said, "We don't need any new legislation to make day care better. We need standards, moral commitment, and money."

Day care advocates outside the government also see money as the key. Theodore Taylor, executive director of the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, noted that all federal child care programs are aimed at families with incomes below \$4,500—and only one-third of the eligible families are reached. So not only are the majority of poor families being denied federally supported child care services, but all middle-class ones as well, including single-parent families and those in which both parents work.

An equally outspoken critic of the status quo is William Pierce of the Child Welfare League of America. Mr. Pierce is completing a major report on day care in which he says that "universal, high-quality, non-discriminatory day care has about as much chance of becoming a reality for Americans as universal, high-quality, non-discriminatory public education." In a recent interview, Mr. Pierce added, "We don't need cheap solutions: what we need is adequate funding." He noted that the administration was at least \$750 million short in its original proposals for day care, since all the government's figures were based on 1967 costs which, of course, have been drastically increased by inflation. According to the administration, developmental day care could be provided for \$1,600 a year per child. Mr. Pierce said it would take on the average at least \$2,300 a year per child to offer "acceptable" day care (based on federal standards) and more than \$2,600 to offer "desirable" services.

Finding competent people to staff day care centers is a serious problem today, primarily because of the low salaries. It is not uncommon for professional staff to be paid \$5,000-\$6,000 a year, while non-professionals often receive salaries just above the minimum wage. Any increase in the number of day care centers will, of course, make it even more difficult to find qualified personnel.

While at the Office of Child Development, Dr. Zigler proposed the creation of a new job category, the Child Development Associate, a person with competence in child care but not necessarily a college degree.

Mr. Pierce sees still another personnel problem: the lack of qualified directors, trained in early childhood development, who can work successfully with both children and adults, and are also good administrators. Mr. Pierce suggests that a program to retrain some of the nation's 100,000 or so unemployed elementary and secondary school teachers could provide a ready pool of day care directors.

The Office of Child Development, under acting director Saul Rosoff, has far from resigned its responsibilities. It was one of the few branches of HEW that did not suffer fund cuts in President Nixon's budget for fiscal 1974, and the Head Start program will continue. New licensing guidelines have been made available to serve as models for state statutes. The Child Development Associate idea is being tested out, and OCD is studying the use of television, both to train personnel for centers and to act as a teaching tool within the centers.

Given the present situation, parents should make the best possible use of existing facilities. Poor families should seek out public and voluntary day care services. Middle-class families should take advantage of the tax benefits now permitted under federal law. Working couples and families with only one employable adult are permitted to deduct up to \$200 a month for the care of one child, \$300 for two, and \$400 for three or more children in outside care. Up to \$200 a month can also be deducted for household help, if it frees the mother to work. Specific information on child care deductions is contained in the Internal Revenue Service's Publication 503, "Child Care and Disabled Dependent Care."

Parents should be extremely careful in choosing a day care facility. Particular cau-

tion should be exercised before enrolling a child in any commercially run day care center. Some of these centers start out hoping to make a profit, then find that they cannot do so and consequently cut down on the amount spent for the care, feeding, and supervision of children enrolled. Other such centers are run through franchising, arrangements, under which a central office directs the activities of the local centers. A great many franchised day care centers have failed. (For guidelines on selecting a center see recommendations at end of this article.)

With all the problems attendant on providing good day care services, it is important to realize that developing an extensive national day care system is not an impossible task. During World War II, when large numbers of women were needed to work in factories, an efficient nationwide network of child care centers came into existence virtually overnight—and disappeared just about as quickly after the War. Nevertheless, this wartime experience is proof that day care on a wide scale can work. What is needed is a sense of urgency and the commitment of large numbers of citizens. Only when parents begin to make their feelings known to those in power—local officials, state legislators, members of Congress, the President—will the dream of adequate day care for our nation's children become a reality.

NEGLECT AND EXPLOITATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, two recent reports by agencies of the Federal Government on profound injustices borne by Indians in the Southwest merit early attention and action by Congress.

In May 1973, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights issued "The Southwest Indian Report," which is based upon hearings held in Albuquerque, N. Mex., and Phoenix, Ariz., last November. The report covers the discrimination and deprivation confronting Indians in the Southwest States in the fields of employment, education, health care, administration of justice, and water rights.

Over 20 percent of the Indian population of the United States resides in Arizona and New Mexico. Yet this major Indian group confronts a staggering unemployment rate of up to 60 percent, a high rate of high school dropouts, an infant mortality rate substantially above that for the U.S. population, frequent arrests on misdemeanor charges, and an almost total uncertainty about water rights which are vital to reservation life.

That the Federal Government bears heavy and direct responsibilities to redress these grievances is beyond question. And yet, for all practical purposes, the only answer the Indian people have received is silence and continued discrimination.

A recent article in the Evening Star-Daily News, of Washington, D.C., has brought to light a second report—a sharp indictment of exploitation of Navajo Indians under the trading post system. Prepared by the Los Angeles Office of the Federal Trade Commission, after public hearings and an extensive survey, the report describes what must be labeled as cruel and inhuman treatment suffered by Indians who find themselves constantly in debt to the trading post and forced to sign over welfare or social security checks before being allowed to purchase any further goods.

The report cites exorbitant prices paid by Navajo consumers under this trading post system monopoly—people who are without any realistic recourse, largely as a result of ineffective regulation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The FTC report recommends measures to control outrageous interest rate charges, to provide for judicial settlement of trader and consumer claims in tribal courts, and to promote the establishment of cooperatives and stores under tribal control.

I have recently written to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Affairs (Mr. ABOUREZK), requesting that the subcommittee undertake a study of the important issues raised by the FTC report at the earliest opportunity. I am deeply concerned that the serious injustice worked upon the Navajo Tribe under this trading post system be corrected without delay.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the introduction to "The Southwest Indian Report," issued by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in May, 1973, and the article, entitled "FTC Cites U.S. Abuse of Navajos," appearing in the June 15, 1973 issue of the Evening Star-Daily News, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SOUTHWEST INDIAN REPORT INTRODUCTION

American Indians suffer much of the economic, social, and cultural damage that afflicts other minority Americans. Their problems, however, are complicated by additional factors. While American Indians encounter pervasive discrimination not unlike that faced by other minority groups, their plight is traceable, in large degree, to the failure of the Federal Government to carry out its treaty obligations and statutory responsibilities.

Traditional history texts of nineteenth century and early twentieth century America celebrate the heroism of white settlers in the development of the continent and the subduing of "hostile" Indian populations. Expressions reflecting this attitude can be found on monuments throughout the Southwest. For example, in the town square of Santa Fe, New Mexico, the oldest settlement in the West, there is a commemorative inscription:

To the heroes who have fallen in the various battles with savage Indians in the territory of New Mexico. . . .

Little is reflected, in texts or monuments, of the cultures and histories of the diverse peoples commonly known as American Indians. Less is mentioned of the suffering that Indians have endured and continue to endure. Only recently has a more accurate account of official brutality, displacement, and neglect become recognized and grudgingly acknowledged.

Most Indian tribes and pueblos are conquered nations. In exchange for their rights and privileges as fully sovereign entities, they have received certain guarantees and assurances from the Federal Government. Reservations were created to house tribes retaining a limited form of sovereignty. These reservations are semi-autonomous preserves upon which a combination of Tribal, State, and Federal law applies. Indian people received the Federal Government's commitment to provide certain services and act as trustee for Indian interests. By treaty, many tribes relinquished all legal claim to vast areas of land in return for health care, education, and other services.