

Y 4
Ed 8/1

1015

9914
4887
4106

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

P 92 PRESCHOOL CENTERS SUPPLEMENTARY
EDUCATION ACT

GOVERNMENT
Storage

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETIETH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
ON
H.R. 10572
A BILL TO PROVIDE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO IMPROVE
THE EDUCATIONAL SERVICES IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE
NONPROFIT CHILD DAY CARE CENTERS

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 990237 ✓

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.,
FEBRUARY 28, 29; AND JUNE 15, 1968

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1968

20-497

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
ELMER J. HOLLAND, Pennsylvania
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAS, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
HUGH L. CAREY, New York
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
SAM GIBBONS, Florida
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILLIP BURTON, California
CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
CHARLES E. GOODELL, New York
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
OGDEN R. REID, New York
EDWARD J. GURNEY, Florida
JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
JOHN DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
JAMES C. GARDNER, North Carolina
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin

SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey, *Chairman*

JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
EDITH GREEN, Oregon
CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma

OGDEN R. REID, New York
ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held in—	
Washington, D.C.:	
February 28, 1968	1
February 29, 1968	51
San Francisco, Calif., June 15, 1968	101
Text of H.R. 10572	1
Statement of—	
Allen, Rebecca, Parent Cooperative Preschool International, Mont-	
gomery County Child Day Care Association, Kensington, Md.	36
Alphin, Mrs. Ida Z., supervisor, day care units, Department of Institu-	
tions and Agencies, State of New Jersey	93
Anderson, Marian P., president California Association for the Educa-	
tion of Young Children, Broderick, Calif.	118
Bronfenbrenner, Urie, professor of psychology in child development	
and family relationships, Cornell University	18
Lair, Mrs. Phyllis, president, San Francisco Parents' Association for	
Children's Centers, San Francisco, Calif.	126
Hymes, James L., Jr., professor of education, University of Maryland.	67
Mahler, Theresa S., director children's centers division, San Francisco	
Unified School District, San Francisco, Calif.	102
Mink, Hon. Patsy T., a Representative in Congress from the State of	
Hawaii	6
Oliver, Mrs. Covey, member of the board of the National Committee	
for the Day Care of Children, Inc., member of the West Philadelphia	
Day Care Committee, former president of board of Jardin Infantile	
in Bogota, a day care center for 110 children of working mothers	97
Pucinski, Hon. Roman C., a Representative in Congress from the	
State of Illinois	12
Scheuer, Hon. James H., a Representative in Congress from the State	
of New York	17
Snyder, Dorothy K., director, Los Angeles Children's Centers, Los	
Angeles, Calif.	146
Tignor, Mrs. Marian, legislative chairman, department of elementary,	
kindergarten, and nursery education, National Education Association.	76
Weber, John R., supervisor Children's Centers Services, State Depart-	
ment of Education, Sacramento, Calif.	128
Weir, Mary, National Association for the Education of Young Children,	
Washington, D.C.	42
Worlock, Patricia I., special assistant, department of community af-	
fairs, State of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J.	27
Wynne, Mrs. Helen, National Capital Area, Child Care Association,	
Inc.	84
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.:	
Allen, Rebecca, Parent Cooperative Preschool International,	
Montgomery County Child Day Care Association, testimony by	37
Alphin, Mrs. Ida Z., ACWS supervisor, day care services unit, depart-	
ment of institutions and agencies, division of public welfare, Bureau	
of Children's Services, Trenton, N.J., statement of	93
Hanley, Hon. James M., a Representative in Congress from the State	
of New York, testimony of	155
Lair, Mrs. Phyllis, president, San Francisco Parents' Association for	
Children's Centers, San Francisco, Calif., testimony of	127
Mahler, Mrs. Theresa S., director, children's centers division, San	
Francisco Unified School District, prepared testimony of	106

IV

Prepared statements, letters, supplemental material, etc.—Continued	
Matsunaga, Hon. Spark M., a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii, statement of.....	Page 156
Oliver, Mrs. Covey, representing the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Inc., statement of.....	97
Pines, Maya, "Someone To Mind the Baby," newspaper article entitled.....	64
Preliminary report of a consultation on women and day care needs, convened by Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor.....	51
Keyserling, Mary Dublin, Director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, "Working Mothers and Their Children—The Urgent Need for Day Care Services," speech entitled.....	52
Oettinger, Mrs. Katherine Brownell, Chief, Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, HEW, "Day Care Today: A Foundation for Progress," speech entitled.....	55
Reid, Joseph H., executive director, Child Welfare League of America, "Legislation for Day Care," speech entitled.....	59
Schloss, Samuel, National Center for Educational Statistics, "Nursery-Kindergarten Enrollment of Children Under Six: October 1966," speech entitled.....	62
Pucinski, Hon. Roman C., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois, statement of.....	12
Tignor, Mrs. Marian, legislative chairman, department of elementary, kindergarten, and nursery education, National Education Association: Daytime programs for children.....	79
Weber, John R., supervisor, children's centers services, State Department of Education, Sacramento, Calif., prepared testimony of.....	129
Weir, Mrs. Mary, National Association for the Education of Young Children, Washington, D.C., prepared statement by.....	42
Worlock, Mrs. Patricia I., special assistant, Department of Community Affairs, State of New Jersey, statement by.....	27
Zablocki, Hon. Clement J., a Representative in Congress from the State of Wisconsin, testimony of.....	152

PRESCHOOL CENTERS SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dominick V. Daniels (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Daniels, Hawkins, Mink, Scheuer, Bell, Scherle, and Steiger.

(The text of H.R. 10572 follows:)

[H.R. 10572, 90th Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress recognizes the value of early childhood educational programs. Millions of preschool age children whose parents work have no opportunity for this kind of experience. Congress believes that these preschool education programs should be extended to the Nation's child care centers by providing supplementary education services.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each succeeding fiscal year, the sum of \$300,000,000 to make grants under this Act.

ALLOCATIONS TO STATES

SEC. 4. From the sums appropriated for a fiscal year to make grants under this Act, each State shall be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers, in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all the States, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

SEC. 5. Any State which wishes to participate in the grant program under this Act shall designate or establish for that purpose a State agency which is broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups, and submit to the Commissioner through such agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State commission") a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

- (1) provides that it will be administered by the State commission,
- (2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 6, objective standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants and the amounts thereof,

(3) provides for approving and recommending to the Commissioner the day care centers which shall receive grants, and the amounts thereof, solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods,

(4) provides for affording to every applicant for a grant an opportunity for a hearing before the State commission as to its action under paragraph (3) with respect to such applicant, and

(5) provides for the making of such reports, in such form, and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this Act.

BASIC CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING PRIORITIES

SEC. 6. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants, and the amount thereof, shall be subject. Such basic criteria shall be such as will (1) give a preference to day care centers where the Federal grant will provide the greatest educational and cultural enrichment to children most in need thereof, and (2) best tend to achieve the objectives of this Act while leaving opportunity for flexibility in the development of State plan standards and methods which will best accommodate the varied needs of the several States.

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

SEC. 7. (a) Child day care centers which wish to obtain grants under this Act shall submit applications therefor at such times, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application for a grant under this Act if—

(1) the grant will be used only to provide supplementary educational services and education equipment for day care centers;

(2) the State or the political subdivision in which the day care center is located enforces standards for the operation of day care centers which give assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that such centers will be operated in a manner which will not be unsafe, insanitary, or otherwise detrimental to the children there, and the applicant meets such standards;

(3) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission; and

(4) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, that sufficient funds are available in the State's allotment to make the grant.

AMOUNT OF GRANT—PAYMENT

SEC. 8. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this Act, the Commissioner shall reserve from the appropriate allotment the amount of such grant. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this Act, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with provisions of section 5, or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 10. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 5 or with his final action under section 9(b), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 11. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "supplementary educational services and education equipment" means services (and related equipment) which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day care center's program, such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists, and other child development specialists, as well as the use of books and audiovisual material and equipment.

(2) The term "child day care center" means a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution which provides, at one or more centralized locations, for the care, guidance, and supervision of children during the day if (A) the daily period of care, guidance, and supervision is at least eight hours for a majority of the children involved, and (B) a majority of the children involved are aged three to five, inclusive.

(3) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(4) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

SEC. 12. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

Mr. DANIELS. The Select Subcommittee on Education will come to order.

We are meeting today for the purpose of considering H.R. 10572 and similar bills. The principal sponsor of this important measure is the Honorable Patsy T. Mink, Representative from Hawaii.

The purpose of this bill is to provide Federal assistance to improve educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers.

Until the 1930's most of the nursery schools in the United States were primarily established for children of the economically privileged classes. Women only began to enter the work force in great numbers during World War II, but since then, the number of working mothers has increased at a rate of over one-half million a year. It was during the war years that emergency nursery schools were established for children of working mothers of all classes.

Today, many women continue to work either by choice or through economic necessity. In some instances, a divorced or separated woman is the sole support of her family.

As a matter of fact, among the most neglected of all our children are children of college students who, while usually living on a shoestring budget, are building for a productive future.

One of every eight individuals in our country's labor force is a working mother with children under 18 years of age. One of every three mothers with children under 18 is in the labor force. The number of working mothers exceeds 9.5 million; it has doubled since 1950.

A similar pattern exists with employment of mothers of preschool children. One of every four mothers with children under 6 years is in the labor force. The number of such working mothers has doubled since 1950 and now exceeds 3.6 million. There seems to be no reversal in the prospects of these very significant trends. In this regard, in 1965, the Department of Labor projected a rise of 43 percent during the decade of the 1970's in the number of working mothers of preschool children.

In view of these very significant statistics, more adequate arrangements for enlightened child day care must come to the forefront of public attention. Those of us who have been witness to the deep division between the very best child day care, and the very worst, truly know how deeply a child's present and future existence may be affected by the quality of care he receives.

At present, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Labor, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce deal in some fashion with day care funding. Yet, despite these efforts, we are failing to meet the substantial challenges of high-quality day care.

The low status of our child day care facilities has caused Vice President Humphrey to declare that the lack of proper facilities for children of working mothers is "* * * one of the greatest problems of tomorrow's America. The availability of modern child day care services is no longer an individual convenience. It is a community and national necessity."

The principal bill to be considered is to be known as the Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act. This bill will provide to millions of preschool children not just the barest custodial care but critically needed supplementary educational services through child care and education centers.

This bill authorizes \$300 million annually in the form of grants. Each State will be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all States, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

As a precondition for State participation, a State must designate or establish a State agency which is broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care groups in the State.

The Commissioner of Education shall, by regulation, prescribe basic criteria for determining which day care centers shall receive grants.

These grants may be used only to provide supplementary educational services and educational equipment for day care centers. Supple-

mentary educational services and educational equipment are defined as services and related equipment which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day care center's program, such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists, and other child development specialists, as well as the use of books and audiovisual material and equipment.

The child day care centers envisioned in this bill are to provide at least 8 hours of supervision for at least a majority of children, and a majority of children in each center will be aged 3 to 5 years, inclusive.

H.R. 10572 makes it explicitly clear that no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under the authority of this act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

I want to compliment and commend Mrs. Mink, and all the other members of this body, who have demonstrated such a strong interest in this legislation now before the Select Subcommittee on Education.

Congress has already demonstrated that it recognizes the value of early childhood educational programs for children in their formative years.

A major expansion of day care services seems inevitable in view of the steady march of women into employment. In a way, the hope of the future may depend on what we do during the course of deliberations on this important bill.

Mrs. MINK. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I will be happy to.

Mrs. MINK. I would like to express my appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, for calling these hearings on my bill and for expressing such a strong justification for its serious consideration by this committee and by the Congress. I also would like to say that I am very pleased that you have authorized plans for extensive field investigations on this bill. This, I believe, will become the major work of the House in this area and will clearly delineate the problem and the specific improvements needed in the day care centers and in nursery school education generally.

I have had a very deep interest in preschool education and I feel that it is extremely timely that we consider this matter what with the success record we have noted in Headstart under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Headstart was the forerunner but with so many outstanding educators and experts in the field testifying to the value of educational experience for the youngsters between the ages of 3 and 5, I feel it is extremely appropriate for this committee to concern itself now with these youngsters being cared for in these centers.

Again I express my appreciation to the chairman and look forward to very interesting and productive hearings by this committee.

Mr. DANIELS. I want to thank you for your kind remarks. I do wish it to be noted that after several days of hearings, it is the plan of the Chair to conduct a field study. As a matter of fact, in order that we may not waste time in the field, I am going to recommend to the chairman, Mr. Perkins, that we send an advance guard out to take a look at the various centers which would be of the most interest

to the committee. I hope that as many members of this subcommittee who have the time and are able to get away will join us in the field trips.

I would like to introduce the members of the committee present here this morning. To my immediate right is Mrs. Patsy Mink of Hawaii, a very distinguished Member of the Congress.

To her right is a very able colleague, Mr. Scheuer, from my adjoining State, the State of New York, who has indeed distinguished himself in the short period of time he has served in this Congress and he has made very, very many valuable contributions to the deliberations of our committee.

To my left is our able colleague from the State of California, Mr. Alphonzo Bell.

To my immediate right is my good friend and colleague from the great State of California, our distinguished and able representative, Mr. Augustus Hawkins.

Our first witness is the very able Congresswoman from the State of Hawaii, Mrs. Mink.

STATEMENT OF HON. PATSY T. MINK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as a member of this Select Subcommittee on Education, I am pleased to be the chief sponsor of H.R. 10572, a bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit day-care centers. The 24 cosponsors of my bill and the many other bills introduced into the House and Senate providing in various ways Federal assistance and a multitude of services to day-care centers is convincing evidence of the public interest in improving these services to preschool children.

I consider day-care centers as one of the chief services which a community must provide. The need to place youngsters of tender age in a place which is both safe and sanitary and which offers educational programs, has been cited by labor and industrial leaders. City and State tax experts see available centers as the answer to placing mothers in jobs and thereby reducing the welfare rolls. And, finally and most importantly, educators believe that day-care centers can be the first step up the ladder of proper physical and mental development of our pre-school-age children.

Our own President took note of the social ills of our society in a message on education last year which, in effect, pinpointed the need to guide our students along the right path from an early age. President Johnson said:

In education, in health, in all human development, the early years are the critical years. Ignorance, ill health, personality disorders—these are disabilities often contracted in childhood: afflictions which linger to cripple the man and damage the next generation.

H.R. 10572 seeks as its goal Federal aid as a helping hand to public and private nonprofit day-care centers. It would authorize \$300 million a year to be distributed among the States according to the number of working mothers in each State. I believe that this kind of program would encourage existing centers to improve their facilities

and to orient their activities around educational enrichment; and second, would encourage the opening of many new public and non-profit private centers because of the expectation of receiving Federal assistance once they were opened.

I believe this bill has the potential of being the core around which communities will design day-care programs of high standards, provide for staff training, improve their educational curricula, and provide for more stringent licensing requirement not only for health and safety but also for educational criteria and staffing.

At present, the Headstart classes are the best known and largest effort in the field of efforts to aid preschool youngsters. But these are limited by regulation to children of families whose annual income is at a level of economic disadvantage. In addition, the social security amendments of 1967 authorized the establishment of day-care centers in association with work-training programs to be established for mothers receiving welfare. Federal funds may pay up to 85 percent of these costs until July 1, 1969, and 15 percent thereafter. Children at these centers again will be limited to those whose mothers require public assistance. The smallest number of day-care centers are those established for preschool age children of working parents or mothers whose income can bear some of the cost of operation.

In addition to Headstart and the social security amendments, Congress has also approved amendments to the School Lunch Act to include day-care centers among those places eligible to qualify for surplus foods and milk and supplemental payments for hot lunches for the youngsters.

This extension of the School Lunch Act may become a major accomplishment of the 90th Congress in this area of national concern.

I would like for the moment, to review the history and development of day-care centers. In this country, they became best known during World War II when our country underwent its most severe national emergency. Our Government appealed to mothers to staff the shipyards and the other essential posts which their husbands had to leave to fill the ranks of our military services. With Federal assistance, local communities hastily arranged to have small children of these working mothers housed in vacant stores, private homes, churches, and in a strange assortment of dwellings. Here, older women who were retired and could not do the physical labor in the shipyards and elsewhere cared for these youngsters, keeping them amused with games and cookies. It was a temporary arrangement—and like many other things of World War II, it succeeded by the sheer willingness of all the participants.

At the end of World War II, the Federal Government expected working mothers to return to their homes. Aid was withdrawn and most of the centers closed their doors.

Since 1945, however, the picture has changed again. I believe the present situation has been best described by Mrs. Mary Dublin Keyserling, Director of the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor. She has placed the number of working mothers currently at between 31 and 33 million and adds:

The number will be even greater this year. Our economy would fall apart without them. They are responsible for 37 per cent of all the goods and services currently being produced. And more than one-third of them, over 10 million women, are working mothers with children under 18 years of age. Nearly 4

million have children less than 6 years old—4 million! While the number of all women who work has doubled since 1940, the number of mothers in the labor force has increased more than sixfold—more than sixfold increase in less than 27 years.

Mrs. Keyserling said her study revealed that less than half of the children of working mothers are cared for in their homes, usually by the father or another relative, but in a great many instances care was provided by youngsters under 16 years of age or someone else in the household who was not competent to provide the kind of care a child needs. More worrisome was the finding that among the children under 6 years of age, one-third were cared for in the homes of others and much of this care was very poor indeed. Mrs. Keyserling believed that in instances where three or four children are cared for in a neighbor's house, they are receiving merely custodial care. She also learned that some 1.5 million tots were looked after by the mother while she was working at her place of work and that 40,000 children below the age of 6 were on their own trying to fend for themselves. She added:

The problem isn't going to go away if we continue to ignore it. As a nation we can afford to do a better job. We can no longer afford not to. Our children pay the price for the inadequate care so many now get. When their health, development and welfare are neglected, their futures are undermined. Our children are our most precious asset. We owe them the best our affluent nation can provide. The time is long since overdue for every force in our great United States to rally to meet child care needs.

There have been various estimates on the number of children attending public or private day-care centers, but they all place the total number at fewer than 400,000. How are communities meeting the needs? The Labor Department found the picture acutely distressing. The welfare council in one large city made a neighborhood-by-neighborhood survey and found 7,000 children in need of day care in one low-income area. To meet the need, the Labor Department said there were four licensed day-care homes and one commercial day-care center with a combined capacity for 87 children.

Furthermore, one city has submitted a plan for Federal assistance where the target area for future action has been clearly identified. In that target area alone, there is an established need for places for 5,000 children in day care. And the Labor Department asked, "What does the plan call for?" It calls for doubling the city's present day-care facilities from places for 25 children to places for 50.

Today, when the number of working women exceeds the World War II total by 6 million, licensed public and voluntary day-care centers have shrunk to one-sixth of their wartime capacity. They have also changed their orientation. Instead of opening their doors to all, they tend to concentrate on families with serious emotional or social problems. Their waiting lists are staggering.

A giant assist was given to day-care centers by the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962. Just after they became law, the total amount of funds spent for direct care of children from Federal public child-welfare sources was about \$200,000. In 1966, the total was \$12,100,000 for this purpose from Federal, State, and local public child-welfare funds, with \$3 million of the total coming from Federal funds.

In this period, the number of licensed day-care facilities increased about 32 percent, but it still provides for less than 400,000 youngsters compared to the needs of several million.

What happens to these children—most of them under 6 years—of the 4 million working mothers?

Irving W. Fellner, regional foster care consultant with the Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, views the scene this way:

About one million children under 14 years of age are without any supervision while their mothers are at work. It is not far fetched to assume that a significant percentage of these children will someday require rehabilitative services, whether by a probation officer, social worker, or psychiatrist. From the cost point of view alone, we should be convinced that there is a ripe area for the proverbial ounce of prevention.

I might also mention that the "ounce of prevention" in H.R. 10572 is only \$300 million a year while the cost of juvenile delinquency is now running about \$4 billion a year. If some supervision and leadership can eliminate a slight amount of destructive attitudes in youngsters, the effect of a lesser cost for juvenile rehabilitation would be felt immediately.

With the key emphasis in the social security amendments placed on job training for welfare recipients, the role of day-care centers becomes even more important. I am told that the director of the Cook County Department of Public Aid believes that one-fourth of the 26,627 mothers in Chicago on AFDC could—and would—go off relief immediately if there were a place for their children.

The Labor Department made a study of unemployment and under-employment in 10 areas where poverty is especially highly concentrated. They found that almost one of every five of the slum residents who were not in the labor force but who wanted a regular job gave inability to arrange for child care as the principal reason for not looking for work.

As is the case of most of the 900,000 mothers receiving this aid, these women feel that it would be better for them and better for their children if they worked. They do not want their children to grow up on welfare, deprived of the opportunity of seeing their parents as working, contributing members of the community and thereby themselves learning from their home environments about the world of work.

There is a second key way in which the creation of added day-care facilities can break the cycle of dependency and cut down on the welfare rolls. Substantial numbers of persons would be needed to operate these new centers and many, if not most, of these new positions could be occupied by AFDC mothers themselves who had received training as subprofessional aides. There are existing manpower training programs which can provide the necessary training. This use of parents and neighborhood people has been a proven success in the Headstart program.

Finally, it was discovered recently that in one State alone 400 nurses would be working today if they could find day care services that they would trust for their children. Meanwhile, hospital patients suffer from the critical shortage of nurses.

Much has been said about the value of these centers to the development of the child but one of the most concise statements has been made by Dr. John Walton, professor of education at Johns Hopkins University, who made this comment on the Headstart program:

Almost 1,500,000 children have been enrolled in 2,400 communities—probably the largest peacetime mobilization in hitherto unorganized groups. The curriculum was designed to give them some intellectual training. What are the results? They look pretty good. Without any exaggerated claims at all, one summary says that there has been a minimum of 5 to 10 points in I.Q. tests and 20 to 25 points on reading readiness tests. Now, these are the minimums. The maximums must range much higher and even the median gain must range much higher.

H.R. 10572 is basically a bill which places responsibility upon the individual States to recognize the need for new and better day-care centers, and to select those which are most in need of improvements and upgrading. The apportionment of funds among the States is to be based upon the percent of working mothers in each State. I realize this formula does not focus on the need of working mothers who have children aged 3 to 5, however, my research preparatory to drafting the legislation indicates that the U.S. Department of Labor and the Census Bureau have only information on working mothers. These concerned agencies acknowledge a lack of specific data as the total number of working mothers with small children.

It must be pointed out that the legislation is not intended to limit Federal funds to serve only youngsters in the 3- to 5-year bracket or only children of working parents. The requirement that the majority of the youngsters in the centers should be in the 3- to 5-year age group is only for the purpose of qualifying the center and once it is given a grant, the benefits would accrue to all the children who are attending the center.

There is great discussion on the provision that States which wish to participate in the grant program under the bill must designate or establish an agency which is broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups. My research on the need for this legislation again turned up the finding that there is an absence of uniformity on licensing, regulations, administration, and supervision of child care activities in the States. In this absence, it seems wise to require that the States accept the responsibility for designating one agency to do this and to determine which centers are eligible for aid. There is a belief that the legislation automatically expects the States to place this responsibility in its educational agencies. However, I did not intend to limit it to the educators. I thought the bill would serve the additional function of bringing together the various kinds of groups that already exist and various kinds of agencies that are already authorized to function in this area and perhaps through this mechanism create a greater awareness of the total problem and develop a greater spirit of co-operation and coordination of the activities, recognizing that the Social Security Act has now brought in a further new element into the program. There has been some discussion that our State departments of education are disinterested in preschool education because of their many other responsibilities. Many people have expressed a feeling that they would not want to see the education departments given any preference in administering this program but that in each instance they believe, as I do, that the Governor should have

the right to decide whether it shall be the department of education and to also have the alternative of designating some other department or indeed creating its own commission for this specific purpose.

There is also a provision in the bill that all of the local centers which wish to be considered for funds would apply to the State. No one could go over the head of the State to deal directly with Washington. It would have to be done on the State level. The State then would recommend approval. The State agency would approve the application locally and recommend final approval by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The bill states clearly that the U.S. Commissioner of Education could not authorize grants under the program that have not been previously approved by the appropriate State commission, thereby again recognizing local control. The role of the Commissioner of Education is simply to make sure that the overall purposes of the program have been satisfied.

The recommendation most often heard in relation to this bill is that it should authorize construction funds for new centers. I omitted construction as one of the eligible activities for Federal aid at this time because of a realistic appraisal of our national fiscal situation.

I can't agree more that what we need most of all are more centers, that we need to build new and better facilities, that we need to provide basic services, and to start from the ground up by providing for health and nutritional needs of these children as well as to provide the teacher and an education factor in these programs.

However, in examining the budgetary situation and the limitations under which we must present our legislation, it seems to me that to get something passed by Congress we had to take what seems possible at least as a first step. This bill is constructed around the concept of utilizing the centers that are now in existence or may come into existence and attempting to provide those supplemental services which are necessary in order to upgrade the kind of services that these centers are or will be providing.

However, I certainly don't intend to curtail the development of new centers by this provision. As long as there are no construction requirements to actually open the center, it would seem to me that an application for Federal aid for a proposed center should be included within the context of this bill.

I have included in the bill "* * * the use of books and audio-visual material and equipment" as legitimate activities to be included in an application for Federal aid. I should not need to explain that I did not mean a wasteful helter-skelter purchase of equipment with this assistance, as some people fear may happen. I believe the State agency charged with the responsibility of passing on applications must be entrusted to use its judgment on equipment that is necessary and useful to teaching youngsters of this tender age.

The bill defines "supplementary educational services and education equipment" as services which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day-care center's program. The listing of special services such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists, and other child development specialists is only for illustrative purposes and is not intended to be a limitation in any respect.

To the disappointment of some, H.R. 10572 does not provide specific aid for the training of teachers or teacher aides or other

professional personnel. The Education Professions Development Act and its programs for teacher development, it seems to me, ought to provide needed professionals for this program without proliferating teacher training funds under this act and thereby negate our recent efforts to consolidate these under one roof.

However, the programs which are funded under my bill could certainly encompass on-the-job training of the aide or semiprofessional assistant whose presence would have the purpose of increasing the individual attention given to each child.

H.R. 10572 obviously does not offer answers to all the deficiencies of day-care needs in the country. It does, however, recognize the problems which exist and it offers the encouragement that the Federal Government stands ready to extend a "helping hand" to those who will begin the momentous task of serving the millions of working mothers and their preschool children. I am optimistic that this "start" will go on to a growing plan for more and better day-care centers.

I thank the chairman and members of this subcommittee for your kind and courteous attention to my presentation and for the opportunity given me to present my statement in support of this piece of legislation.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you Mrs. Mink for your fine statement.

Our second witness this morning is another very able, capable, and distinguished member of our committee from the State of Illinois, Roman C. Pucinski. In order that we may not waste too much time on very elaborate introductions, Mr. Pucinski, I would suggest that you go ahead.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the entire committee has my prepared statement, so I would suggest we put it in the record at this point and perhaps let me briefly summarize it.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Select Subcommittee on Education, I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak on the necessity of child day care center legislation. I wish to commend my colleague, Mrs. Mink, who in introducing H.R. 10572 has helped to bring this subject to the attention and concern of the Congress.

I have long supported legislation to provide funds to enlarge, expand and create day care centers for children in pre-school years, as well as elementary school years.

I am confident that this Committee will gather extensive testimony showing the urgent need for day care facilities. In 1940, there were 1,500,000 working mothers with children under 18 years of age. That figure has now increased to over 9,500,000. This means that there are over 15,000,000 children with working mothers—12,000,000 of these children being under 14 years of age. The Department of Labor projects that one half of the increase in the labor force between 1964 through 1970 will be attributed to women. So that this figure of 9,500,000 will have substantially increased by 1970. The statistics also tell us that one out of every four mothers with children under 6 years of age is in the labor force—a total of 3,600,000 women. There are additionally 600,000 pre-school age children of working mothers in fatherless homes.

I'd like to provide the Committee with information compiled by the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago during a thorough study of the needs and resources of day care facilities for children in Chicago. There are 200,000 children under 14 who have working mothers—70,000 of these children being under six years of age. Of this 70,000, only 4,700 are in licensed, full day care centers. The number of "Latch key" children—children who receive no supervision at all—stands at 15,000, while 9,000 children are being cared for by relatives who themselves are under 16 years.

How are all of these children throughout the country presently being cared for? Less than 2 percent of them are cared for in day care centers. The fact of the matter is that in 1966 there were licensed day care facilities for only 300,000 children. The remaining millions of young children are cared for by relatives or non-relatives—or have no supervision. The most startling figure is that there are approximately 1,000,000 "Latch key" children.

There is no question that the need is there. The question is whether we are ready to use our resources to effectively care for our children.

Legislation written by this Committee should have three objectives:

- (1) Increasing the participation of children in a formal education experience—and at an earlier age;
- (2) Reducing the number of children who are not cared for or who are inadequately cared for because their mother must work;
- (3) Affording the opportunity for mothers on relief to obtain employment and be removed from welfare rolls.

It is now recognized by educators that a child's development in his early years is the key to the future of the individual and his potential contributions and capacities. Our successes with the Headstart Program and the achievements of the Montessori Method indicate the great value of an early educational process. A comprehensive day care program would bring education and encouragement to the children who are most often in need.

I have previously indicated the extent of the problem so that we must now work to fulfill my second objective of a reduction of children not properly cared for.

The Director of the Cook County Department of Public Aid says that one fourth of the 26,627 mothers in Chicago on AFDC could—and would—go off relief tomorrow if there were a place for their children. I am sure that this is the case throughout the country. We must act now so that public welfare doesn't pyramid and extend from one generation to another. By creating new opportunities through day care legislation we can move people off relief and reduce the terrific cost of welfare payments.

What is needed now are supportive services such as those mentioned in Mrs. Mink's bill. But we desperately need new facilities and trained personnel to handle the millions of children we are talking about. I am mindful that this involves cost. However, consider the cost imposed upon our society for the tragic waste of neglected children. Consider the cost of our welfare payments. Consider the cost of crime. During hearings on the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act, the General Subcommittee on Education heard testimony from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement indicating that juvenile delinquency costs this Nation \$4 billion annually.

So, if we can get at the root causes of crime, delinquency, poverty, and lack of education, day care programs will be well worth the cost and will, in fact, be an investment in our most precious resource, the young people of this country.

I submit to this Committee that it is time to end the concept of the fortress school.

By that I mean the school that slams its doors shut at about 3 PM each afternoon and closes its doors all summer long. I propose that a program be enacted which would give preference to applicants who would make use of already existing school facilities or who would make facilities available near those already existing. I think that this would be a most effective means of providing day care.

For example, a mother could see that her 9 year old child went to the grade school and that her 4 year old child went to the day care center either within the same school facility, or one nearby. The 4 year old would be cared for during the mother's work day. The 9 year old, after being dismissed from regular classes, would then be under the supervision of trained personnel in a center for his age group.

I contend that this concept of establishing day care centers in conjunction with the public schools which will be open from 8 AM to 5 PM, eleven months of the year will benefit the children and the mothers greatly as well as the taxpayers who must maintain these educational facilities which so often are not being effectively used.

So again, I wish to commend the Committee for studying the day care needs of this Nation. We have come to the realization that our destiny as a country will be determined by what we are willing to invest in our young people.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think that this is extremely important legislation. I want to congratulate the gentlelady from Hawaii, Mrs Mink, and our colleagues who have introduced the legislation. I think they are performing a very notable public service.

There is a great need for this legislation. I have been trying to arouse considerable interest in the need for this legislation. Recently, the welfare council of Metropolitan Chicago prepared an extensive study on the needs and resources of day care facilities for children in Chicago and there are 200,000 children under 14 who have working mothers and 70,000 of these are under 6 years of age. Of this 70,000 there are only 4,700 who are in licensed full-day care centers.

The number of "latchkey" children stands at 15,000. I submit, Mr. Chairman, one of the great problems of this country today is the "latchkey" child, the tremendous number of youngsters in America who are totally unsupervised during an appreciable part of the day simply because we don't have facilities. I am cutting my testimony short so that you will have more time to hear from Dr. Bronfenbrenner on this. So, this legislation is good. I would think that this legislation ought to have three objectives:

1. Increasing participation of children in formal education experience at an earlier age.
2. Reducing the number of children who are not cared for or who are inadequately cared for because a mother must work.
3. Affording an opportunity for mothers on relief to obtain employment and be removed from welfare rolls.

I think we can make a tremendous contribution here with the day care centers and in the long run the taxpayer is going to save money. Today, we have in Chicago alone some 90,000 youngsters who are on public assistance, on a public dole. Our surveys have shown that contrary to popular opinion in most instances the mothers of these youngsters on AFDC would go to work and want to go to work and are capable of going to work if some facilities were set up to take care of the youngsters during their working hours.

I think it is a myth to suggest that people on AFDC just don't want to work. We have ample evidence to show that such facilities can be created to take care of the youngsters during the day. Many of these women would be very happy to go to work and provide for their youngsters the kind of care that they ought to have with the dignity of self-reliance.

So in the long run I think you are going to find that you are going to save the American taxpayer a great deal of money.

We have before my subcommittee the school construction bill. It is my hope that when we take testimony on that bill, that we will be able to persuade our committee to include a priority. I would like to give priority to those school districts that will set up day care centers as part of the school environment and agree to keep those schools open from 8 o'clock in the morning to 5 o'clock in the afternoon. I would like to give them a priority in the allocation of Federal funds because I think the only way you are going to solve the problem is to make the school a more viable institution in the community and make the school the outlet for day care centers as part of the total learning process.

I would like to make one final suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and that is that this bill, as all other bills coming out of our committee hereafter, should have some formula for evaluation. Now, we didn't adequately accomplish that in title I of ESEA, and I think that what is happening to title I across the country today is just short of a national tragedy. We are starting to get some very, very serious results and reports from all over the country on the ineffectiveness of the compensatory programs that we have funded through title I.

I think that we erred when we wrote title I in failing to include in that legislation sufficient evaluation machinery so we could know as we move along what are they doing with this program and what effect it is having.

Now the Office of Education is trying to get an evaluation and other people are trying to get evaluation but the legislation, lacking that specific language, in my judgment weakened the program.

I would recommend to the gentlelady sponsoring the legislation that she seriously consider our adding to this legislation some language that would provide for evaluation as we move along with this very important program. After all, it is a \$300 million expenditure and the Congress ought to know how we are spending the money.

More important, I think, we ought to know what kind of results we are getting. I regret now we didn't write that type of language in the Library Services Act. It is my purpose hereafter in all bills moving through the committee to have some language in there calling for evaluation as the program moves along.

I would hope that the gentlelady would be willing to accept this recommendation and add it to her legislation which does have some form of present evaluation.

I thank you for letting me testify on the bill in which I have a deep-rooted personal interest and will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. No questions.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. No questions except to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois for a very worthwhile statement.

Mr. DANIELS. Mrs. Mink.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank my colleague for his strong endorsement of the bill and his excellent statement on the general need for this legislation in the country. I have only one question.

While supporting the bill, there are various statements in your testimony which give the impression that your preference is for a bill that would provide funds for construction of new facilities to take care of the children that are now not being provided for in our existing day care centers. Recognizing that this is also a tremendous need, I have deliberately omitted construction funds because of the critical nature of our fiscal situation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentlelady is wise in eliminating construction funds from her bill. There are many existing day care centers now that need help very desperately. We passed the lunch-room bill the other day to provide hot lunches for day care centers. Your bill would provide the material, the equipment, and the various other supportive activities that are needed.

So I find no conflict at all between my basic concern for brick and mortar and your bill which would provide the facilities and the services and material and all of the other things that would have to go into this brick and mortar once the building is built. I think you are moving your bill because brick and mortar bills are always difficult bills to get through the Congress.

So I think that your bill is designed to fill an immediate need and, with a successful enactment, existing day care centers could immediately start taking advantage of it; so I find no conflict, and I support this legislation before your committee.

I hope, though, that when the school construction program comes along, which is a brick and mortar bill, that we will be able to write in some priorities and give the school districts that want to get into the business of day care centers some sort of priority to build the facilities which then would be furnished with the legislation now before this committee.

So there is no conflict between our views; I am sure of that.

Mrs. MINK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman from New York, Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. SCHEUER. I want to congratulate Congressman Pucinski for his fine testimony.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Scherle.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I have one question that I would like to ask my good friend, Mr. Pucinski. I am wondering if the quality of day care and child care centers teaching staffs is such that we should be talking about spending one-third of a billion each year for machines. If we are going to do something about day care centers, shouldn't we start by considering whether the staff is such that children are receiving the proper type of human contact first?

Mr. PUCINSKI. My answer, Mr. Scherle, would be that the chairman has indicated there is going to be very extensive hearings on this bill. There is no question that you have raised a very significant and important point. I am sure that this legislation is going to be rewritten and improved and strengthened and tightened up. If something can be done to improve the quality of the personnel I am sure that will be considered, too.

As President Kennedy used to say, "Even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step," and I think the gentlelady has taken the first step here in Congress. I am grateful to her and the committee and the chairman of this committee for at least beginning hearings on what I consider one of the most important single problems in America today and that is the need of some facilities for the youngsters who are uncared for during a substantial part of the day.

Mr. SCHERLE. This I certainly approve of; however, without the human element involved are these children going to be cared for through mechanization? I think we have this problem to consider.

Mrs. MINK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. I would like to say the bill contemplates a major area of emphasis on use of personnel, particularly trained teachers, in order to supplement the day-care centers so they are not merely babysitting operations but do incorporate the latest methods and ideas concerning the importance of early education for children

between the ages of 3 and 5. The reference to equipment was only as an addendum recognizing that teaching children in this early age period requires the use of materials, audiovisual equipment and so on, and I believe this program should include support in that area too.

Mr. SCHERLE. I can appreciate that very much. Of course, my primary concern is this: These children would no doubt be better off for the attention they will receive under this bill; however, it would be defeating our purpose if we sacrifice the human element.

Mr. PUCINSKI. If I may make this observation, I think the gentleman made an excellent point and I think the next witness will be much better prepared to discuss the entire aspect. I would defer therefore any replies, with the consent of the committee, to the professor who spent all morning with us and whose views are extremely interesting. I think it would be very helpful to your committee.

Mr. DANIELS. There are no further questions, and the Chair desires to compliment the gentleman from Illinois for his excellent statement.

I wish to announce Chairman Perkins has sent word down he desires all of the members of this committee to step down to the committee room to constitute a quorum, and I think a couple of us can get ourselves excused and can return here in a few minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your courtesy. (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

STATEMENT OF JAMES H. SCHEUER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. DANIELS. The subcommittee will come to order.

Our next witness is the distinguished gentleman from the great State of New York, Congressman James H. Scheuer, who will make a brief statement on the legislation under consideration.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate your courtesy in inviting me to testify this morning. I would like to commend you on the fine leadership you are giving this subcommittee and particularly to commend Mrs. Mink for putting together this fine piece of legislation.

I have been working for the last year or more on a child development program that I contemplate introducing as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act next year so I have been doing a great deal of work in this area and I see in this bill a bill that substantially fulfills many of the goals of the legislation I have prepared and I think it is a fine piece of work.

One of the men I have been working with closely over the last year is Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner, professor of psychology in child development and family relationships at Cornell University.

Dr. Bronfenbrenner is one of the founding fathers, so to speak, of the Headstart program and is considered one of the very creative and seminal thinkers in the field of preschool child development programs of all kinds. He was kind enough to appear this morning before Congressman Pucinski's subcommittee in a briefing and has con-

sented to appear here today so I would like to yield my time to him here with the consent of the Chair and arrange to come back at the convenience of the Chair either later today or tomorrow for some very brief further remarks.

STATEMENT OF URIE BRONFENBRENNER, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY IN CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Mr. DANIELS. Without objection, your request is granted.

Professor Bronfenbrenner, will you step forward?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is indeed a privilege to have you yield your time to allow me this opportunity to address this committee. I have also been made aware in my meetings with your committee of a situation which has, well, it is a two-edged sword. I am impressed with the sophistication and receptiveness of the members of the committees both here and earlier and could only wish that the same receptivity and rapid understanding were evident in some of the professional colleges with whom we have had to deal on these matters.

I say this for a reason which I think will become apparent. I have much welcomed this bill and its general intent because it is my view that one of the greatest problems confronting this Nation is the problem of child rearing, not only in the disadvantaged segments of our society but in our society as a whole because the research evident in my own research and that of others is indicating a progressive lack of contact between young people and older people, between adults and children, across-the-board in American society.

I regard this situation as one of the most relevant to larger social problems, not only in terms of occupational incompetence but in terms of rising delinquency, even in middle class and in what one might call alienation from our own society on the part of younger generations.

I do not regard this as a failure in the younger generation but regard it as a failure in our generation in giving higher priority to other matters, worthy matters to be sure, but certainly no less at the heart of the human problem than the problem of conveying to succeeding generations the best values, skills, and aspirations of the present.

It is in that context that I view this bill and I hope that you will consider expanding its conception, because while its general intent is precisely the general intent that is needed, the lack of awareness of the importance of certain elements in the process of making human beings that exists in our country at this present time requires these things be explicit when we have legislation because otherwise it may not happen.

Let me be clear. I speak specifically to the element that Mr. Scheuer referred to, the human element. Certainly, it is good to have adequate buildings, and I might say parenthetically, that one of the countries in which we are working is the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union, which is not as rich as our own society, does have a very active building program for preschool and I strongly advise us not to show our Soviet visitors the kind of situations in which some of our best nurses have to live in old rattletrap buildings and in slums,

and one that was visited not long ago in the basement pit of an ex-gas-station, because we don't have funds for buildings in our preschool programs.

But that is not my main concern. When I say the human element, I refer not only to training needs, and these are very great, ladies and gentlemen. Headstart has already drawn upon the existing resources in this field. If you are setting up new programs, who is to staff them? Who is to provide the professional leadership that is needed?

I would hope that in your thinking about that you would not restrict yourselves to the conventional early childhood education programs around the country, because we do need in addition to the competence of State supply, we need to draw in new kinds of specialties and new kinds of concerns in persons engaged with young children.

We need to draw in men, and men who have interests not only in children but in life and in activities and in occupations. I would hope or I am particularly excited by Congressman Pucinski's notion that day care centers should be made adjacent to or part of school systems. I see this as important, not in terms of solely what happens to the children but the opportunity to provide for older children to become aware of their responsibilities and their capacities toward the young, because working with young children is one of the major ways in which one can learn how to be responsible, learn how to love and care for another human being.

I would hope that among the supplementary services which Congressman Pucinski has in mind he would conceive of the notion of supplementary services of supervision of older children including boys as well as girls in how to play with, how to enjoy, how to help young children.

This brings me to my principal theme. As a researcher, as a person who has devoted his life to the problems of children and families, I want, or if I would like to convey anything to you, it is this, at the present time in our scientific knowledge we know of no more powerful instrument to facilitate a child's development than his own mother and father.

These are still the most efficient tools and still better than the best trained child development specialist. I notice that you talk about psychologists and other child-development specialists and much as I am attached to them and wish them to receive consideration, I would yield that privilege because, to me, the most important aspect of a day care program is second to giving mothers an opportunity to have their children cared for while they work, is the opportunity to give mothers, fathers, older children, neighbors, opportunities once again to reenter the lives of children.

That is because children are cognizant of skills, not from being given lessons, but from being talked to by people who love them, by being played with, by being smiled at, and as we say being reenforced and loved for being alive.

This is what teachers' concept of actual skill is and the person who is with the child most of the time, the person to whom that child has an emotional attachment, even though he may not be as professionally skilled, can actually do much more for the child than the skilled person who comes in you know for a few hours a week or a few hours a day.

I would, therefore, hope among these ancillary services you would include the programing of the re-entry of the mothers and the fathers and the neighbors of these children into their lives.

This does not minimize the role of the professional, because the professional is the one who opens to these people all of the kinds of things that can be done with these young children, that is fun not only for children but the adults. Many of us have forgotten the delight that is involved in playing and talking with a young child.

Older people, for example, this is one of their major functions in society, to reconstruct a function which has been debarred. I see child development specialists and the professional in this situation assume one who works as much with parents and neighbors as with children.

So, without minimizing the value of art and music teachers, of psychologists and child development specialists, glory be to them, and the use of books and audiovisual material and equipment, I would hope very much that we could bring in people, the trained people who are necessary and the untrained people who are the human beings who alone can make human beings out of others.

I thank you very much.

I would be pleased to answer any questions. I have not spoken here about the research which supports the views I have because I felt you were more concerned with implications rather than with studies.

Mr. DANIELS. Professor, I want to compliment and thank you for a very fine statement. Although you were not an expected witness this morning, I want you to know your presence this morning is most welcome and I am very much impressed by the testimony you have given.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Thank you very much.

Mr. DANIELS. The gentleman from California, Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have just one question.

Professor, I assume what you are doing is adding a third dimension to this approach, the basic program being provided by the educational system and, secondly, the supplementary research being provided by this bill, and I assume you are suggesting that a third element be added which would involve the parents and neighbors and older children in the program that is not now provided by either of these two factors?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes, sir, and the professional personnel who would be working with these people in order that they can have their full impact.

Mr. HAWKINS. Certainly, I agree with you.

Mr. DANIELS. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes.

Mr. DANIELS. In what manner would you have the neighbors and older children work in this program?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. I have, and this is a matter I have given a good deal of thought to, and I just turned over to a group this morning a document which outlines some of these ideas. Many of them are already incorporated in Headstart programs.

The kinds of things we have in mind are these. Consider parent involvement. Unfortunately, parent involvement, while given much verbal approval in Headstart programs, often when seen in actuality

becomes one of two things, either they are parents on the advisory committee, which is well and good, or there are adult education classes for parents. The essential element in parent involvement is really in doing things with the child. Concretely, what this means is this, that parents would be encouraged to become, or rather to do, the kinds of things with their children that are done by the professionals.

By this I don't mean the parents are told what to do. They don't have to. You just have to show them and the parents want to do it. If they see a new toy they want to play with the child using that game. One of the major elements here is home visits, going into the home to tell the parent what is going on.

Often the parent can't come to the center.

Mr. SCHEUER. You mean a professional?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes, a professional goes into the home and says, "We want you to know the kinds of things being done for the children and your child. We brought along some of our toys and games and do you want us to show them to you and we will now show you the kinds of things that are done."

The effect is the mother begins to do the things with her child and asks to borrow them. There ought to be a library, not of books, but a library of activity material that can be taken home and can be kept overnight without too much ado about it.

Mr. SCHEUER. Could a neighborhood person after months of training be a home aide of some kind?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. They certainly could. You see the things that children most need are the kinds of things human beings have done for centuries long before child-development specialists were ever thought of. All we have to do is to exhibit these things and provide social support for them, tell people these are good things to do and this is a good time to do them and show them.

They are not going to be hard to learn. Otherwise none of us would be here. I think the problem is creating the opportunity and restating the priority again so that people can once again do what they always do with young kids.

Mr. HAWKINS. Professor, are there any good examples of how this is being done?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes, there are. One excellent example is Susan Gray's program at George Peabody College where they have been developing this kind of programing and in turn involvement very imaginatively and creatively and the results are apparent in changes and measurements on the children. If you could see the faces of the parents as they are watching what is being done with their children and practically reaching for the activities.

Parents want to do these things, they find them exciting and what we need to do is create the time, the opportunity, and the support for these kinds of activities.

Mr. HAWKINS. Are you aware of any local school district, or any local child-care center program that is really operating in this manner?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. These are local programs that I speak of that are under the auspices of George Peabody because the work is actually done in Knoxville, Tenn., in another State, and these are all, you know—well, you have to work in the local community in the local center.

You can't have people coming to the university. That is a foreign word.

There is another comment that is important here. There is a great deal of difficulty in some situations where the schools are involved in this because this is against the tradition of separation of school and society, which for very good reasons we have inherited in our day. The notion that parents can have something to do with school affairs comes hard and for this reason it would be very important not to restrict such programs to school auspices, although I hasten to add some of the best programs are run by schools, but there is an understandable resistance, a fear that professionalization is being challenged, and I want to make it clear I don't want it challenged. I want professionals to do professional work and human beings to do what humans can do.

Mr. SCHEUER. What kind of agencies would you suggest are appropriate agencies for this program other than the regular or traditional sources?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. You all know what kind of agencies. Over 60 percent of the Headstart programs are not being done by schools; they are being done by all kinds of agencies, church groups, recreation groups, welfare departments. I know of one in North Carolina being run by the National Recreation Forest, because there was no other nonprofit agency that could be found.

It does not matter who the sponsoring agency is, but what matters is that they have a program that includes all of the elements. I have a question about the bill as to whether "accessory services" include medical and health problems because these are among the most serious in young children and their mothers. One of the most effective ways of reaching a mother of the next child is through the child who is in nursery school and as you gentlemen know, one of the major causes of mental retardation and so-called cultural deprivation in the disadvantaged is only cultural in an indirect way.

It refers to inadequate nutrition in delivery during the prenatal period.

So it may seem strange to talk about this in relation to a preschool program, but a preschool program where the mothers are involved is one of the best ways to reach that mother before she has her next child.

Mr. DANIELS. Any questions, Mrs. Mink?

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I think that you have brought a very valuable insight to the whole problem which this committee will be investigating, I hope very thoroughly. Your comments were very appropriate because one of the motivating factors for my interest in a bill of this kind was the successes that we seem to be achieving in the Headstart program. As I understand the Headstart program one of its main purposes has been to seek ways of involving the parents to better understand their children, communicate with them, and become more involved in their maturation and educational experience.

In the case of Headstart, however, the mothers basically are unemployed and, consequently, it is much easier for this program to emphasize the mothers' role in the total program. In my State programs with which I am familiar the Headstart directors concentrate

heavily on organizing mothers clubs, and invite them to participate in the activities of the center. It is a very successful effort and we see some very concrete and dramatic changes in the youngsters in a very short period of time.

This emphasizes the necessity for extending Headstart into not only a summer activity but a year-round program because of its notable achievements in creating in these youngsters greater sociability and more well-rounded interests in the world around them.

In the particular area that this bill directs its attention to, and that is existing day-care centers, because we can provide no money for construction, I wonder how we are going to achieve this emphasis of parent and neighborhood involvement without burdening the bill to such an extent that we would not be able to carry it forward?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. This is a difficult problem, one in which I am not adept as a writer of legislation, but it occurs to me that you can do a number of things. First of all, I think it would be a very helpful thing to make clear that among the professional supplementary services which you do mention in the bill, that there be included specialists whose task would be to increase the participation and involvement of parents in activities with their children, both within the program and outside the program.

The very existence of such a specialist, of course, creates the implication this is a good thing to do. This is important, too, because there can be a misunderstanding that arises from the existence of a child care or day-care center; namely, the understanding that since my child is now being well taken care of, I don't have to worry. I think one of the functions of a day-care center ought to be to make parents worry more rather than less and spend more time with their child rather than less time with the child.

I think the inclusion in the legislation of references to these kinds of activities, not only at the center, but in the home, of specialists who are not only child development specialists but family specialists, I think would help signal the notion that this is a cooperative program rather than a program which takes over the task of child rearing from hard-pressed parents.

There is also the matter of, I don't know whether this would be regarded as prejudicial, maybe to civil rights, but legislators would be concerned, about specific involvement of males in these programs. The world of children gets to be bereft of males and important as females are and as central as they are in child rearing, the evidence does indicate that men make some difference, particularly on boys.

For example, Father absence in our data is correlated with low need achievement, that is, the drive to achieve, and kids whose fathers are not around very much don't have as much get up and go as the kids whose fathers are around and argue and have conflicts with them and battles, and so on.

So if there could be some way of making clear that there is a special priority for including males in this enterprise, I don't know how expensive it would be, but another kind of supervision, another kind of supervisory would like to see included as a supplementary person is a supervisor of activities by older children with young children.

This is a way of getting older boys in touch with younger boys in a constructive setting. You see, I view these day-care programs not just as making their impact now when children are young but these are

the programs, are the experiences which determine the nature of the bond between the child and others for the rest of his life and if he does not develop a bond with his parents and older people during this period, parents and older people will not have, will not count, rather, they won't matter and their society won't matter.

I want to be sure there is a bond seal here, a bond of affection and commitment and mutual effect and you can't seal a bond if they are not there.

I know I wondered from the practical question of what can be done in this bill. I have made a suggestion that the explicit specialists named be specialists who are going to concern themselves with parents as well as children, with older children as well as young children, always in relation to the very young, and that is one concrete suggestion.

Mrs. MINK. Professor, in line with that suggestion, I interpret your comments to mean that the child development specialist is not an inclusive term for the kind of specialist you have reference to?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. That is right.

Mrs. MINK. How do you describe your kind of specialist?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. It is hard, you know it is significant in our society we don't have a word for it. In other cultures, there are words for people who work with adults and children in combination. We don't have that word.

Mr. SCHEUER. How about family development?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Family development specialist. You almost have to write it in English and say "Persons who can work together with parents, older children and young children in developing activities and experiences of benefit to the very young."

You know you almost have to spell it out and say this is what is wanted. We don't have a specialist like that. If you get a child development specialist, you will get somebody who knows all about preschoolers, but very often knows very little about teenagers or how to work with them.

They would be quite flabbergasted with the notion they were supposed to be involved in this kind of experience.

Mr. HAWKINS (acting chairman). May I suggest we may consider writing into the report some of these suggestions which cannot really be clarified or written into the law itself specifically. I think we should incorporate some of these suggestions in that report made direct to the administration to consider.

Mrs. MINK. If the chairman will permit me to pursue the question, and if society and the academic world and the world of specialists has not yet come up with a name for such an individual, does this specialist exist?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. No. He does not exist. That is the way social changes always happened. That is what happened when the nursery movement started. There were no nursery school specialists, but we now have them.

You have to find people with imagination who are going to create this kind of thing.

Mrs. MINK. Rather than trying to define this individual in one of the lists of definitions in the bill, would it not perhaps be more direct in saying that the plans which are submitted for approval will include programs which are designed to also include parent involvement?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes, I see you are far more expert at these matters and I recall this is exactly what we did in Headstart. We didn't know how to name the specialists, but we said no program would receive funds unless it had parent involvement and people concerned with developing it and, of course, that means you have to have somebody in there thinking about it.

You suggested, or what you say is "Here are the components that have to be in a program before you get supplemental funds."

Let me mention one other thing. It has to do with where the center is. I have already mentioned the notion of placing them in your school, of placing them in community centers, in placing them in areas not where children will not be seen by other people but quite the contrary, you know, where you stumble onto little kids as you are going in and out and other people become aware of them, I think is a much wiser kind of planning than one which isolates the little kids so they are out of the way.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Steiger.

Mr. STEIGER. I appreciate the professor's statement. I think it was an eloquent and very important statement for the committee to have as we consider the legislation. The one question I did have really has been answered on where specialists are and apparently we don't have them now.

How we develop them is critical. I don't have an idea or a suggestion on how that can best be done.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Well, one way of doing it, I know it is beyond this particular piece of legislation, would be grants-in-aid for developing programs for training these kinds of people.

You know, universities are very materialistic in this kind of regard, if there are Federal funds available for a program for training high-level grasshopper catchers, we will come up with one for you. It is desperately needed. This is one way of inviting the imagination to move.

Mr. STEIGER. In response to a question that Congressman Scheuer asked, and I think you know of Jim Scheuer's very deep and abiding leadership and belief in professional and subprofessional, am I to assume by what you said earlier that you would recommend that we attempt in the legislation to find a way to put a stress on the development of the subprofessional in this field?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. I would hope very strongly you would do so. I would add, too, I would add two qualifiers, and the first is to do this you need professional personnel to develop it. The second is, I hope you would not restrict it to parent involvement. I hope you would make it broader, involvement of adults and older children.

Mr. STEIGER. I agree completely.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. It does not exclude parents, you understand, but it opens it up to senior citizens, Uncle Joe, for instance, who has been great with kids and now his wife is dead and he would love to get in with this thing but he is not a parent and he just isn't there.

Mr. STEIGER. I think your two points make very good sense. Thank you.

Mr. SCHEUER. Doctor, I enjoyed your testimony very much. Let me just clarify in my own mind the specifics of this last comment. As

I take it, you feel there is a role for the parent, parent not necessarily as a full-time aid to the student, a co-op parent?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Co-op. This is a parent assisting in the program.

Mr. SCHEUER. He may come in for a half a dozen hours of orientation on how to be a meaningful and supportive parent with his kid and the training could take place in the child day-care center or in the home?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes.

Mr. SCHEUER. And that would be a co-op parent?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Right.

Mr. SCHEUER. In addition, as I get it, there is a role for a full-time neighborhood aide?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes.

Mr. SCHEUER. That is for the 8-hour program working with the children, reading, and singing, and so on, with them and that could be a parent or your Uncle Joe?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Right. But it is important that that person be someone who signals to the child "this is one of our people."

Mr. SCHEUER. Right.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. This is a person who is part of his on-going life, because the importance of all of this business is to change the child's environment, because it is the child's environment that changes the child, not the child himself. If these people are then in his life from then on there is a whole new meaning with the child's life, whereas, if it stops when he leaves the school he may have had the best people in the school but if nobody outside of the school symbolizes the things that he was doing there, it is over.

Mr. SCHEUER. So in terms of giving meaning, in terms that are understandable to him in this 8-hour experience, and in providing a bridge to a community?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Yes, bridge is the word.

Mr. SCHEUER. The neighborhood child development aide or whatever you want to call him is not only a quantitative extension of the professional, but a qualitative extension of the professional?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. Right.

Mr. SCHEUER. The third ingredient you would talk about is the older child and this might be done in the home, too?

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. And the neighborhood child.

Mr. SCHEUER. Yes; who can improve his own performance, his own attitude and commitment to education and general help in civic responsibilities by helping a younger child.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. It is also a very important matter because little kids, to a little kid the older kid is a real model. In fact, that kid is very important to him, that older child. If that older child says "Have you done your homework" it has 20 times the impact than when you and I say "Have you done your homework?"

Mr. SCHEUER. I enjoyed your testimony tremendously and thank you very much.

Dr. BRONFENBRENNER. I am both very grateful and very impressed with the quality of the questions and the interest which I have been privileged to receive.

Mr. HAWKINS. Professor, again we wish to thank you for the contribution which you have made this morning, I think Mr. Scheuer expressed the feeling of the committee on what you have meant to us.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA I. WORLOCK, SPECIAL ASSISTANT,
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
TRENTON, N.J.

Mr. HAWKINS. Now the next witness is Mrs. Patricia Worlock, special assistant to department of community affairs in the State of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J. It is a pleasure to have you before the committee. We regret we have been moving along slowly but we are pleased to have reached you. Without objection, your prepared statement will be entered in the record at this point. I would suggest that you summarize it and deal with it as you see fit.

(The document referred to follows:)

STATEMENT BY MRS. PATRICIA I. WORLOCK, SPECIAL ASSISTANT, DEPARTMENT
OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Gentlemen, good morning. I am Mrs. Patricia I. Worlock, Special Assistant in the Department of Community Affairs in the State of New Jersey and I am very happy to be here this morning. The Department, which is just a year old this week, has responsibility for long-range state and regional planning; for the state's housing, urban renewal and model cities programs; for anti-poverty programs; for the coordination of manpower and training activities; for youth and aging programs; and in general for the rationalization of the state's use of federal and private revenues.

In addition to working for the Department of Community Affairs—and perhaps more relevant to our purposes this morning—I am among the nearly one million women over fourteen who are already in New Jersey's work force—well over 36% of the state's female population. I am also a single parent and the mother of two boys, one in first grade, the other in a full-day care center. So far I may be representative of some of the 4 million American working mothers with pre-school age children. I am not representative, however, of thousands of these mothers—first, because my salary makes it possible for me to pay for very good full-day care, and second, because I have been lucky enough to find an excellent full day care center which has room for my child. New Jersey has only 120 licensed day care centers throughout the entire state. And these centers are a drop in the bucket of our need.

For both personal and professional reasons, then, I am happy to be here this morning. I would like to speak briefly in support of House Resolution 10572, the Pre-School Centers Supplementary Education Act; to raise some questions which have occurred to us concerning certain provisions in the bill; to talk a little bit about a demonstration day care program being developed in New Jersey; and perhaps to dream a little.

I. SUPPORT OF BILL

First and foremost, I should like to say that we are in complete agreement with the basic purpose of this bill to provide federal assistance to improve educational services in public and private non-profit day care centers. For perhaps the first time in the day care field, the level of funding requested—\$300 million annually—seems appropriate to the level of need.

And the emphasis on education in day care reflects New Jersey's conviction that education is the prime element—albeit *prima inter pares*—of the components of good day care; a conviction expressed in the fact that New Jersey's day care centers are licensed and regulated by the State Department of Education.

Furthermore, we too share the belief of the sponsors of this bill that high quality day care services should be made available to the children of all working parents.

II. SOME QUESTIONS

Within this framework of broad and strong support for the proposed bill, however, there are a number of questions which I should like to raise here this morning.

A. The first concerns Section 5, which calls for the establishment of "a state agency which is broadly representative of the public and private non-profit day care and other child education groups" and through which state plans and projects should be submitted. We would agree that day care is important enough to

warrant particular attention within state government—indeed, perhaps even important enough to justify a specific administrative entity. We would also, however, argue against the further splintering of responsibility for educational programs for a number of reasons.

1. First, at the federal level, the tendency to develop separate and non-coordinated agency approaches to a single area of responsibility has frequently led to the passage of disharmonious and even conflicting legislation. For instance, the 1967 Public Welfare Amendments to the Social Security legislation mandated state responsibility for the provision of day care services, both for parents presently receiving public assistance and for families who could maintain their own independence if such services were available. At the same time, however, and in the same legislative session, the amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act sharply reduced the funds available for Head Start, perhaps the most outstanding of the anti-poverty programs. OEO reports have indicated that in the current fiscal year between 10,000 and 12,000 pre-school children will be dropped from currently funded Head Start programs (including full-day programs), and in the next fiscal year reduction of a similar number may have to be made.

This inconsistency is humanly cruel to the children involved and financially expensive for all of us.

2. At the state level, a further diffusion of responsibility for educational programs would also lead to inefficiency, duplication and, as a result of these, to an all too frequent disillusion with the purposes and operation of government programs.

We would strongly recommend that every effort be made to encourage an educational continuum of services, the unification of responsibility for those services, meaningful involvement of the users of those services, and the coordinated utilization of funds from the variety of pre-school education sources available. These would include, but not be limited to, Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Head Start, Follow-Through and Parent-Child Center programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, and the amended Social Security legislation. Legislative wording which would mandate such developments would prove most useful.

B. Secondly, I should like to raise the question of the limited age eligibility under HR 10572.

Recent research in early childhood development being done by Martin Deutsch of New York University, Halbert B. Robinson of the University of N. Carolina, Jerome Bruner of Harvard University and Benjamin Bloom of the University of Illinois—among others—suggests that we will have to amend our assumptions concerning the age at which meaningful cognitive experiences begin to take place. Their work—taken singly and as a body—suggests that day care of the young child can become a major educational tool in preventing and/or avoiding the extreme deprivation and educational destruction of our urban ghetto schools. New Jersey now requires the licensing of all day care centers serving children between the ages of two and five and downward revision of this age is being contemplated. We would urge that the age category of HR 10572 be broadened to include centers serving younger age groups.

Before and after-school care for the children of working parents, particularly from low income families, is also desperately needed. In 1967 some 77,000 New Jersey children between the ages of five and seventeen received ADC benefits, in addition to some 20,000 of pre-school age. Most of the mothers of these children were not then working; many of them will be urged to do so under the revised amendments to the Social Security Act. Their children will then join the uncounted thousands of "latch key children"—particularly in our urban centers where family and neighborhood support is weakest—who are presently left untended, with predictable appearances in our drop-out rates, juvenile courts and case records.

The need from the parental, as from the broader community, viewpoint for both before and after school care for children between the ages of six and twelve is as acute as in the traditional "day care" age range. Such programs can provide a real opportunity for the concentrated tutoring, counseling and recreational programs which many school systems and educators are presently encouraging. We would urge the sponsors of HR 10572 to consider the needs of this potential day care group explicitly in amending the proposed Act.

C. Third, we should like to raise the question of how these new funds for day care educational services will be utilized, how they will be integrated into the existing structure of day care.

I have spoken of recent early childhood research. I should also say that there exists in the field today at the minimum, controversy, and at the maximum,

conflict over the meaning of this research and over the ways in which it should be applied. There are no one-and-for-all truths where human nature is concerned, and there are no hard-and-fast answers to questions of educational method. Nor will additional monies—however desperately needed—automatically insure wise implementing of the theories we have. In the search for wisdom, however, we would urge that a portion of each year's appropriation under this act be set aside, perhaps at the federal perhaps at the state, level for Research and Development.

Wisdom may dictate a central or a regional Research and Development approach. Regional early childhood development laboratories may provide the best method of identifying useful concepts and methods, training staff in their use, and disseminating up-to-date methods throughout the existing service structure. Or certain day care centers in each state might be designated as Research and Development centers, and provided with special supportive services, and certain training responsibilities.

We are extremely interested in an experimental approach being developed in Newark, N.J. through the cooperative efforts of the Newark Board of Education and a private, non-profit Day Care group. The two groups have been working together on the purchase, renovation, and operation of a large facility which would provide day care on one floor and kindergarten through second grade on another floor of the shared facility. The purposes of this experiment are manifold, but among others, we hope it will suggest ways of structuring an educational continuum from day care into elementary school, actively involve neighborhood parents in important aspects of the public school system, provide a setting for training of new and retraining of old staff, and begin to supply data for measuring the effectiveness of day care in altering public school performance.

We would hope that this and similar educational experiments in day care could be supported by research and development under this act.

D. I should like to suggest for your consideration the inclusion of training as one of the justifiable costs to which funds under this act could be applied, for two principal reasons.

First, in many ways this legislation represents an educational corollary to the day care responsibilities mandated to the states under the Social Security Amendments of 1967. H. R. 10572 would insure that such day care services be more than barely custodial in nature. As I'm sure many experts with far more experience than I will tell you in coming weeks, good day care is an amalgam of educational, medical, social and other child welfare services, and it is extraordinarily difficult to separate out the educational functions from the others in good programs. Ideally each staff member is actually teaching in all of his or her contacts with the children. This becomes truer the younger the child.

Second, the potential of day care to offer career ladder employment opportunities to both men and women of low educational attainment and low income is very great indeed. We believe that within every community there are adults with the basic attitudes and potential competencies to become effective staff members in centers for young children, *without* lengthy college and post-college formal education. The proof of this belief, however, rests upon the ability of states and communities to develop a pattern of training and supervision which short-cuts pre-service preparation and intensifies the in-service development of staff members.

Such training is crucial to any adequate expansion of day care services and provision of employment to those who are now either unemployed or considered unemployable. It is also expensive, and there are few (if any) shortcuts. We would therefore urge the Committee to include staff training under the "educational services" provided for in Section 11,(1).

III. A NEW JERSEY PROJECT

For all the reasons which have produced the piece of legislation we are discussing this morning, the Department of Community Affairs, in close cooperation with other state departments, has been developing a demonstration project in the field of day care. By establishing an experimental state level administrative unit representative of the different state agencies concerned with various aspects of day care, and by operating at the local level through a variety of sponsors, we hope to combine maximum integration of federal, state and private funds at the state level with maximum initiative and imagination in local communities. We expect to extend the services of existing centers, establish new ones, and train the staff necessary for such a task. Local sponsors are expected to include not only non-profit groups such as Community Action Programs and United Fund agencies

already engaged in providing day care services, but also Boards of Education, municipalities, business and industrial concerns employing large numbers of women, labor unions and appropriately organized parent groups.

One of the important considerations of the proposed project is that the clientele represent an economic and social mix. We share with you the belief that good quality day care, like good public education, is desired by all working parents. It would be a tragic mistake for states to operate publicly funded day care programs with minimum educational and health standards primarily for welfare mothers—thereby further perpetuating a kind of second class citizenship.

Our proposed training program may very well be the most significant aspect of the new centers, aside from the basic fact of their existence. We expect to rely heavily on instructors and aides to provide the bulk of the new day care staff, perhaps half of them to be drawn from the hard core poverty and ADC population. We believe that with intensive pre-service and lengthy in-service training of the staff of each center as a group, it is possible to create a viable career ladder structure in the early childhood profession—one with the potential for a major impact on the social work, health, homemaker, recreation and related professions, as well.

IV. CONCLUSION

It is fast becoming clear that day care is an institution capable of contributing markedly to the convenience and well being of the working parent, as well as to the education, health, and well being of the child. It is a service desperately needed in New Jersey and around the country. Day care, particularly for very young children, is an expensive service. The hours are long, the desirable staff-to-child ratio is high, adequate facilities are scarce or non-existent, and the human qualities required to educate children effectively are not easy to come by. The costs of not providing that service—while they may be hidden in our rising welfare costs, in the higher accident rates of women workers when their children are home sick or unsupervised, in our drop-out and juvenile delinquency rates, and in the anger and frustration of our urban unrest—are very real indeed. As both you and I know, however, there is no way around the challenge.

H.R. 10572 is a desperately needed and wise step toward meeting this challenge and I am grateful to you for the opportunity of supporting it. Thank you.

Mrs. WORLOCK. Thank you very much. I think that the delay was of benefit to those of us listening to it. The major points in my testimony are very good and strong support of the bill and the basic purposes of it, to support Federal assistance to day-care centers.

As I said in the testimony, New Jersey is probably the only State in the Union that licenses day-care centers through the department of education and we feel very strongly this is a prime component of day care.

We have a number of questions, some of which have been covered in the testimony this morning, which we would like to raise concerning the precise provisions of the bill. Although we would certainly agree that day care is important enough to warrant specific attention through a particular agency within a State government, we feel strongly that it would not be wise to further splinter the responsibility for educational programs within State governments.

We feel that on the Federal level some of the tendency is to put the money into different projects which has in fact led into different directions; and one has a prime example in the last session of the social security legislation mandating a vast extension of responsibility for day care while, at the same time, the Headstart program, and particularly the year-round Headstart program on parent-child centers, had been forced to cut back markedly because of the cutback in funds; and we would like to see these two developments go hand in hand, not in different directions.

First, at the State level, we feel that the creation perhaps of a new agency with a prime interest on education in day care as opposed

to day care as an extension of educational responsibility might easily lead to duplication and perhaps to inefficiency.

We argue strongly in favor of an educational continuing of services and unification of responsibility for them.

We would also strongly support Professor Bronfenbrenner's emphasis on involving the users of these services not only in the way he suggested, actually in involving parents in the homes, but also at the State level within the agency, perhaps through advisory groups and other ways.

We would like to raise the question of limited age of 3 to 5 under H.R. 10572. Recent experiments in research in early childhood have indicated that children begin to learn at a much earlier age than we had previously taken any recognition of. New Jersey had since 1946 licensed day-care centers for children down to the age of 2 and we would urge that some consideration be given to allowing day-care centers serving children of that age to be included under this legislation.

Secondly, and also under the age category, I think that we would again support Professor Bronfenbrenner's comment concerning the need both for actual day care and the involvement of children of an older age, which is detailed here.

Thirdly, we should like to raise the question of how the funds for day-care services will be utilized in the existing structure, and I think the earlier comment made by Congressman Pucinski for an evaluation mechanism and a precise means of determining both the usefulness of recent research and the most effective way of applying it should be an ongoing part of the program.

We feel that the experiment in Newark, N.J., which has been to a large extent an outgrowth of the interest and concern after the last summer's riots, is of great value here. The board of education has been working closely with a private and nonprofit group to determine what relationship day care ought to bear to a public school system and to try to see how it can actually be worked out within the existing structure of the school system.

We hope that this will proceed rapidly and we will be able to provide some information for programs in the relatively near future.

Finally, I would urge strongly that you consider the inclusion of training as one of the justifiable costs. I understand Mrs. Mink is concerned with the fiscal limitations in the present situation; but one of the major problems in any current expansion of day care, not only New Jersey but throughout the country, is a severely limited supply of personnel. I think we can do a lot more than we have in training nonprofessionals and the professional not just to exist in day-care centers, as I frequently think they have done in Headstart, but to become an integral part of the whole teaching mechanism and in whatever way they can be trained to do so and in whatever ways that additional personnel for the various centers can be achieved I think they should be.

I would urge that this legislation not exclude that training at a reasonable cost. Thank you.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Worlock. Mrs. Mink.

Mrs. MINK. Yes; thank you very much for your statement and for your very valuable criticisms of various portions of the bill and for stating so clearly your reasons for these reservations.

First, in reference to the proliferation of responsibility for day-care services and your suggestion that this bill attempt to coordinate what is now a very loosely coordinated field of activity, may I say that in my research preparatory to drafting this bill, I could not determine there was any uniform basis on which these various centers were either licensed or regulated or administered or supervised; and in the absence of this kind of uniformity, it seemed to me that it would be best to place in the States the responsibility of designating some agency to determine which centers were eligible and which ones would end up with the grant.

Now, if the selection of this administering agency by the State is inappropriate, what suggestion would you have to meet the specific objections which you raised?

Mrs. WORLOCK. Well, maybe New Jersey is in a different situation than most States. I think, fortunately in this case—that is, because we would normally turn to the department of education which does already do the licensing and I would find that a reasonable outcome of this.

However, in many other States, day care, for instance, the basic responsibility is lodged with the welfare department or at best with one department, perhaps with two or three. I think that from a number of points of view it would be unfortunate if day care were to be caught that closely to the welfare system and I would—I am no writer of legislation, but I would urge that the language at least reflect the need for the State agency to represent the interests of a number of different departments concerned with day care, and I would spell out which component had primarily education but certainly also health and labor insofar as it is concerned with manpower training and obviously welfare also.

Mrs. MINK. This was the reason for the language in section 5, that we did not want to say that in any given case the State would have complete autonomy in designating the department of education over the department of welfare; and so, instead, we said: The State must designate or establish, for the purposes of this act, an agency which is broadly representative of all of the people and agencies that are involved in child care activity, including child education groups.

We thought in this way the bill would serve the additional function of bringing together the various kinds of groups that already exist and various kinds of agencies that are already authorized to function in this area and, perhaps through this mechanism, create a greater awareness of the total problem and develop a greater spirit of cooperation and coordination of the activities, recognizing that the Social Security Act has now brought a further new element into the program.

Mrs. WORLOCK. When you spoke of the groups interested in child education, would you include fairly loosely groups that would become an outgrowth of the anti-poverty program?

Mrs. MINK. Yes.

Mrs. WORLOCK. You did include it?

Mrs. MINK. Very definitely.

Mrs. WORLOCK. That they would be represented at the State level?

Mrs. MINK. This was my intent.

Mrs. WORLOCK. I think that is excellent.

Mrs. MINK. The other point which you raise which I think is also a very important one has to do with the age eligibility. It was not my

intent in offering the bill that we would limit the services available to youngsters in day-care centers to a specific age group but only for determining the eligibility of the center, that a majority of the youngsters of that center have to be between the ages of 3 and 5.

With that explanation of the provision of the bill, is it still your view that the criteria for eligibility ought to be lowered to age 2 as you suggest is your eligibility for the State of New Jersey?

Mrs. WORLOCK. Yes, it would still be our feeling because the kind of activity that one plans in a day-care center for 2- and 3-year olds tends to be difficult for 4- and 5-year olds, whereas if we had larger centers where you had more flexibility, and the average number of children in the centers in New Jersey is around 18 and generally that averages around it, but there are a few large ones but the efficient size is more apt to be 50 or 60.

What you have now I would say is a number of centers organized primarily for the younger age groups which would not have a majority of their children falling between the ages of 3 and 5.

Secondly, I do think we are moving very definitely toward a greater flexibility in dealing with very small children in groups. I think that the few centers presently serving the younger ages will be growing in number rather markedly. Such legislation as this might inhibit that growth. I think that is probably true.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Steiger.

Mr. STEIGER. Mrs. Worlock, let me get back to the question that Mrs. Mink asked and your statement as it relates to further proliferation of agencies at the State level.

What, specifically, would you recommend as to how best to implement to whom goes the responsibility for the implementation of this bill were it to become law?

Mrs. WORLOCK. Are you speaking of the Federal or State?

Mr. STEIGER. I am talking at the State level.

Mrs. WORLOCK. Well, New Jersey, I would say to the department of education primarily. We have a rather odd situation because of the character of the department of community affairs. It seems to have been an amalgam of a lot of different agencies and new responsibilities, so that what we might tend to do, off the top of my head, is, we would or could easily carry the responsibility for a couple of years until it is shown how we are going and I eventually think it should go to education.

In most of the States where there are not departments of community affairs—and there are only three or four others of this kind in the country—I would urge it to be the department of education.

Mr. STEIGER. In the end, would you perhaps recommend that the greatest amount of flexibility be given to the State to make the determination as to which agency it ought to go?

Mrs. WORLOCK. Yes, with strong language, as Mrs. Mink has stated, reflecting the multiagency responsibilities.

Mr. STEIGER. No further questions.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have some questions at this point. Would the State Department of Education of New Jersey, for example, qualify under section 5 of the bill, as section 5 is now drafted? I have reference to the the fact that in lines 15, 16, and 17, the State agency should be

broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups.

Mrs. WORLOCK. No, the department of education would not qualify in New Jersey under that language and neither would any other department.

Mr. HAWKINS. Then, are you suggesting that that language be changed to allow the State department of education to qualify or that that language and even broader language be left in the bill and leave it up to the States then to create such an agency? Which are you suggesting?

Mrs. WORLOCK. I am suggesting that if you will interpret the language of the bill and particularly the "broadly representative" to be met by a working advisory council with very real responsibility for the kinds of programs and very real roots in the community rather than simply an advisory council which affects the heads of certain given organizations, then I think the language would be quite adequate as it stands. I think it is a matter of interpretation. Does that meet your question?

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, I thought you indicated that the department of education, the State department of education should be the one to whom the administration be given, and yet you testify that that agency should be broadly representative? Now, there seems to be a conflict, that if it is going to be broadly representative, then obviously it cannot be the State department of education.

Mrs. WORLOCK. No, and perhaps I didn't state it as clearly as I might. It seems to me what the language will do is to make it necessary for the department of education or other departments, whatever, to organize and to become broadly representative as this language states. I think that would be a move in the right direction.

Mr. HAWKINS. I see; you prefer to leave the language somewhat as it is and in doing so require the States to modify their agencies so that the agencies become broadly representative?

Mrs. WORLOCK. With firm Federal guidelines as I indicated, yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. SCHEUER. You mentioned specifically that the subprofessionals not only had functional chores but also performed as part of the learning process. Could you describe what you mean? Have they functioned in the education process itself, or do they just clean up smudged paint and wipe noses and keep records and serve lunch?

Mrs. WORLOCK. All of which are necessary.

Mr. SCHEUER. All of which are necessary.

Mrs. WORLOCK. Like you take me to the point of the university program, which I mentioned, in which we are in the process of, we hope, getting started this summer, and what we have taken I think a fairly major chance on, but a reasonable one, is that nonprofessionals, perhaps professionals in high school who have graduated from high school and maybe who had some further education but not necessarily can be trained in a relatively short period of time, perhaps 8 weeks of preservice training and have intensive and year long at least inservice training to operate a full-time staff in a day care center under the supervision, close supervision of a fully qualified head teacher.

It has seemed to us unless you do something of this sort, you didn't stand a chance of being able to meet the personnel demands that we

have not only in preschool programs but in programs straight across our educational system. There simply are not enough teachers particularly in the urban ghettos to keep the teachers that we do have and we felt strongly something of this sort had to take place.

It has not been proven, I don't imagine, that any hard information that could stand evaluation could come for at least 18 months, but we believe very strongly it needs to be done and we are going to try.

Mr. SCHEUER. There are about 125,000 school aides at work in the schools under title I, and I am sure the vast majority are not employed creatively as we are trying to do, but I think when we get the evaluation process a little more refined, we may be able to find a few gold nuggets of hope in how subprofessionals are actually involved in the learning process.

Mrs. WORLOCK. If I may make a comment as to that, I think one of the problems in use of teacher aides has been insufficient understanding of the needs for long-term training on an ongoing basis not just of the aide, but other teachers with whom they are going to work.

Mr. SCHEUER. May I interrupt? I couldn't agree with you more. I sponsored an amendment this last year to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that provided that, implying no school could use subprofessional aides unless they had professionals who were going to supervise the aides.

Let me ask you, when you mention the prerequisite of a high school diploma, do you feel that it would be inappropriate to try using subprofessional aides who had less than a high school diploma but with the requirement that they get some kind of university training?

Mrs. WORLOCK. No. Precisely what we hope to do, and I should also say, and I don't mean to restrict it to the younger age groups, we are going to have at least one center which will work intensively with senior citizens where we felt grandparents could be used.

I should also say further to make the point, I agree completely with the professor about the need for a male staff and this is directed toward that definitely.

Mr. SCHEUER. Is there an appropriate place in your child development program for the college graduate, the mother, middle-class mother who has raised her family and her kids are now in school and she is substantially free of her child-bearing and child-rearing responsibilities to get back in the educational system, a woman who may have a degree but is not a licensed teacher and does not have the normal teacher-training points or certification. Where would she fit in the hierarchy?

Mrs. WORLOCK. She would fit in the group which we call the instructor which is the next step above an assistant, an aide.

Mr. SCHEUER. I suppose the neighborhood aide also could aspire.

Mrs. WORLOCK. Very definitely. We are working with them with the community colleges to do precisely this kind of stepping training. What we would hope the mother would do is to come in as an instructor and take courses and become a fully qualified teacher. That is certainly within our hopes.

Mr. SCHEUER. This is my last question, I am interested in your saying that we ought to go below the age 3 group. I have been working on a piece of legislation substantially comparable to this. I have had

some conversations with Rene Dubois of the Rockefeller Institute. Are you familiar with his work?

Mrs. WORLOCK. No.

Mr. SCHEUER. He is a physicist and biologist and his experiments with mice indicate that if you deprive mice either of an adequate diet or of a stimulative environment up to an age that would be comparable to 2 in a human child, that the mice suffer irreparable damage. Even if, at that point, you remediate the problem, even when you give them a full diet or give them a fully stimulative environment, there is still permanent retrogression in the development of the cortex, and he interprets this as the kind of thing you obviously couldn't perform a controlled experiment on, on children, but he takes this as a clear signal that if we don't do something for the kids in that first year and certainly in their second year in terms of medical care, nutrition, and a stimulative environment, that irremediable damage has been done certainly by the time they would get to a Headstart program, age 5 or 6, and probably by the time they would get to a program that didn't get them into their third year.

He feels very strongly, I think his people feel very strongly, that we ought to involve the kids not too far along in their first year in comprehensive medical and nutrition services and in a general stimulative environment. They should be read to, sung to, talked to, even though they may not comprehend everything that is going on; but it is becoming more and more apparent that you get geometrically better results as you arithmetically achieve an earlier point of contact in earlier years.

Mrs. WORLOCK. It is certainly reflected in the research of people we have spoken with simply in terms of the possibility, I don't think it is impossible to further a program of kind, but I hoped very much we would be moving in that direction, and I think that day care centers are providing a natural vehicle for this to take place and medical centers and family education and family kind of services to be built around it.

Mr. SCHEUER. We enjoyed your testimony.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Worlock, for your very excellent testimony before the committee.

STATEMENT OF REBECCA ALLEN, PARENT COOPERATIVE PRESCHOOL INTERNATIONAL, MONTGOMERY COUNTY CHILD DAY CARE ASSOCIATION, KENSINGTON, MD.

Mr. HAWKINS. The next witness is Mrs. Rebecca Allen, Parent Cooperative Preschool International, Montgomery County Child Day Care Association, 9901 Connecticut Avenue, Kensington, Md.

Mrs. Allen, we are glad to have you before the committee. Do you have a prepared statement?

Mrs. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. Without objection the prepared statement will be entered in the record at this point, and we would appreciate it if you would summarize your statement, Mrs. Allen.

(The document referred to follows:)

TESTIMONY BY REBECCA ALLAN, PARENT COOPERATIVE PRESCHOOL INTERNATIONAL, MONTGOMERY COUNTY CHILD DAY CARE ASSOCIATION, KENSINGTON, Md.

I wish to thank the Chairman for his kindness in inviting me to present my views on this legislation. I think that it is highly gratifying that Congresswoman Mink has sponsored H.R. 10572 and has already obtained over twenty-five co-sponsors. This shows that there is a very keen awareness in the Congress, as well as throughout the Nation, of the urgent need for more and better day care assistance for families with working mothers. In a way I believe that this recognition is due in very large measure to the outstanding and well-known success of the Head Start programs which have demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt how much preschool children can benefit from the varied educational and health programs which Head Start offers. The very successes of Head Start in hundreds of communities throughout the Nation have made us more acutely aware of the serious deficiencies in other child care centers, particularly those in lower-income neighborhoods. There is every reason to believe that the critical need for upgrading and multiplying child care centers will grow rapidly in the years ahead.

You are aware, I am sure, that the number of working mothers with preschool children has been fast increasing. In 1966, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that there were 3.8 million working mothers with children under 6 years of age.¹ Of these, half were cared for in their own homes, usually by a relative. Shockingly about 1 in 12 were left to care for themselves.² According to Mrs. Keyserling, "The Bureau of Labor Statistics has conservatively estimated that the number of working mothers 20 to 44 years of age with preschool children will increase to 5.3 million by 1980."³ With this anticipated increase in the employment of mothers, we must expect that more and more of these mothers will need to find a place where they may leave their children with confidence that they will be well taken care of. This bill, H.R. 10572, offers a constructive approach to the solution of the problem that good child care will be assured. To the extent that the child day care centers will be able to offer more satisfactory educational services and cultural enrichment, these centers will benefit not only the children but will provide reassurance to their parents and more satisfactory family relationships.

Much as I support this Bill, there are three sections on which I should like to suggest that some amendment might be beneficial.

1. Section 4 of the Bill states that "* * * each State shall be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all the States." In view of the fact that this Bill is limited to those centers in which a majority of the children involved are aged 3 to 5 inclusive, it would seem more consistent to make the allocations on the basis of the ratio of the number of working mothers with children aged 3 to 5 inclusive in such State to the number of such mothers in all the States.

2. Section 6 states the "Basic Criteria for Determining Priorities." Such criteria according to the Bill should "give preference to day care centers where the Federal grant will provide the greatest educational and cultural enrichment to children most in need thereof."

This language seems to me to be extremely difficult to administer in any objective way. There simply do not exist the standards for measuring educational and cultural enrichment that could take into account the extreme diversity in neighborhoods, backgrounds, and variety of local conditions which prevail in the various cities and rural areas of our nation. It would seem more advisable that this Bill should set standards in accordance with the best practices which have been developed in recent years. In other words, criteria could be set forth which would bring day care centers already established up to generally accepted minimum standards which would still permit substantial local variation. With this kind of goal in mind, and with a date set when minimum standards should be met, this section would provide for more workable guidelines than the present language affords.

3. Section 7(b)(1) provides that an application for a grant will be approved if "the grant will be used only to provide supplementary educational services and education equipment for day care centers." This would seem to be unnecessarily restrictive on two counts.

¹ Women's Bureau. *Working Mothers and the Need for Child Care Services*. May 1967. p. 1.

² Children's Bureau. *Some Facts and Figures About Children and Youth*. 1966. p. 3.

³ Women's Bureau. *Op. cit.*

In the first place, we should recognize that probably not more than \$300 million, the amount authorized to be spent annually under this bill, is probably more than is currently being spent on day care in the entire country.⁴ It might therefore appear desirable to use some of the funds allocated by H.R. 10572 for the establishment of new centers in addition to the improvement of those day care centers, and they are all too few, which are now in existence.

Secondly, a crucial factor in the success of any day care program is having adequately trained personnel. To purchase equipment which will not be used effectively would clearly be a waste. As stated in the Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study, University of Toronto, "It should be emphasized . . . that equipment alone will not ensure development and in many instances its beneficial use will depend on the teacher's clear formulation of his goals."⁵ Therefore, it would seem highly appropriate to permit some of the funds also to be used to provide training for teachers and day care center aides. It would appear desirable to provide for grants to permit state school systems and community colleges to offer courses which would bear directly on the training of the teachers and their assistants in these day care centers.

With these three amendments, I am thoroughly convinced that the Congress would be taking a big step forward in the path of improving early childhood educational programs, the value of which they already recognize. I would only add a sense of very real urgency for the passage of this legislation. We need only think of the tensions in scores of our larger cities, the feeling of relative hopelessness in many of the depressed areas of the Nation, and the inadequacy of preschool facilities in much of rural America to realize that we have no time to lose.

Thank you very much for permitting me to give you my views on this much needed bill.

Mrs. ALLEN. Thank you for inviting me. It is certainly encouraging to see the amount of interest this committee has shown in day care and to realize the vast knowledge that you have of the needs that exist.

I was pleased to hear Mrs. Mink state that 3 to 5 was not meant to be the cutoff point. However, if the funds are to be restricted to centers caring for children of these ages, then the statistics of the number of mothers of the State should relate precisely to those ages. May I urge that the age range of the children be broadened to include younger children, because there are so many requests for day care from parents who have younger children. One local director pointed out that she receives as many as 10 calls a month concerning the day care of infants. Frequently there is a request for care for 2-year-olds. Persons operating day care centers have found that children as young as 2 can be cared for in groups successfully. I would agree with the previous speaker that the age limit should be changed to include 2-year-olds.

With regard to the criteria, I would like to recommend more positive wording written in as guidance for the kind of programs that should be given priority in funding and what standards should be met. As I pointed out in my statement, the present language of the bill is much too vague. Government agencies now providing funds for day care are working on standards. Such standards should be required to be met at some future date to insure not only the safety of young children but their educational development as well. One suggestion would be that day care centers be graded according to three of its components: (1) personnel, (2) program, and (3) equipment. Then the funds available could be used to improve first those centers having the poorest programs.

⁴ Reid, Joseph H. (Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America.) "Legislation for Day Care." *Preliminary Report of a Consultation on Working Women and Day Care Needs*, Women's Bureau, June 1, 1967, p. 16.

⁵ Schermann, Ada. "Cognitive Goals in the Nursery School: Criteria for Evaluating Material." *The Bulletin of the Institute of Child Study*, University of Toronto, Vol. 29, Nos. 3 and 4, 1967, p. 50.

I certainly agree with Professor Bronfenbrenner's recommendation that parents should be involved in the day care program. My own interest in child care stems from participation in a parent cooperative preschool, such as the one Mrs. Kennedy set up at the White House for Caroline. Parent cooperative preschools are primarily for children from 3 to 5 years of age; they are organized and administered by the parents. The most important part of the program, however, is that the parents themselves participate as assistants to the teachers and arrange for orientation sessions for parents with emphasis on the needs of the young child. Aside from cutting down on the cost, the participation of the parents provides them with a most valuable learning experience while the preschool program provides an enriching experience for their children.

From this experience too I learned how invaluable the services of the trained childhood education specialist are in a preschool program. The learning and happiness of the children vary in direct proportion to the skill and understanding of the person in charge. In fact, I would support Mr. Scherle's view that equipment alone cannot insure the enriched education that children in day care centers need. I am sure all of you recognize this fact. As stated in my prepared testimony, one of the best ways of upgrading these centers is to provide some kind of ongoing training for the aides, as well as for the directors of the programs. Many day care centers are directed by persons with little or no knowledge of the needs of the young child.

Training must then be required for directors so they in turn can plan an adequate program. Just adding equipment is not enough. The knowledge of how to put it to the best use for each child is essential.

I would join the others in speaking to the points of the further training along with the equipment, and I am pleased to have spoken before this committee today.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Mink.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much, Mrs. Allen, for appearing before the committee in general support of this legislation, and I want to extend my appreciation to the association that you represent. I think you have made some very helpful suggestions to this committee and certainly we will weigh them very carefully.

I note your comment on the restrictive use of the funds and the use of the moneys for construction purposes. I quite agree with you that this is going to remain as an unmet need. I hope you will understand the reasons that necessitated the limitation of this program.

Mrs. ALLEN. If I may comment on that, I think I was not concerned so much with the construction of centers as additional personnel for centers. For instance, I know in the District of Columbia they are able to find facilities (although they may not be ideal facilities) but they need funds to hire additional personnel to take care of the children. This use of the funds was my concern.

Mrs. MINK. You make reference to personnel not directly related to the educational aspects of the program. What kind of personnel do you refer to?

Mrs. ALLEN. All aspects of the program. Day care centers need teachers, aides, cooks, janitors, and counselors to provide a good program. If an agency, say, had a waiting list of as many children as they are now serving, they should be able to use the funds to hire additional personnel to take care of those children. When you con-

sider that statistics show that one out of 12 children are left without any caretaker at all, you realize how many thousands exist who need at least basic day care. That is the primary problem as I see it.

Mrs. MINK. You also expressed concern about the basis for allocating the funds. The bill bases the allocation on the number of working mothers in a State as compared to the total number in the country. Your recommendation is that the ratio be not just working mothers but rather more specifically working mothers with children aged 3 to 5.

This was my preference. However, I was advised by the Department of Labor that these statistics are not available and that, if I based my allocation of the funds on this factor that it would be quite some time before the program would be readily implemented because the formula for distribution could not be ascertained. So I had to delineate a formula which could result in immediate distribution of funds based upon statistics which were in existence in the Department of Labor. This statistic on the number of working mothers they apparently do have and could use in effecting a distribution of the funds to the States.

I quite agree with you a better basis would have been those that can be identified as being the specific beneficiaries of the program, but it was unfortunate I could not ascertain with any degree of certainty that these figures could be secured for all 50 States.

Thank you very much.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Mink.

Mr. Steiger.

Mr. STEIGER. Mrs. Allen, let me touch on the statement you made on the need for the training of teachers and day care center aides as a high priority need.

The question in large measure goes to both you and Mrs. Mink, because, is it appropriate in the legislation to try to provide the methods by which we can train the people for the centers or is this better left to the Educational Professions Development Act, an educational bill rather than a day care center bill?

I have a fear of proliferating legislation, and I am not quite sure how we handle this problem, recognizing it is an important problem.

Mrs. ALLEN. For many years, day care has not come under the category of education per se. However, with the increasing research that is underway in the area of the development of the young child, we are learning the prime importance of the stimulation of the child at the earliest age. Consequently day care is now undergoing careful reevaluation. Particularly at this early age, the whole child must be considered. The director in charge of the program must be aware of the child's total needs. (Where the education of these directors best fits into the legislative pattern, I am not competent to judge but must leave it to you who are the experts.)

What should be avoided is that any legislation should encourage a highly structured program of day care in which little children would be stopped from carrying on a meaningful activity with the words "Now the music teacher is here, everybody must listen." Music is an integral part of a total program—that may be used for 15 minutes one day and an hour another as the conditions vary. Art is the use of paints and paper and crayons and paste and scraps to be explored, not

exploited. The directors may need supplemental education to know just how to include these component parts in the program; they may need the advice of a psychologist in handling certain severe behavior problems; their centers may need more paper and paste and books and blocks and climbing equipment, but let's make sure first that the kind of people who are in charge have the best kind of know-how to put all these elements into a good program for guiding the children's total growth and relating it to their home, their family, and their future.

The State colleges and community colleges, for the most part because of the needs of Headstart, are instituting good training programs. If, in defining supplementary education (and certainly I don't know exactly how to write it), this "supplementary education" could be training for the staff members who are in charge of the children—if that definition would fit into the terminology of supplemental education services—that, in my opinion, is the real need in upgrading child day care at present.

Mr. STEIGER. You are recommending, then, this be a part of this legislation?

Mrs. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. STEIGER. Let me ask one other question which you may want to comment on. In the statement of findings and purpose, it says: "Millions of preschool-age children whose parents work" have no opportunity for this kind of experience, and any allocation is to be made on an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all of the States, determined by the Secretary of Labor.

Does this really work at cross-purposes with what I would foresee as part of the need for expanding the day care center program? If we limit this only to mothers that work, are we then not leaving out a portion of our population in which there may be mothers who don't work but where there is no father, for example?

I am searching, and I would be interested in any comment you have on whether or not it really ought to be limited to just working mothers.

Mrs. ALLEN. It is likely that most children in day care centers are children of working parents. To base the State allocation on the number of working mothers should not necessarily mean it can benefit only children of working mothers. Certainly there can be children in day care centers whose mother is ill or whose mother is incapable of taking care of children in the home and therefore must send them to the center. I would hope that was the intent of the bill.

Mr. STEIGER. But I am afraid that by the statement, as it is written now in section 2, there is a limitation by intent, and it may not be what Mrs. Mink and the authors have in mind, but if I were to look at it and say, "Who do we serve?" "We are serving millions of preschool-age children whose parents work."

Mrs. ALLEN. Perhaps the wording could be supplemented to read "whose parents work or are unable for other reasons to take care of their children."

Mr. STEIGER. You would agree there are others whose role at this point in their lives makes it as important for them and their children to be served as it is for those whose mother works?

Mrs. ALLEN. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. Will my colleague yield? I will be happy to delete the three words "whose parents work," because it is not meant to limit the effectiveness of the program. That is a very valuable contribution.

Mr. STEIGER. I thought the question ought to be raised, because I think coverage would be limited if the congressional intent remained in that form.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Allen, for your very excellent testimony.

STATEMENT OF MARY WEIR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. HAWKINS. The next witness is Mrs. Mary Weir, National Association For the Education of Young Children. Mrs. Weir.

Your statement, Mrs. Weir, will be entered in the record at this point, and we will appreciate it if you would attempt to summarize it. (The document referred to follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT BY MARY K. WEIR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN

The National Association for the Education of Young Children is an organization of over 15,000 persons who are concerned with the education, development and well-being of young children between the ages of two through eight. We welcome the opportunity to testify and comment on H.R. 10572.

We now know that little children do learn. Evidence from the studies of Jean Piaget, Martin Deutsch, James McVikar Hunt, Benjamin Bloom, Susan Gray, Glen Nimnicht, to name but a few, indicates that the preschool years are crucial years for learning and that this learning is the foundation for all other future learning. Last week Commissioner Howe in a speech before the school superintendents of the nation listed preschool education as one of six priorities facing educators today.

When young children are brought together in educative group settings such as child day care centers, how and what they learn as well as the kind of care they are receiving while learning has become a focus of concern for many of us who are active in the field of early childhood education.

Let's look briefly at some of the most persistent, plaguing problems found in today's child day care centers. My own experiences stem from California; however, I'm told by those working in the day care centers in other states that the problems are not dissimilar.

First, day care has been hung with the label of custodial care or just baby sitting for many many years. There are certain historical reasons for this which I will not take time to go into now, nevertheless much of the labeling has been true. This is not because the administrative and teaching personnel in some centers have wanted it to be this way. Many devoted teachers have tried on shoe string budgets and ill-prepared staffs to provide educational programs in addition to the traditional custodial care which is associated with the day care center. An acute shortage of funds for educational equipment and services has long been part of the problems faced by day care centers.

This, however, is not the only problem of day care. Young children need lots of room in which to grow and learn. In California 35 square feet of space per child indoors and 75 square feet of space per child out of doors are the minimum requirements of space for licensing of such centers by the State Department of Social Welfare. Unfortunately, not all the day care centers in the state fall under the jurisdiction of this licensing agency; therefore, many of our centers are ill housed, in inadequate, improperly lighted and poorly ventilated buildings. Inferior existing facilities is one aspect of the problem. Throughout the United States there is also a shortage of centers to care for those children whose parent(s) need to use the services of the center. It is not uncommon to find long waiting lists at existing centers. Working mothers are forced to make other arrangements, usually a babysitter or casual neighbor arrangement as an alternative to day

care. A greater crisis in day care is expected with the influx of children to the day care centers as legislated by the recently passed social security amendments. This will become an immediate and very real problem within the next few months.

Because the existing centers try to serve as many children as they can on small budgets in limited space, the professional staff is frequently inadequately trained, if at all, in the principles guiding education in early childhood. The salaries paid are below that of other teachers providing the same educational experiences in other settings and the circular problem of attracting qualified professionally prepared teachers to the day care center seems to have found no resolution. In service training for those working in the centers seems to my organization to be one answer which will begin to raise the quality of program. Better working conditions for the teachers will attract the better qualified person.

I have sketched only three major difficulties with which day care centers struggle: space, personnel and quality program. The National Association for the Education of Young Children feels that a comprehensive approach to the day care center problems is desirable.

H. R. 10572 takes account of one aspect of the problem of educational quality in program offerings. It seems to us to be necessary to have some guidelines at the federal level which provide to the state commissions criteria for choosing which centers are to be funded and which are not.

My organization, NAEYC, supports H. R. 10572 as an attempt to solve one aspect of the many problems found in day care centers today. We would suggest that the committee consider all the problems of day care on a national level and incorporate some of their findings into this bill.

Mrs. WEIR. Yes. In the brief minutes that are remaining for the committee to meet—and I assume you have a time of closing?

Mr. HAWKINS. We wish to apologize. It is unfortunate that time seems to run out. Certainly it is not meant to deprive you of your opportunity. You have a contribution to make, but it is simply that time does not stand still.

Mrs. WEIR. I would like to identify my organization, and then I will summarize what my presentation would have been if I had read the body of the statement.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children is an organization of over 15,000 persons who are concerned with the education, development, and well-being of young children between the ages of two through eight. We welcome the opportunity to testify and to comment on H. R. 10572.

I, in the body of my statement, make essentially three points. No. 1, we support the bill. We think it is of good intent. No. 2, we feel, as every other witness here has testified this morning, that there are many, many, pressing problems in the field of day care today in the United States. I point to two of these which have been mentioned, and I will not belabor them before this committee.

The first one is the question of facilities and space. There are not enough day care centers in the United States to take care of the need. The existing day care facilities are woefully inadequate in terms of the amount of space, the amount of needed equipment, facilities for outdoor play, the kind of design which makes it easy for children to move in and out of buildings. For example, many day care centers I know of are housed in old, inadequate, remodeled houses, sometimes 3-year-olds are placed on a third floor and have to march up and down two and three flights of steps, to get to the out-side area in which to play. I think this kind of problem also needs the attention of the committee when considering a bill that relates to existing day care facilities.

The second point under the two conditions which I feel exist in many day care centers today is the question which we have also discussed here at length, and that is one of personnel. To my knowledge—

and I come from the California scene, where we are supposed to have some of the better day care centers in the Nation—some personnel who work in day care centers are ill-trained, ill-equipped to handle young children in groups. It is my contention that it takes professional skill to direct a group of young children, that custodial care is not just the custodial care as we have traditionally known the day care centers to be. Any time you bring young children together in groups, they are receiving an educational experience. Many times this experience can be bad, however, under good supervision and direction it can be excellent and of high quality.

I am concerned about pouring money into centers which do not have good-quality programs or the potential for such. The basis for good-quality programs, not that they must be full-blown, but the base in terms of a philosophy and attitude toward teaching young children, which is very, very poor from an early childhood educator's standpoint and even from a custodial standpoint, would gain very little unless one could begin to upgrade the quality of the persons and the professional people who are working in such centers.

So this is my organization's concern. Primarily, we would like to see a comprehensive approach to the day care problem. With fiscal matters being what they are, perhaps this is impossible this year. Perhaps it can be projected for a future time when a more comprehensive bill can be written.

We certainly do support the bill as one step toward alleviating some of the problems.

Now, the last point I make in my testimony is that I would like to see some broadly written guidelines for the States who would be administering such a bill, for the commissions that would be set up in these separate States, so that it is not so loosely delineated that the kind of thing I mentioned before, very, very poor programs, would begin to be supported without any basis for developing adequacy in quality within these programs with money which would be spent.

I think it is like pouring money down the rathole, which has been done in some of the other programs which have not had any kind of control in terms of the quality of the program that one is trying to bring help to.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to make this presentation.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you, Mrs. Weir.

The House is now in session and under our rules we must adjourn the meeting.

Mr. STEIGER. I have not heard the bell.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have an appointment, but if you and Mrs. Mink would like to stay and question her. All right, Mrs. Mink would like to hear some of your answers. Mrs. Mink.

Mrs. MINK. If I may assume the Chair in your absence?

Mr. HAWKINS. You have it.

Mrs. MINK. I am delighted to have the support of your organization and certainly welcome your statement, and the suggestions you have made in your testimony, I am sure, will contribute greatly to the final outcome of the bill and the form that it will take.

On the matter of pouring money down the rathole, this is, of course, a major concern that always must be considered by committees in

drafting legislation. The primary purpose of this bill is to upgrade the existing centers and to make sure that the purposes of the bill are actually fulfilled, it seeks to provide those additional services which will contribute to this upgrading.

I wonder if you could suggest perhaps what kind of criteria you had in mind which should be written into the bill to give the State commissions the kind of direction that you feel is necessary to assure that only those programs which will accomplish this end will be funded.

Mrs. WEIR. Yes. I had in my original testimony which I deleted because my copy of the pamphlet is in California and I couldn't get ahold of it in time, a pamphlet titled "Basic Propositions for Early Childhood Education," in which very general guidelines are spelled out as to the needs of young children.

Another excellent pamphlet which would give us guidelines in this direction would be "The Fundamental Needs of the Child," a pamphlet written by Laurence K. Frank. Unfortunately, I was not able to procure these and I had intended to enter this into my testimony if this is proper to do so. I would be happy to send the committee copies, if you would like it. To summarize two pamphlets, though, in terms of basic guidelines, I think, would take up far too much of your time.

Mrs. MINK. The committee would appreciate very much if you would submit these two reports for the files of the committee so we might each have an opportunity to review it.

It certainly is my hope that we will be able to come up with legislation which will accomplish the whole purpose of upgrading our centers.

I did not and specifically did not include in the bill the requirement that the Office of Education here and the Commissioner set guidelines for determining the eligibility criteria, because it seemed to me that the States and the commissions to be established under this legislation could do this themselves. But I shall welcome an opportunity to study the reports.

Mrs. WEIR. I think on your last statement that some States could certainly do this, I think that we find different approaches to day care from one State to another. Some States have very good quality day care and a good central administration for this day care. Others don't even know it exists, and I am quite sure that what does exist in those States is not licensed or supervised and controlled. It is at the State level where recognition to the existence of whatever day care there is, would take place, and I would think that these States would certainly benefit by such an introduction of guidelines by the Commissioner of Education. Is that the procedure, that this could be in the working paper given by the makers of the bill, along with the bill itself?

Mrs. MINK. In section 7(b)(2), there is a paragraph on page 4, beginning on line 15, in which one of the criteria for approval by the Commissioner is that "the State or the political subdivision in which the day-care center is located enforces standards for the operation of day-care centers which give assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that such centers will be operated in a manner which will not be unsafe, unsanitary, or otherwise detrimental to the children there, and the applicant meets such standards."

I assume from your testimony, that you feel it should go beyond just physical requirements and also include the educational standards.

Mrs. WEIR. Yes; I feel strongly there has to be a philosophical underpinning which indicates some knowledge of what is good educational experience for young children.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Steiger, do you have any questions you would like to ask?

Mr. STEIGER. Madam Chairman, yes, I do have a few questions I would like to go over.

The fact you, Mrs. Mink, are here as author of the legislation is excellent, because you may wish to enter into any dialog that we can develop.

How are day-care centers, Mrs. Weir, licensed in California now?

Mrs. WEIR. The licensing of day-care centers in California is done by the State department of social welfare, and the day-care centers which were the carryover centers from the old Lanham Act days are under the State department of education and are not licensed. I do not know the breakdown in figures as to how many are licensed and not licensed, but we have two agencies, in effect, running day-care centers in California.

Mr. STEIGER. One of the agencies' social services department licenses its day-care centers?

Mrs. WEIR. Yes; State department of social welfare.

Mr. STEIGER. Each department does not?

Mrs. WEIR. The State department of education has no licensing regulation for the day-care center. They are called children centers in California now. They have one criterion for personnel through a children's center permit which does have some control over the quality of the person who is employed to work in the children's center but these centers can be housed almost anywhere.

Mr. STEIGER. What percentage, if you know, of the centers in California are run by profitmaking individuals and groups versus those run by nonprofit organizations?

Mrs. WEIR. I have no idea. I am sorry. I am sure you can probably get the figures from the State department of social welfare, who does the licensing.

Mr. STEIGER. How would the day-care centers that are run by two departments in California meld with the Headstart centers, Headstart programs run by the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mrs. WEIR. The State department of education children centers, which are the old child-care centers from World War II are cooperating with the Headstart programs in various locations in that the children who are enrolled in the child care children's centers go out of the center to a Headstart facility, a number of hours, something like 3 or 3½ hours in the morning, have their classes there, then return to the children's center for the remainder of the day.

In some situations, the Headstart program is imposed on the children's center; that is, they have the Headstart program in the same facility; more often than not, it is not in the same facility; the children move out and then come back, which seems to us a kind of ridiculous situation in California.

Mr. STEIGER. How should we try to best organize this? Assuming this legislation was adopted and you set up a major focus on supplemental, or preschool centers. Wouldn't it be better to transfer the

Headstart program out of the Office of Economic Opportunity into the Office of Education so the two could go together?

Mrs. WEIR. I think that depends on what State you are talking about. In some States it might prove very effective, and in other States it would not be effective at all. I see a danger in putting the program into the Office of Education. I have a particular bias about this. It seems to me it loses its local control, it loses the element of involvement of the poor in the development of the program which the program seeks and which is so necessary.

I think when you put it directly into the hands of a State agency which is already well established and has its way of doing things, that you very often get a kind of regimentation and curriculum development and curriculum control that you lose when you have the more creative—what I consider the more creative approach to this problem.

Mr. STEIGER. In a way you have a qualification about your support for the legislation because it does place this responsibility in the Office of Education; is that correct?

Mrs. WEIR. For this particular legislation?

Mr. STEIGER. Yes.

Mrs. WEIR. I don't know any other body that you would place it in the hands of, unless you wanted to give it to Office of Economic Opportunity. They are more comprehensive in their services than, it seems to me, this bill is geared to in terms of Headstart.

You see, Headstart has primarily been a program which is a half-day program. There are occasional day-care centers run by Headstart. These are not nearly as frequent as the part-time Headstart programs, 3- or 4-hour-day program, in which you have unemployed mothers sending their children.

Mr. STEIGER. We have an excellent day-care center program in my district, Fond du Lac, Wis., funded through the Office of Economic Opportunity, and it is a full-time program. I think it does an excellent job.

You touched on a point I would like to pursue a little bit. In your statement and in the statement that was made earlier by the professor, you both have commented that "day care has been hung with a label of custodial care or just babysitting for many years."

If that is correct, and I see the point that you are trying to make, are we, then, really attempting in a way to take what is now in our educational system and develop a subeducational program? Is this an expansion of our public education to grades below the first grade and kindergarten? Is this the direction in which this legislation should go if it is more than custodial care or babysitting?

Mrs. WEIR. I can see some positive features of having educational developments which are outside of the existing public schools framework. I think that it perhaps does a couple of positive things. It enables those designing the program a great deal more freedom than what is allowed under existing State departments of education. It also acts as an innovator to the existing public school systems. I am not saying that public school systems are not trying to be innovative now but I think they are trying to be innovative as a result of a great deal of pressure from below and these programs happen to be one of the areas of pressure.

Certainly, historically speaking, the nursery school movement and the day-care center has been, in a sense, locked out of the educational system for a great many years. It is not because we have not tried to get in. We have tried very hard.

Now that it is becoming a viable instrument in society in terms of providing education for larger numbers of children, we have become extremely respectable and responsible. All of a sudden it seems that we are to be taken in and become a part of that which for many, many years we were not a part of.

The few experiences in Headstart, for example, which I am familiar with where the Headstart programs have been a part of the public school system we find that it is extremely difficult to get personnel into Headstart who do not necessarily hold the teaching credential standard certificates in the States. These teachers who hold certification and are recruited to teach Headstart have absolutely no training and no experience in working with 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children, so we find a kindergarten program imposed on Headstart children which from my point of view, educationally speaking, is a very poor initial program for Headstart children. We would like to see more flexibility for a whole number of reasons—there are teachers that are available to go into the program who have specific training in early childhood education, who come, as Mrs. Allen did, out of the cooperative movement with many years of experience as a co-op mother working with young children. I venture to say, she would be locked out of a Headstart program which is run by a school district in my State because she does not hold a valid State of California teaching credential, even though she has "umteen" years more experience working with young children than a young teacher who had been working in the public schools of California with a valid teaching credential.

Mr. STEIGER. What you are saying here is that you don't see the concept involved in this legislation as one that is a program aimed at education per se? You are talking, then, about the cultural enrichment and whatever other facets of early childhood development are appropriate which makes it possible for a child to then enter the educational system better prepared because of his experience; is that correct?

Mrs. WEIR. No; I think that we define education for young children differently perhaps because I think when you talk about cultural enrichment or education you are probably talking about similar qualities in terms of experiences that we give to young children, educational experience.

Mr. STEIGER. But you don't want to impose the educational system into the day care system; am I correct?

Mrs. WEIR. If by what you mean as an educational system, a well-formulated, established curriculum such as are drawn up, say, for first, second, and third grades in the public schools, my bias at this particular point is that it has to be much more flexibly drawn, that education for young children is not a cut-and-dried and well-ordered unit this week and another unit the next week sort of thing which can be easily codified and established and laid upon all children between the ages of 3 and 5.

Curriculum for young children is something which grows out of the growing needs of the young child in groups and is developed by the teacher with her knowledge and with her background of how young children grow. It is built out of her understanding of these needs.

To say, for example, that one must have a unit on a fire department and we will all go visit the fire engine and have the unit on the fire department at x week in the semester is, in my opinion, not appropriate curriculum design for young children.

If we have something in the experiences of these young children which leads them to an interest in the fire department and fire engines or if the teacher decides "I am going to create such an interest," then we develop that particular unit with the children.

Mr. STEIGER. Under the bill the term "child day-care center" means a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution.

Based on your experience, and your own background in this field, this, then, means that any of the profit day-care centers that are presently being operated, which may in fact be custodial or they may be more than that, under proper auspices would not be eligible for assistance. Is this appropriate? Is this the way it ought to be done or is it better to try to also utilize some of the resources that may now be available in the country for day-care centers, that are not operated on a nonprofit basis?

Is this the way it ought to be done or is it better to try to also utilize some of the resources that may not be available in the country for day-care centers, that are not operated on a nonprofit basis?

Mrs. WEIR. That is a very difficult question, because in our State—that is, the State of California—there are some profitmaking day-care centers which are, in fact, better than nonprofit day-care centers, educationally speaking.

They have, for a number of years now, been willing to take children—a certain number of slots are saved for these children from AFDC mothers. These children are placed in profitmaking day-care centers. I am not sure of the formula by which the welfare department pays for the children to be in these centers; I do know that the experiences that these children have had have been very good ones. I think you get into the whole question of furthering the profits of those who are in the day-care center business for a profit.

The problem becomes more complex because some of those who are in for profit are also very devoted to the education of the children for whom they care. They just don't have dollar signs in their eyes. I don't know how to resolve the problem. I have not given it that much thought.

Mr. STEIGER. I appreciate very much your comments and analysis, Mrs. Weir. I think you have made a very great contribution of how we should go about proceeding to try to find out and figure out what it is we should do.

I have one suggestion to Mrs. Mink. On page 4, I think it would be better to change that (b) sub (2) to make it a positive rather than a negative, so they "will be operated in a manner which would be safe and sanitary" rather than "will not be unsafe and unsanitary."

Thank you.

Mrs. MINK. I will note that suggestion.

Mrs. WEIR. Thank you for staying. I enjoyed the opportunity to testify.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much, Mrs. Weir. We certainly enjoyed your comments and I must say I am in total agreement with almost all of the responses that you made to my colleague, and at this time I would like to again express the appreciation of the committee to Mrs. Worlock and Mrs. Allen for their patience in staying this late with us, and we certainly appreciate the contributions you made.

This committee stands adjourned until tomorrow at 9:45, when this bill will again be considered. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 9:45 a.m. Thursday, February 29, 1968.)

PRESCHOOL CENTERS SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Patsy T. Mink (acting chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Mink, Hawkins, Scheuer, and Steiger.

Mrs. MINK. The Select Subcommittee on Education will now begin continuation of the hearings on H.R. 10572, to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers.

Before we call the first witness to the witness table, I would like to ask unanimous consent to insert three documents, one entitled "Preliminary Report of a Consultation on Working Women and Day Care Needs," issued by U.S. Department of Labor, containing three articles, one by Mary Keyserling, one by Mrs. Oettinger, and a third by Joseph Reid; and another document, issued by the Office of Education, entitled "Nursery-Kindergarten Enrollment of Children Under Six," dated October 1966; and an article by Maya Pines entitled "Someone To Mind the Baby," which was issued in the New York Times magazine of January 7, 1968.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

They will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The documents referred to follow:)

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF A CONSULTATION ON WOMEN AND DAY CARE NEEDS,
JUNE 1, 1967, WASHINGTON, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, WOMEN'S BUREAU

In response to many requests, the Women's Bureau is issuing this preliminary and partial report containing the three major speeches delivered to a consultation on "Working Women and Day Care Needs," held in Washington, D.C., on June 1, 1967. A full report of the proceedings will be published at a later date.

The consultation was convened by the following organizations:

Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor
Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Directions Seminar:

American Association of University Women
Association for Childhood Education International
National Association for the Education of Young Children
National Committee for Support of the Public Schools
National Committee for Children and Youth
National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Inc.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers
National Education Association
National Education Association Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education

WORKING MOTHERS AND THEIR CHILDREN—THE URGENT NEED FOR DAY CARE SERVICES

(By Mary Dublin Keyserling, Director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor)

May I add my warmest words of welcome to you all. We meet today to discuss one of the most urgent items on the national agenda of unfinished business—the need for greatly expanded day care services for the children of working mothers.

Newspapers carry the story day after day of heartbreaking child neglect, of the tragic consequences of our failure to rise adequately to our responsibilities for our children. A recent column begins:

“When many of the mothers of the central downtown district go to work in the morning, they tie identification tags around the necks of the toddlers they leave behind. They do this in the hope that someone will guide the wandering child homeward at the end of the day, because they cannot pay for care while they are gone.”

We read all too often of children in so-called “nurseries” locked up in wooden cages too small for them to stretch out or stand up in; of children crowded in cold, foul-smelling basements, not provided even with custodial care; of children “minded” in their own homes or those of neighbors by the incompetent or worse; of children totally uncared for.

The lack of sufficient and adequate day care facilities for the children of working mothers, at a price they can afford, has become a major social crisis in our midst. It is at long last beginning to challenge us to action as a nation.

In March 1965, 4.5 million children under the age of 6 had working mothers. There were another nearly 6.5 million children between the ages of 6 and 11 whose mothers held jobs. These numbers have grown considerably in the succeeding 2 years. Yet today we estimate there are licensed day care facilities available for fewer than 350,000 children.

A large majority of the mothers of these children work for compelling economic reasons. Many are the heads of fatherless homes. Many have husbands who are not at work or whose earnings are too low to meet essential family needs—earnings which wives must augment if acute hardship is not to be the family's daily lot. And even with both parents at work, many families still experience poverty.

The number of mothers who work has continued to rise rapidly because they have needed to work and, no less important because jobs have become increasingly available. Society has sought and welcomed the contribution of its working women. The number of working mothers has more than doubled since 1950; it has increased more than sixfold since 1940. In recent years the employment of mothers of preschool children has increased even more rapidly than that of mothers of school-age children.

As the number of employed mothers has grown, the availability of facilities for the day care of their children has failed to keep pace. The gap between the need for adequate care and its provision actually widened over a period of more than 30 years to become one of the most distressing areas of unmet need on the American scene. It has begun to narrow only in the last few years and only in slight degree.

Numerous communities have surveyed the situation. Report after report paints an acutely distressing picture. The Welfare Council in one of our largest cities made a neighborhood by neighborhood survey. In one low-income area there were 7,000 children in need of day care. To meet this need there were four licensed day care homes and one commercial day care center with a combined capacity for 87 children.

A recent State study points out that nearly three-fourths of the centers surveyed provided only part-time care; that the majority of full-time centers were under proprietary auspices with fees too high for most low-income families; that centers providing subsidized care on a fee basis adjusted to income had far more applicants than they could possibly accommodate.

Here in the District of Columbia, as many of you know, an intensive child care survey was made a few years ago by the Day Care Committee of the Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area. There were licensed family day care homes in the District with a capacity for only 250 children too young for group care. There were four Health and Welfare Council financed centers providing group day care for about 200 children. In addition, licensed church-based or proprietary day care centers served only about 1,300 children, charging fees ranging from \$10 to \$20 a week for each child. Such costs were virtually

prohibitive for low-income families, especially those with two or more children. The overwhelming majority of families in need of day care services, whatever their income, sought care for their children through informal day care arrangements in their own homes or in someone else's. This in all too many cases was sadly inadequate.

This conclusion was clearly substantiated on a nationwide basis by a study undertaken jointly 2 years ago by the Women's Bureau and the Children's Bureau. The study was limited to the 6 million mothers who worked either full time or part time for 27 weeks or more in 1964, and who had at least one child under 14 years of age living at home. These mothers had a total of 12.3 million children under 14 years old—one-fifth of all American children in this age group.

What did we find with respect to the kind of care these children received when their mothers were at work?

Nearly half of the children in the survey were provided care in their own homes, usually by the father or another relative. In too many instances the care was provided by a youngster under 16 years of age. Fifteen percent of the children in the survey were cared for in homes other than their own—half in homes of people not related to them. Among the children under 6 years of age, a third were cared for in the homes of others.

Care in the home or in other homes may be good. But in all too many cases it is very poor indeed.

In the case of 13 percent of the children in the survey, the mother reported she looked after the child herself while working. Low-income mothers were twice as likely to do this as those in modest or comfortable circumstances. Over half a million preschool children, we found, were being taken by their mothers to their place of work.

Our joint Women's Bureau-Children's Bureau survey showed that of the more than 12 million children covered, 8 percent were expected to take care of themselves. These are the children with identification tags around their necks, which may help some stranger to guide them home when they stray. These are the "latchkey kids" who fend for themselves, and our survey indicated that about 38,000 of these children were less than 6 years old. This may be a gross underestimate, for how many mothers will tell you when interviewed that they have no alternative but to leave their children on their own?

Only 2 percent of all the children covered by the survey were benefiting from group care. This type of arrangement varied by age, being 4 percent for children under 3, 7 percent for children 3 to 5, and less than 1 percent for children 6 years of age and older.

Do we need further evidence to conclude that the stock of facilities now available for the care of children of working mothers is abysmally inadequate when measured against the overwhelming and growing demand? We lag sadly behind many other nations in providing the good care that should be every child's birth-right, especially in a proud and prosperous democracy such as our own.

"Why is it," a Washington press correspondent asked in her column a few weeks ago, "that countries like Sweden and Israel provide vastly better day care for children of working mothers than does the United States?" The wife of the Swedish Ambassador, Mrs. Hubert de Besche, was interviewed. She reported that in her country the availability of day care for the children of working mothers is far greater than in the United States. Yet she said that her government plans to double the number of places by 1970.

The reporter questioned Mrs. Avraham Harman, wife of the Israeli Ambassador. She reported that today in her country there are sufficient day care centers for all children needing them. She commented that it was in her view more a matter of philosophy than finance. "Ours," she said, "is a child-oriented government in a community which gives its highest priority to the needs of the child."

So, too, we believe, is ours. We are beginning to give long overdue recognition to the problems we confront.

You will be hearing later today of the progress made as a result of the enactment of the Public Welfare Amendments of 1962, which marked the beginning of significant Federal funding for day care. These amendments have served to stimulate the States to improve standards for day care facilities and to develop more ambitious day care plans.

You will hear of important new programs innovated by the Children's Bureau and the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and by the Office of Economic Opportunity, among other Government agencies. I am sure we will all wish there were time to hear, in full detail, reports on the

establishment of the growing number of OEO-financed centers. This is in addition to those Headstart programs that now operate in the summer or on a year-round but part-time basis. Year-round full-time care is the only kind which meets the need of most low-income mothers who must work.

If this were a longer conference, there would be time, too, to hear reports of increased assistance for day care services for the children of migrants and seasonal farm workers. The Department of Housing and Urban Development would be able to report on the inclusion of day care as a vital component of some of their neighborhood facilities grant programs.

New recognition is being given to the need for the expansion of day care services as an essential element in our mounting attack on concentrations of poverty in our city slums. Many mothers now on public assistance rolls want the opportunity to gain economic independence through training and gainful employment, but without adequate day care for their children the gateway to a greater measure of self-sufficiency is closed. This is equally true for many other mothers who are not receiving public assistance but who live in poverty and need and want training and work.

We in the Labor Department recently made a study of unemployment and underemployment in 10 areas where poverty is especially highly concentrated. We found that almost 1 out of every 5 of the slum residents who were not in the labor force but who wanted a regular job gave inability to arrange for child care as the principal reason for not looking for work.

You will be heartened to know that funds are to be available to help expand day care services as part of the concentrated employment programs now being developed. This will mean that additional mothers who wish to do so will be able to move into training programs now increasingly available and to go on to employment and self-sufficiency, provided that day care services remain available and are within their means. The choice in a democracy should be theirs as to whether to remain on assistance or to work. They will not have a choice unless day care facilities are greatly enlarged. The contemplated provision of day care funds for this purpose will be an investment in the future of mothers and their children—an investment that will be repaid manyfold in both human and economic terms.

The President in his 1967 Message to Congress on America's Children and Youth noted the progress under way toward the provision of a widening range of services for needy children and their parents. But he emphasized, too, that efforts still fall short in many ways. He listed day care for children under 3 years old as among the services needed. Such facilities are to be provided through a pilot program of child and parent centers conducted by community action agencies in areas of acute poverty.

All this and much besides is good news, but it remains a beginning. Unmet need remains huge in scope. To meet the need will require far more than larger amounts of Federal funds and additional programs. It will require more than State plans and larger financial participation. It will require action at the community level. It will require a far greater measure of public understanding, support, and involvement. The focus must be on action.

Recognition of this led representatives of the nine outstanding voluntary organizations whose names are listed on the back of your program, the Children's Bureau, and the Women's Bureau to join in convening this consultation.

How can we get on with the job more effectively? It is the desire to find constructive answers to this question—and to find them speedily—that brings together today representatives of more than 60 voluntary national organizations and of more than 20 governmental bureaus or other administrative units. Joining, too, in today's discussions are representatives of several interested congressional leaders who have introduced supportive legislation, and of the Citizens Advisory Council on the Status of Women, among other important groups and individuals.

What legislative programs are under consideration that will help to narrow the gap between the need for and the supply of good day care services? These will be reviewed in some detail later this morning.

Have we given sufficient thought to the wide range of innovative approaches to action that would help to move us forward? To stimulate our thinking we will hear from a panel of innovators this afternoon. Unions and management are beginning to take up the torch and are saying, "Innovations in the field *can* be provided by private industry." Housing developers say good day care services can and should be built into the community scheme of things. Public and private centers and agencies are exploring and finding ways to accelerate the expansion of services. Can these be more widely adopted? Can they be replicated on a State and local basis?

Can Government agencies or groups of Federal employees, working through their own voluntary organizations, find means to establish day care centers for the children of mothers who are employed by the Government?

What can our school systems do to spur innovation?

Should an army of volunteers be recruited and trained to supplement professional workers—volunteers who could help facilitate a significant expansion of services?

Can hospitals, acutely in need of more doctors and nurses, and schools and colleges, no less in need of teachers, give more thought to the number of well-trained women who could return to work part time or full time if their children could be cared for properly in a nearby or built-in center?

Must we not analyze factors that have slowed action in the past and be prepared not to repeat earlier mistakes? Have we sometimes been excessive in our demands with respect to what we think a good day care center should provide? Must we find a happier compromise between our desires for perfection and the need for speedy action to provide better care than millions of children now receive?

Most important of all, how can we work together to give greater visibility to the important questions on our agenda today and to win the consensus and support so urgently needed?

The program planners for our consultation were well aware that our discussions, in focusing on action to meet the need for expanded day care services for the children of working mothers, would relate to the most pressing aspect of national day care needs but still would be only partial in scope. We shall all be aware as the sessions proceed that there are needs of many other children that must also be included in a well-rounded national plan for action—children who are physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped; children whose mothers do not work but who would benefit from good day care. We are aware that good facilities must become increasingly available for children at all economic levels.

May I say, on behalf of the nine voluntary organizations that comprise the Directions Seminar, the Children's Bureau, and the Women's Bureau, which have joined in convening this consultation, how grateful we are for your warm response to our invitation. It has far exceeded even our most optimistic expectations. If it is a measure of a new depth of concern and interest on the part of leadership groups in the issues before us, it bodes well for constructive solutions in prospect.

DAY CARE TODAY—A FOUNDATION FOR PROGRESS

(By Mrs. Katherine Brownell Oettinger, Chief, Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

The lack of adequate day care services is threatening the future of our children. We have swept this problem under every conceivable rug. Our society is so ambivalent about it that on the one hand there are those who want all mothers to stay home and look after their children, but at the same time they decry the lack of enough manpower—and womanpower—to meet our national needs. There is continuing pressure to get mothers off the tax rolls and into the labor force.

We simply are not facing the fact that today nearly 3 million children whose mothers are at work need the care and protection that day care offers because they are in one-parent families, or because both parents work and the family has a marginal income, or because some handicapping problem has beset the family.

If this many children stood in hazard because of an epidemic, the Nation would be up in arms. There would be cries for a vaccine; no expense would be spared to launch research efforts that showed promise of putting an end to the hazard.

But it is not a health hazard, primarily, which confronts these children. It is a hazard to healthy childhood development. I do not need to tell you at this conference today the potential damage that social hazards can bring to the lives of children. You are here because you are acutely aware of the multiple hazards that children face. Some of you have not only asked for this consultation but have helped develop its direction. We have determined it should be an experience to stimulate action—an encounter that will set off a chain of reactions across the country.

We are here because the Nation is behind the times, and it is our role to bring it up to date on the serious costs of neglect of day care resources and on the great promise if we decide to pay the price to meet a problem of this magnitude.

You are all no doubt familiar with the work that is now going forward in developing a plan of the model cities. Certainly, this planning should be future oriented. Yet, even present planning for children is not in keeping with the current employment of their mothers, as Mrs. Keyserling has so vividly depicted.

One city, for example, has submitted a plan where the target area for future action has been clearly identified. In that target area alone, there is an established need for places for 5,000 children in day care. And what does the plan call for? It calls for doubling the city's present day care facilities from places for 25 children to places for 50.

The provision of the poverty program that encourages the training of totally untrained workers either in high school courses or in vocational training has, of course, involved some mothers receiving aid to families with dependent children. As the program has developed, it has become obvious that day care for the children of these mothers and others receiving training is essential.

During the present fiscal year, over 42,000 women trainees need day care facilities while they are going through their training period. Each woman has an average of three children, at least one of whom needs day care facilities. At any given time, day care facilities are needed for 24,500 children. Even though the program has been able to find temporary day care facilities for most of the women, an estimated 2,700 women will have to drop out of training simply because they cannot find adequate day care services.

When these women complete training, at least half, and possibly two-thirds, will be going into regular jobs. This means that in addition to the existing facilities which the program has been using, there will be need for 20,000 to 28,000 day care spaces if these women are to put their children in adequate day care arrangements. A study by the Brandeis University has shown that the cost of providing day care runs from \$1,000 to \$1,500 per year per child, depending on the quality of the care. Simple arithmetic therefore indicates that it will cost about \$28 million to provide day care for these needy children whose mothers are trying to get off public assistance.

We know that there are 770,000 children under 6 in families where the total yearly income is under \$6,000. We know that these children, too, need day care.

Children in another large age group have been the losers because their mothers work, for little account has been taken in considering the period from infancy to 3 years. For too long, we and the child care specialists held the view that mothers of children under 3 should not work; that if they did work, it was a deprivation to the child because of the separation of mother and child at a critical life stage. The Children's Bureau must share part of the blame for the failure to look at reality in today's day care picture, when thousands of infants and young children are being placed in haphazard situations because their mothers *are* working.

The view has been proved to be based on inconclusive scientific groupings and opinions; not facts. Two years ago, at the National Conference on Day Care Services, I reported the reversal of that philosophy. More exact experience and research by leading psychiatrists and child care experts has shown that it is the quality of the relationship between mother and child, surrogate mother and child, or even institution and child that is important. It is the deficit of mothering, in other words, that deprives a child in his early years.

And so we are moving forward to see how, if mothers are to be out of the home, their young children's needs can best be met. We are experimenting with group care, family and foster day care, block mothers—all innovations that will be described as you consider new approaches this afternoon.

Even if we had been realistic—and as a nation we have not been—about the needs of so-called normal children for adequate day care, our concern has not been matched by comparable effort in providing day care for children with special needs: children who are mentally retarded or emotionally disturbed, and children whose environment is so deprived that they will grow up intellectually malnourished unless there is community intervention.

We who care about day care have also spent a long time debating with each other about how we define day care. At the National Conference on Day Care Services 2 years ago, you were promised that this colloquy would end with a statement on day care, which would emerge from the thinking of the many representative groups.

That promise has been kept. With the help of many people now in this room, the Children's Bureau has issued a pamphlet that defines what good day care is and sets forth the premise, which we all hold true, that in whatever setting it is offered, good day care must enrich children's daily lives, helping each to realize his own potential.

Let us look at other developments that represent progress in terms of where we were when the 1962 Public Welfare Amendments were passed.

In 1963, just after the amendments became law, the total amount of funds spent for direct care of children from Federal public child welfare sources was about \$200,000. In 1966, \$12,100,000 was spent for this purpose from Federal, State, and local public child welfare funds, with \$3 million of the total coming from Federal funds.

In this same period, the number of licensed day care facilities increased about 32 percent.

In the early sixties few States were organized to meet day care needs. Since then the States have had an opportunity to assess need, and now 52 States and jurisdictions have placed on record their intention to provide day care services in some measure for the children within their boundaries.

In 1962 there were only a handful of public child welfare employees with licensing responsibilities. Last year there were 671 full-time employees who devoted their attention to the development or provision of day care services, to licensing, to consultation, to community organization.

In 1962 there were licensed facilities for only 185,000 children in day care in the entire country. Now the number has grown to more than 300,000.

Even before the 1962 amendments, States were using Federal child welfare services funds to pay for institutes and workshops for day care operators and staff. This training has been a major factor in improving the quality of care, raising requirements for licensing, and establishing rapport and lines of communication between agencies. Today 43 States maintain some kind of training for day care personnel.

Progress has also been made in the past 3 years in offering in-service training for public welfare staff. Thirty-four States report that they offer workshops, institutes, and consultation to their own staff. In addition, because manpower shortage among professional staff is now and will continue to be severe, job responsibilities are being reassessed so that child care aides and assistants or other child care workers can be used to supplement the professional staff.

A sizable number of community colleges, junior colleges, and vocational schools offer 1- or 2-year courses in child care. High school home economics courses all over the country are offering classes in child development to girls who may become aides in working with children in day care and other settings. We affect the lives of children by encouraging these background preparations. For example, in Oklahoma last year a series of four workshops were begun to explore areas of child care with both day care center workers and family day care mothers. Ongoing training sessions for day care personnel are being projected into the future.

In addition to these specific developments in day care, there have been other developments at the national level that are closely related and have a bearing on future program directions.

The passage of the Economic Opportunity Act in 1964 was a major development. Project Headstart, as an arm of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), has given specific attention to programs for children.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 recognized the importance of preschool services to young children.

The Housing and Urban Development Act, which was also passed in 1965, registered concern about lack of physical facilities for neighborhood services, including programs for children.

This is where we stand now. We are prepared for action, but the action that faces us today is of a magnitude which we really haven't faced as a nation.

How do we go about playing fair with the hundreds of thousands of today's children who need day care?

There are any number of avenues.

Senator Ribicoff chose one method when he introduced a bill in Congress to provide day care for the boys and girls under 6, whose families earn under \$6,000 a year. Senator Ribicoff has reminded us, if we need a reminder, that:

"The question that faces us is not whether mother's place is in the home. The question that faces us is not and was never intended to be whether day care should substitute for parental care. The question that faces us is whether we should tend to the day-to-day care of our children—or face the consequences of inaction."

I understand that Senator Javits and some of his colleagues are also proposing to introduce legislation in this Congress to provide day care for children in needy families.

Action can be taken at the State level. A number of States have been making very rapid forward strides in the field of day care. For the year ending March 31, 1966, the State of New York, for example, appropriated \$500,000 for day care services. The following year, the appropriation was \$4 million. New York now has an open end appropriation for day care services. Just recently the persuasive voice of Welfare Commissioner Mitchell Ginsberg brought an allotment of \$5 million for New York City alone from the City Council. As all of us here know, Mrs. Randolph Guggenheimer and the National Committee for the Day Care of Children have long made it clear that New York City had waiting lists of 6,000 children for available day care facilities.

In Georgia in 1962, when no formal program of day care services existed, a group of community leaders in Atlanta developed a document describing desirable standards. Within 6 months a law was passed, standards developed, a day care consultant employed, a committee established, and a start made on licensing facilities. Today, a day care licensing consultant is located in every region in the State. More than 450 day care centers are licensed, including year-round Head-start programs. Independent family day care homes are also being licensed, and the State is offering family day care under its own auspices.

One of the cherished ideas jointly held by the Women's Bureau and the Children's Bureau is that the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women might choose to designate a State that would give us all a pilot demonstration of ways to saturate the State with day care services, using the strength of the Committee, State advisory committees on day care, State committees on children and youth, and local day care affiliates.

Certainly, demonstration projects can help us move in the direction of our goal. Just to take a single example, the Children's Bureau funded a demonstration day care project in Buckhorn, Kentucky, that provided intellectual stimulation to both children and their parents, as well as practical learning experiences and careful attention to good health habits. The values demonstrated by this project have been incorporated as an integral part of the Rural Child Care Project in Kentucky, financed by OEO funds. The Buckhorn project identified bright children, who since have been selected for training and leadership in special classes.

You will be hearing later today of another approach to the day care problem. The Children's Bureau is helping to support a project, which represents a partnership with industry, unions, and local voluntary and public agencies in Massachusetts, to meet the needs of working mothers in one industrial setting.

Some church groups have been active in the day care picture, particularly in relation to children in migrant families. Their experience could be helpful in broadening their own efforts and in influencing public opinion on the need for day care.

President Johnson has indicated his interest in the enrichment of family life by calling for the establishment of centers for children and parents. While the basic responsibility for the administration of the centers would be lodged with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the President has asked for the cooperation of the Labor Department, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Bureau of the Budget, and the appropriate units of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, including the Children's Bureau and the Office of Education.

A member of the Children's Bureau staff is serving as the co-ordinator of HEW efforts in the center's plans. Even as operational details are being worked out, other Children's Bureau staff members are developing guidelines for these centers and designing research that will measure the impact of the program when it gets under way.

Since these centers will be particularly concerned with children under 3 and their parents, and since the approach is family oriented, we will be watching the development of this program with great interest.

We know that the gap between available day care and the goals of day care cannot be filled by a single kind of service. The present void is as deep as a chasm, and it will take many kinds of services to fill it.

The important thing is that we begin. This conference today will give you an opportunity to express yourselves on ways to make the most auspicious, the most promising beginning at a time when action is crucial.

I know that we are in common cause about the need for day care. I believe that our concerted effort can bring about that necessary climate in which our numbers will be multiplied into the millions. For I am still convinced that the march of arms is not as strong as "an idea whose time has come." The time for day care is now.

LEGISLATION FOR DAY CARE

(By Joseph H. Reid, Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America)

Although this is not perhaps the most propitious year to discuss pending and proposed day-care legislation in the Federal Congress, few years are really considered so, except in hindsight.

There are four bills before Congress that have direct and specific bearing on day care. In addition, there are many other pending measures, as there have been in the past, which, though not directed specifically to this area, will, if passed, prove to be significant in terms of other sources of funding for a variety of day-care needs such as staff training or building construction.

As you are aware from the discussions this morning, sections of previously passed legislation—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, various acts affecting the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and particularly the legislation that established programs under the Office of Economic Opportunity—contain funding provisions for various parts of day care programs. I won't mention those sleeper bills that are before the Congress, primarily because I don't know about them, but I do want to discuss briefly four pieces of legislation that I think are important to this particular group.

First, there is the administration's social security bill, H.R. 5710, introduced by Representatives Mills, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. The aspect of the bill most important to this audience is a proposal that the Federal Government provide 75 percent matching funds for personnel expenditures under the provisions of the Social Security Act, generally referred to as child welfare services. This includes day care personnel.

The proposal itself is a small step but is significant in the sense that for the first time in this field, as in practically every other area affecting human beings, the Federal Government would agree to match the expenditures of the States for child welfare services. It is important in considering this type of legislation to realize that the Federal Government does share in the funding of State and county programs for the aged, the blind, the deaf, and for practically every major category of human need or disablement. In child welfare there is no such Federal matching of expenditures. It is an illusion to think that we are a child-centered country.

But this bill, which is an administration bill and therefore has a better than average chance of passage, I think, would be a giant step forward in that the Federal Government, for the first time, would agree to match expenditures in this area. Since personnel is a major segment of the cost of operating day care centers, the potential of this legislation is extremely significant, although the initial amount of funds provided is not very large, relative to the need.

An even more significant piece of legislation, originally introduced in the last Congress, is a bill now known as the Burke bill, H.R. 1977. Presently before the Ways and Means Committee, this bill would go much further than the administration bill in that it would provide matching, of all present expenditures for personnel on a 75 percent basis. In other words, as long as a State maintained its level of expenditures, the Federal Government would provide 75 percent of all the funds now spent on personnel and would provide, on a variable matching basis, between 50 and 83 percent of the other expenditures for child welfare services.

As we know, few day care centers operate under public welfare auspices in the United States. This legislation would free a tremendous amount of funds, relatively speaking, that could be used to establish new programs. This would be a highly important source of funding because it is "open end legislation" wherein the Federal Government would match whatever the States and counties chose to spend.

I would be remiss if I did not say that I think the open end provisions have but slight chance of passage in this session, primarily, or possibly, because of problems experienced under title XIX, the medical provision of the Social Security Act.

This bill, particularly its underlying philosophy, has very important implications. It would provide the kind of funding that would enable local people to push for the provision of day care centers on an equal basis with others seeking State funds for adult programs.

As it is now, when a State commissioner of public welfare goes to his legislature and asks for personnel to set up a center for the aged or a specialized program for

the deaf, the blind, the economically disadvantaged, or for AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children) families, he is asked inevitably by his legislature, "How much Federal funds will we get for every dollar of State funds we appropriate?" He is able to say that for each State dollar spent for personnel, the Federal Government will contribute three Federal dollars. If he is asked the same question about other types of expenditures—nonpersonnel expenditures—he can say that the State will get at least 50 percent Federal matching funds, and in the poorest States, up to 83 percent matching funds.

But if he is proposing day care programs and is asked what Federal funds will be available, he has to answer zero. The probability of State legislatures appropriating funds in this area under such a handicap is very poor. It is highly significant that programs for children are the only ones in which there is no provision for this type of matching.

The principles underlying the Burke bill were enunciated and recommended to the Congress in 1959 by the Advisory Council on Child Welfare, which was made up of representatives of all the major religious groups and various private groups.

These recommendations have been made by several advisory councils to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in subsequent years—in 1962 and 1966. About 20 Congressmen have introduced bills comparable to the Burke bill. Also, there is a fair measure of support around the country for this legislation. In fact, many Congressmen have told me that there is more support for this legislation than for any other aspect of pending social security legislation.

Its chance of passage depends a great deal, I believe, on the representations made by groups such as yours to the Congress, because there is considerable philosophical opposition to such legislation. This is an important consideration, and I will discuss it more fully later.

Another bill, S. 587, has been introduced by Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut. It would provide \$500 million annually for day care facilities for children under 6 from families whose annual income does not exceed \$6,000. The amount of money to be given to States would be based on a ratio of the number of their children under 6 to the general population in the country. The bill would provide for 90 percent Federal matching funds to 10 percent in State funds.

A fourth bill, H.R. 9720, introduced by Representative Mink of Hawaii, would provide \$300 million for supplementary educational services and educational equipment for day care centers.

The latter two bills are useful in that they draw attention to some of the needs of day care services. I think, however, that their chances of passage are slight. When we want to support and discuss legislation, we need to determine which bills advance our cause and also stand a fair chance of passage.

For example, providing \$300 million for educational supplies when only about that amount is now spent nationwide for day care as a whole might be somewhat questionable.

These are the four bills now before Congress that specifically apply to day care. I think we must examine carefully, however, some of the proposals being made within committees of Congress and reactions to these legislative proposals. The apparent interest in day care in this session may be negatively based, particularly with respect to mothers in the AFDC program. In other words, there are proposals under rather serious consideration that \$25 million or \$50 million or other sums be set aside for day care to force mothers now receiving public welfare to go to work. Those who adhere to this view are frequently the same people basically opposed to day care as such.

Many of them advocate measures that would "ghettoize" day care centers for children from welfare families. They seem to be more interested in punishing the mothers than in meeting the needs of the children. Their interest is not in examining the conditions in our country as a whole and the place of working women in our economy. They are all too frequently the prisoners of their illusions. This is true, I am afraid, of the majority of the population of the United States. They are prisoners of illusions that ignore the reality of the working woman in our country.

The organization for which I work has found in a recent study that the average opinionmaker in our communities, including the educator and social worker, does not believe women should work. If women do work, many feel that they are working for frivolous reasons and therefore can take care of their own children.

This attitude is prevalent, and unless it is changed I do not think that the chances for meaningful legislation in this area are very good. I recall that one of the men interviewed in this particular study was the owner of a large electronics plant that employed over 1,000 women. While he said that women were absolutely essential

in his industry because of their manual dexterity, he believed women shouldn't work. If they did work, he felt it was to buy luxuries, not necessities. He saw no reason why private or public funds should be provided for the day care of children of the thousand women he employed. This attitude is shared by many professionals, such as social workers and psychiatrists. Because of their conviction that children are, in general, better off under the care of their mothers, they tend to a negative view of working mothers.

Some groups, alarmed by the increasing number of working women (one third of whom are mothers), fear that the provision of more day care facilities will further accelerate the rise in the number of working mothers. In other words, there are major segments of our society, religious and professional, that have succeeded in blinding themselves to the reality of the 6 million children with whom we are concerned. It may well be that this point of view is held by the majority.

I think that a useful strategy for obtaining increased day care services has to take as its primary target this public misapprehension as to the economic and social facts of the communities in which we live.

Again, we must say reluctantly that some of the legislative interest in day care is directed primarily toward making certain that adults live up to their responsibilities and not toward concern for the children.

Also, from the standpoint of the strategy of a conference like this, it is important to remember, when considering the eventual outcome of these pending bills, that there are several professional disciplines deeply concerned with the provision of day care. Each approaches Congressmen in a different way. This is probably why one of these bills calls for the administration of the hoped-for facilities under education and another under welfare. I am sure in another year we could find them under health or somewhere else.

For example, I happen to think one of the greatest opportunities for the promotion of day care in this country lies in the Headstart program, which has promoted quite a number of full-time day care centers. Yet to me we are losing a tremendous opportunity as long as we have the Headstart program, nursery schools, kindergartens, or whatever the rubric under which we care for children, but do not combine them to meet the many needs of children for education, stimulation, and development, as well as the needs of those children who require longer out-of-home care for health or educational reasons. As long as we promote bills that will provide \$1, \$2, \$3, or \$5 million for a limited purpose and fail to look at the whole, we are losing the battle. This is particularly true for the children of low-income families. We cannot afford to ignore the realities. Children of low-income families have a high percentage of working mothers. They cannot avail themselves of the educational advantages in limited-purpose centers unless the centers are operated so they can "double in brass" as day care centers. Here is an instance where I think we are losing a very significant opportunity to get sound legislation.

It seems to me that as we approach Congress or our State legislatures, whether our interest happens to be primarily in general welfare, child welfare, or education and whether we approach day care from a social or a social work standpoint, we must combine our interests. This must not be in terms of seeing how one discipline fits with the other or how we can divide up the money so that we each get a hunk of the administration, but rather we must look at the reality—the social cognitive needs and the educational needs of children as a whole. We must examine the kind of family they come from and the social conditions that surround them; or we will continue to take less than full advantage of the many possibilities within the Federal Government for funding day care programs.

I am not suggesting we put all our eggs in one basket under the rubric of education, because I do not know as yet what is most salable to Congress at the moment—the need to protect children of working mothers, the need to provide educational stimulation for children who come from culturally impoverished homes, or the need to provide early educational experiences to prepare children for school. I don't know which particular slogan, tag, or need will appeal most to Congressmen, so I am very much against putting all of our eggs in one basket.

The multiple approach is fine in getting funds, providing those who help draft the bills and help educate the Congress are themselves cognizant of the total picture and use one avenue rather than another because they recognize that one thing is more acceptable than another at the moment to our legislators.

But if the people who promote the legislation and educate the American public see only one side of the coin, then we lose a tremendous opportunity to have much important legislation before the Congress and our State legislatures. We have an

opportunity to produce a real change in this extremely strange phenomenon, perhaps the strangest that exists in our country—people blinding themselves completely to a genuine revolution that has taken place in the United States in a relatively short period; namely, the already great and increasing number of working mothers and therefore the needs of their children.

NURSERY—KINDERGARTEN ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN UNDER SIX, OCTOBER 1966

(By Samuel Schloss, National Center for Educational Statistics)

For the third consecutive year, the Office of Education arranged with the Bureau of the Census to collect in the October 1966 *Current Population Survey* (a sample of 35,000 households) data on the enrollment of young children in nursery schools and kindergartens. The results of the special preschools survey are summarized in this report. The enrollment data have been tabulated by such characteristics as age, color, sex, residence (region and metropolitan-nonmetropolitan), family income, occupation of household head, and type of school attended (public or private).

SCOPE OF REPORT

This report deals only with the 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds in the total population and the number enrolled in public and private nursery schools and kindergartens. Therefore, the enrollment data on 5-year-olds do not include 505,000 children in elementary schools (above the kindergarten level), and the kindergarten enrollment does not include 127,000 6-year-olds.

Summary

The approximately 12.5 million children in the 3 to 5 age group has remained relatively stable from 1964 to 1966. However, the number and percent of the total enrolled in nursery schools and kindergartens increased slowly but steadily from 3,187,000 or 25.5 percent in October 1964 to 3,407,000 or 27.1 percent in October 1965 and 3,674,000 or 29.4 percent in October 1966.

For each age, the number and percent of children enrolled in nursery schools and kindergartens in October 1966 were as follows: age 3—248,000 or 6.1 percent; age 4—785,000 or 18.9 percent; and age 5—2,641,000 or 62.2 percent. In the previous year, the proportion of each age enrolled in school was 4.9 percent for age 3, 16.1 percent for age 4, and 60.6 percent for age 5.

ANALYSIS OF OCTOBER 1966 DATA BY AGE

Type of school attended

3 years—Of the 248,000 3-year-olds in school, 93.5 percent were enrolled in nursery schools (predominantly private) and 6.5 percent in kindergartens (mostly public).

4 years—The 785,000 4-year-olds in school were about evenly divided between nursery schools (generally private) and kindergartens (generally public).

5 years—Of the 2,641,000 5-year-olds in preschool classes, 97.8 percent were in kindergartens (predominantly public) and 2.2 percent in nursery schools. An additional 505,000 5-year-olds were enrolled in regular elementary school classes above the kindergarten level (413,000 in public schools and 92,000 in private schools).

Family income

3 years—In October 1965 the percentage of 3-year-olds enrolled in school was lowest in low-income families and got progressively higher as the family income improved (from 2 percent in families with an income of less than \$3,000 to 8.2 percent in families with an income of \$7,500 and over). However, the October 1966 survey revealed a marked improvement in the enrollment status of the poorest children. The percentage of 3-year-olds in families with an income of less than \$3,000 in school rose to 5.4—exceeding the next two higher income categories—but still below the 8.8 percent for children in families with the highest income (\$7,500 and over).

4 years—As with the 3-year-olds, school enrollment of the lowest income group rose most sharply from 1965 to 1966 (from 9.2 to 13.2 percent). However, the percentage enrolled in 1966 was still lower than for the two highest income categories—15.1 percent for children in families with an income of \$5,000–\$7,499 and 29.1 percent for the \$7,500 and over income group.

5 years—Even at the 5-year-old level, school attendance generally rises with higher income—from 40.1 percent in the under \$3,000 family income category to 72.2 percent for children in families with an income of \$7,500 or more. Metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence (The population residing in standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) constitutes the metropolitan population.)

3 years—The proportion of 3-year-olds enrolled in school in October 1966 ranged from 9.1 percent in central cities of standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's), to 6.6 percent in SMSA's outside central cities (suburban), to 3.1 percent outside SMSA's (rural). The growth rate in enrollment was also higher in the central cities than in the other areas.

4 years—SMSA central cities showed the most rapid growth, with 25.2 percent of the 3-year-olds in school in October 1966 as compared with 21.9 percent in the suburban areas and 11.2 percent in nonmetropolitan areas.

5 years—About 70 percent of the 5-year-olds in metropolitan areas and 49.1 percent in nonmetropolitan areas attended nursery schools and kindergartens in October 1966. While about the same proportion of nonwhite children attended the central city schools as white children there was a marked racial variation both in SMSA's outside central cities (71.1 percent white vs. 51.3 percent nonwhite) and in non-SMSA's (52.8 percent white vs. 24.9 percent nonwhite).

Region

3 years—The proportion of 3-year-old children enrolled in school was highest in the West (9.1 percent) and lowest in the North Central region (3.3 percent). In the North Central region and in the South about the same proportion of nonwhite as white children were in school.

4 years—As with the 3-year-olds, school enrollment of the 4-year-olds was highest in the Northeast and West (almost one-fourth of the children were in school) and lowest in the North Central region and the South, with 16.3 and 15.2 percent enrolled, respectively. Only in the West did white children attend more than nonwhite.

5 years—Only 34.9 percent of the 5-year-olds in the South were enrolled in kindergartens or nursery schools as contrasted with 70 to 80 percent in the other three regions of the country.

Occupation of family head

3 years—In households where the family head was a white collar worker the proportion of 3-year-olds in school was 9.9 percent as contrasted with no measurable enrollment for children in farm families, 4 percent in manual or service occupations, and 4.6 percent in families where the head of the household was unemployed or not in the labor force.

4 years—White collar families had 29.4 percent of their 4-year-olds in school as compared with 14.4 percent in families where the head of the household was engaged in manual or service occupations and 13.7 percent in families where the head was unemployed or not in the labor force. Farm families had only 1 percent of the 4-year-olds in school.

5 years—As with the lower ages, the highest proportion of 5-year-olds occurred in white collar families (70.9 percent) and the lowest in farm families (41.9 percent). Whereas at the 3- and 4-year-old levels a higher proportion of nonwhite than white children were in school, the attendance pattern was reversed for 5-year-olds.

DEFINITIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Population coverage.—The data presented in this report relate to the civilian noninstitutional population in the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Age.—The age classification is based on the age of the person at his last birthday.

Color.—The term "color" refers to the division of the population into two groups, white and nonwhite. The nonwhite group includes Negroes, American Indians, Japanese, Chinese, and other nonwhite races.

Public or private school.—In this report, a public school is defined as any educational institution operated by publicly elected or appointed school officials and supported by public funds. Private schools include educational institutions established and operated by religious bodies, as well as those which are under other private control.

Metropolitan-nonmetropolitan residence.—The population residing in standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA's) constitutes the metropolitan population. Except in New England, an SMSA is a county or group of contiguous counties which contain at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more, or "twin cities" with a combined population of at least 50,000. In addition to the county or counties

containing such a city or cities, contiguous counties are included in an SMSA if, according to certain criteria, they are essentially metropolitan in character and are socially and economically integrated with the central city. In New England, SMSA's consist of towns and cities, rather than counties. The metropolitan population in this report is based on SMSA's as defined in the 1960 Census and does not include any subsequent additions or changes.

Rounding of estimates.—Individual figures are rounded to the nearest thousand without being adjusted to group totals, which are independently rounded. Percentages are based on the rounded absolute numbers.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF THE ESTIMATES

(The estimating procedure used in this survey involved the inflation of the weighted sample results to independent estimates of the civilian noninstitutional population of the United States by age, color, and sex.)

Source of data.—The estimates are based on data obtained in the October 1966 *Current Population Survey* of the Bureau of the Census. The sample covers 35,000 households and is spread over 357 areas comprising 701 counties and independent cities with coverage in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Reliability of the estimates.—Since the figures presented in this report are based on sample data, they may differ from the figures that would have been obtained from a complete census. The sampling variation may be relatively large where the numbers shown are small.

[The New York Times magazine section dated Jan. 7, 1968]

SOMEONE TO MIND THE BABY

(By Maya Pines)

"I know a lot of people say that mothers shouldn't work," Vice President Humphrey stated recently. "But I have been brought up to believe that what is, is." He called the lack of adequate day care facilities for young children one of the greatest problems of tomorrow's America.

The trend is clear: more and more women are going to work. One out of every four mothers of children under the age of 6 is in the labor force; the number of such mothers has doubled since 1950. More than 4 million preschoolers have mothers who work, including 1,600,000 children under the age of 3.

Yet the nation has resolutely ignored the problem. American women remain almost totally deprived of opportunities to make satisfactory arrangements for the care of their children while they are working. As a result, millions of youngsters are being damaged emotionally, intellectually and sometimes physically during their most formative years.

Behind the paucity of services for young children lies the fear that providing good day care facilities might encourage even more women to go to work—a fear entertained by male workers who wish to avoid competition and by moralists of both sexes who believe woman's place is in the home.

There are a few signs that this atmosphere may be changing. In Cambridge, Mass., for example, a manufacturer of hi-fi equipment has just set up a demonstration day care center for the children of its employees in cooperation with the U.S. Children's Bureau and the employees themselves.

The KLH Child Development Center, Inc., will be owned and operated by the children's parents. When it opens on Feb. 1 it will run from 7 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. to coincide with the parents' work day. It will take children between the ages of 2 and 6. Mothers will be free to come eat with their children during their own lunch hours. The center plans to offer all the educational advantages of a good nursery school, at a price the parents can pay, since the company will provide about 15 percent of the cost the Children's Bureau two thirds. It is meant as a replicable project—one that could be copied in many different kinds of industries.

"This is the beginning, we hope, of a trend," declares Mrs. Richard Lansburgh, president of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children. "A tremendous acceleration will take place in the coming years. We'll need money for training, for personnel, so that these programs are constructive for children—not just baby-sitting!"

While management started the KLH center, in Baltimore a union is taking the lead. Not surprisingly, it is a union largely dominated by women—the Amalga-

mated Clothing Workers' Union, makers of men's clothing, which plans to open centers for some 2,000 children in 15 areas of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware and North Carolina.

"We're the originators of this plan, because we operate in small towns where the membership is 100 per cent female," explains Samuel Nocella, vice-president of the ACWU and manager of its Baltimore region. "We've experienced some acute problems—absenteeism on the part of women, and nervous breakdowns, which are very frequent among them. And we've found that at the bottom of it there is always a child. The mother becomes anxious, worried about her child, she calls home or stays away from work, and unless she has parents or somebody close to her to take care of her child, the child may really be in bad condition. So why not do what people have been doing for a long time in Europe, for example in Sweden, and provide child-care centers?"

The Amalgamated is now supporting a bill in Congress to include child care among the benefits that can be negotiated for in union agreements, and day-care centers may become a standard item in collective bargaining next year.

In the long run, however, this is a problem that can only be met by the government on a nationwide scale, declares Jacob Potofsky, president of the ACWU. "This step, creating day-care centers for working mothers, is the first taken by any union—and it is long overdue," he says. Just as his union pioneered in unemployment insurance in the twenties, and saw it included in the first Social Security Act 12 years later, "today we have the same hope that government will assume the responsibility throughout the land of creating proper facilities for the young children of working mothers, for they are the future of our country."

The government's role in day care was prominent only during World War II when it became not merely acceptable, but positively patriotic for mothers to work. Suddenly enough nurseries and day-care centers blossomed, with government aid, to care for about 1,600,000 children. But nearly all these centers were closed at the end of the war. Today, when the number of working women exceeds the World War II total by 6 million, licensed public and voluntary day-care centers have shrunk to one-sixth their wartime capacity. They have also changed their orientation. Instead of opening their doors to all, they tend to concentrate on families with serious emotional or social problems. Their waiting lists are staggering.

State and Federal authorities will soon be forced to enter the day-care field on a large scale for the first time since World War II. A new amendment to the Social Security Act will compel thousands of mothers on welfare to enter work training or take jobs, and some facilities will have to be set up for their children while they work. However, since its goal is not to provide services to children but to cut welfare costs, the new law may lead to cheap custodial arrangements in many states. The law makes no provision for the children's education. As the National Committee for the Day Care of Children puts it, "Our country will then be in the anomalous position of giving some children a headstart, while giving others a push backward."

Day care must be recognized as a public utility for all children, some experts believe. "The new law again puts the emphasis on the underprivileged, on the welfare population, on troubled families," worries Professor Florence Ruderman, a Brooklyn College sociologist who recently completed a large-scale survey of day care for the Child Welfare League of America.

"Day care is needed on all levels of society—by the most normal families and by the middle class, as well as by others," she declares. "It should be available to the entire society, just like our public schools, parks, playgrounds and libraries."

According to Mrs. Lansburgh of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, there is still tremendous resistance to the idea of day care. "Did Planned Parenthood have a more difficult selling job? We think not," she says. "Their resistances are verbalized and conscious; ours are not. Day care is threatening to many people—it says mother isn't in the home and there's nobody to make life nice and secure. Therefore, forget it, ignore it, pretend there's no need for it. Also, few people know the massive size of the problem or the serious consequences of neglect."

"I don't believe that all women should go to work," she adds. "But I do feel that in 1968 women should have the choice, the freedom to choose whether they wish to use their intelligence, ability, training and education without penalizing their families." She points out that in Maryland alone, 400 nurses would be working today if they could find day-care services that they would trust for their children. Meanwhile hospital patients suffer from the critical shortage of nurses.

Just as professional women who want to work should not be made to stay home, women who are on welfare should not be made to go to work, Mrs. Lansburgh declares. "There should be a free choice for both," she says. "This choice does not exist in this country today."

Altogether the nation's public and private licensed day-care facilities—many of them beyond the means of poor people—can accommodate only 450,000 children. Mothers, thus, are forced into all kinds of informal or "black market" arrangements.

Millions of "latchkey" children, for instance, find nobody at home when they get home from school in the afternoon. Carrying their house keys around their neck or in their pockets, they wander about or play without supervision, until their parents come back from work. Sometimes a neighbor or an aunt is supposed to look in on them.

Few families can afford to hire a private nursemaid. In New York City, the going rate for a competent nanny is anywhere from \$60 to \$90 a week, if she can be found. Even middle-class parents often leave their children with untrained and irresponsible household help who may do the child great harm.

An estimated 38,000 children under the age of 6 are left without any care at all while their mothers work, according to Katherine Oettinger, former chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau; many of them are just locked up in their own homes. Twice as many preschoolers are looked after by a brother or sister not much older than they are.

Children under 3 are generally not admitted into the licensed day-care centers because they are considered too young. For many working mothers, the only alternative that remains is "family day care." In theory this does not sound too bad: The mother leaves her child with a woman who takes in several other children at the same time, for a small fee.

But a recent study in New York City showed what family day care is really like. Though the city has an established licensing procedure for family day-care homes, only 25 such homes have been licensed in the entire city. By contrast, 25,000 children—more than half of them under the age of 6—are parked in a variety of unlicensed homes.

One of the interviewers for the Medical and Health Research Association of N.Y.C., which did this study, still has nightmares about some of the places she visited. Many of the day-care "mothers" were physically ill, she reports—and their illness was the very reason for their doing this kind of work. Several were drunkards.

She recalls a harassed 20-year-old girl who had previously worked as a salesgirl but had lost her job because of a severe anemia which left her always tired. The girl lived in a crowded home with many relatives, including three small children, and took in three other children for day care. She hated what she was doing. She had lost control over the six children to the extent that she did not even bother to find out what part of the house they were in. One youngster, aged 4, did nothing but cry all day long, sitting alone on the top step of the porch. The girl said he was "spoiled."

In most of the family day-care homes the children's routine was breakfast, TV, lunch, nap, and TV. One third of the homes had no play materials of any kind. In 25 per cent of the homes the children were never taken out-of-doors. As many as 84 per cent of the homes were rated inadequate because they violated the Health Code, or because the children were severely neglected.

Throughout their study, the interviewers were assailed by desperate women who begged them to help find good day-care services for their children. They would try any trick to attract the interviewers' attention, hoping it might somehow lead them to space in a day-care center. The study's associate director, Milton Willner, a social worker with long experience in day care, concluded that two kind of programs were urgently needed: a training program for women who would run licensed family day care for up to five children in their homes, bolstered by periodic inspections to make sure they provided enough play materials, nap facilities and fresh air; and many, many more day-care centers, including some for children under the age of 3.

The years from birth to 6 offer a unique opportunity to break the cycle of failure that awaits America's poor children. The first four years of life are the most important time of all—the crucial years that determine a child's later personality and intelligence, according to modern psychologists. During these years, a child's environment plays a decisive role.

Now that private companies, unions and the Government are becoming more aware of the urgent need for day care, they have a chance to set a new pattern for

such services. Until now, education has never been day-care's forte. "If there are qualified teachers, it's a nursery school; if it's custodial, it's day-care," has all too often been the working definition of the difference between the two. Unless the new day-care centers offer a truly effective educational program, they will waste their opportunity to make a major improvement in the lives of millions of children.

**STATEMENT OF JAMES L. HYMES, JR., PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION,
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND**

Mrs. MINK. I would like to call Dr. James L. Hymes, Jr., of the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, College of Education, University of Maryland, College Park, Md. Dr. Hymes.

I will introduce my two colleagues for the benefit of those in this hearing. On my immediate right is Congressman James Scheuer of New York, and next to him is Congressman Augustus Hawkins of California.

Dr. Hymes, we welcome you to the committee.

Dr. HYMES. Thank you very much. I welcome this opportunity to testify in relation to the bill H.R. 10572, to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers.

I have questions about specific provisions in the bill, which I will present later. Initially, however, let me express the fullest support for the basic premise on which the bill is grounded, as expressed in section 2.

Beyond question, child day care centers ought to exemplify the very best practices in early childhood education. These centers serve America's most vulnerable young children. They serve them for the longest span of hours of any educational programs.

Ideally, if one were to visit a school group of young children in the middle of the morning one ought not to be able to tell—by looking at the skill of the teacher, by looking at the quality of the program, by looking at the richness and appropriateness of the equipment: Is this a topnotch nursery school? Is this a topnotch kindergarten? Is this a child day care center?

If one were to visit such a school group in the late afternoon hours, then one could make an educated guess: This is probably a day care center. But you would make your guess by looking at the clock, not by spotting differences in the quality of the teaching or of the program. You would know this was a child day care center because only day care centers serve young children and their families at so late an hour of the day.

Theoretically, day care should bring to its young children—early morning, midmorning, afternoon early or late—a richness and stimulation and sensitivity and understanding the equal of the best of any early childhood program.

This is the goal. The actual situation falls frighteningly short of this goal. America's most vulnerable young children tend to be in America's worst groups. And they are there all day long, hour after long hour.

The fact is: You can almost always—instantaneously, morning or afternoon—tell the difference between a nursery school or a kindergarten and the run of day care centers.

The child day care center is overwhelmingly apt to have underpaid and undertrained teachers. Because of this shortcoming, it is over-

whelmingly apt to have meager equipment, inappropriate equipment, and an inadequate educational program.

The day care center you visit will probably meet the two standards specified on line 19, section 7 of the bill: It will probably not be unsafe or unsanitary. These standards tend to be the only two uniformly enforced the country over. But the chances are very great—although there are some few exceptions—that the day care center will not provide the kind of challenging, satisfying, vigorous child living that is the hallmark of a sound program of early childhood education.

In any program of early childhood education, the teacher is the key to quality: her specialized training, her insight into young children, her understanding. Day care centers can seldom afford the topflight teachers who are essential for bringing to children "the values of early childhood educational programs."

Today's day care center is too apt to be a safe, clean parking lot, rather than what day care should and could be: a wonderful school for the young, sensitively geared to their needs, differing only from the best of other early childhood programs in that it operates 8 hours or more a day, rather than simply 2 or 3 hours.

There is a grave shortage of good child day care centers. We have not faced the fact that all good education is expensive. Especially the good education of the very young. And most especially, good education of the young carried on throughout all the long hours of the mother's working day.

There is, in fact, an absolute shortage of child day care centers—good, bad, or indifferent. As a nation we have shut our eyes to the fact that millions of mothers of young children must and do work.

The question we now face is: Will this bill help meet the need? Will it bring to the "millions of pre-school-age children whose parents work * * * the value(s) of early childhood educational programs?"

I fear not, despite the bill's keen assessment of the need.

I doubt very much that the need can be met by providing "supplementary education services."

I especially doubt that the need can be met by providing the particular kind of supplementary services specified in section 11, part 1. Some of the services and equipment specified there might, in fact, lead to a worsening of programs and would, I believe, lead to waste.

A sound early childhood program, one directed by a well-trained teacher, has only a bare minimal need—if, indeed, any need at all—for audiovisual material and equipment.

A sound early childhood program, one directed by a well-trained teacher, would not need a special teacher of art or of any other special subject matter area. Such an outside specialist might, in fact, distort a good program.

A sound early childhood program, one directed by a well-trained teacher, would never consider books as "supplementary" materials. The best of young children's literature is basic to a good program.

The specific inclusion in the bill of these particular items indicates to me some confusion as to the nature of a good early childhood program: what a well-trained teacher does, how she builds her program, what equipment and materials she needs and considers appropriate to the age.

If, for reasons I am not aware of, this bill must confine its efforts to providing supplementary services, I suggest that it would be wiser to concentrate on providing funds for those services which more truly supplement what a good teacher of young children can herself do: pediatric, nursing, and dental services, for example, to insure that each young child has maximum physical health; nutritional services, to insure the best possible food intake for young children; social work and parent education services to link the child's school and home experiences; psychological services (which are specified in the bill), so that each child's mental health is nurtured to the fullest; consultation services in early childhood education so that the teacher's skills deepen and mature on the job.

I believe that such a concept of supplementation—going beyond what a good teacher can do—will lead to less waste and to more direct, immediate benefit to young children and their families.

At the same time, such a concept of supplementation sharpens the awareness of the primary need—the need for a trained teacher, a specialist in early childhood education. It supplements her. It assumes there is such a qualified person on the job. I urge that the bill require that the standards to be developed by the States, under section 5, insure that there will be this central figure in each group—adequately paid, well trained, because without this central figure, there is nothing to supplement.

But I mention such specifics tentatively.

I would rather urge you to rethink the basic problem: Are “supplementary services” the answer?

In my opinion, the child day care field does not need “supplementation” so much as it needs basic general support. I urge you to look again at the overall problem: We need more day care centers—we need more good day care centers. Constructive legislation at this point in time should help move us in the direction of a sound overall structure, not patchwork.

Many elements in the present bill can be used for this purpose. Basic support for child day care will require Federal aid (as well as State and local tax support and probably, at this point in our development, some tuition contribution from parents, no matter how little, geared to their ability to pay).

The amount of \$300,000 authorized in section 3 is a good start. The formula for allocation to States in section 4 seems wise, although I suggest specifying in line 9 “the number of working mothers of children aged 3 to 5, inclusive.”

Basic support for child day care will require clearly designated leadership. The approach of identifying one responsible Federal official—line 1, page 8—seems wise to me. Such clear authority can mean the coordination of Federal programs affecting day care which are now scattered among many agencies. The committee may, however, wish to reconsider where this Federal responsibility should be placed, since day care uniquely involves three professions: education, health, and welfare.

Similarly, the identification of clear State responsibility for day care seems wise to me. The insistence in section 5 on a State commission for day care is highly desirable. Such a State agency or com-

mission should feel responsible for establishing the same high standards for day care—not sanitation and safety alone—which have been the guarantee of quality in public education.

I urge, however, that the composition of this State commission—lines 15, 16, 17, section 5—be reconsidered. It seems highly unlikely to me that a commission representative of the present operators of day care programs will set standards that will provide adequate protection. This is a time for raising standards, not settling as day care has always had to settle because of its poverty for “second best” or “whatever is possible.”

Day care is a huge field. It covers more than the present bill concerns itself with. There are pressing needs for the good day care of children under age 3. There are needs for the day care of young school-age children, especially 6-, 7-, and 8-year-olds. But a bill designed for the basic support of day care, even if limited to 3-, 4-, and 5-year-olds, would be a giant step forward. We have all the knowledge of how to provide a good program for these children. We are not putting this knowledge to work.

The day must come soon when every young child has the opportunity to go to a group of the highest quality for whatever length of day or week or year his needs or his family's needs require.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much, Dr. Hymes. Congressman Scheuer of New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. I was very much impressed by your testimony, Dr. Hymes. One question I have was stimulated by your thoughts that basically the teaching in the arts, music, and the like should not be remedial and should require expert teachers, which should be done by the teacher in charge, primarily in charge of the children.

In a child care center or a preschool child development program of any kind, you will have a number of teachers. Wouldn't there be some advantage to having at least some teachers who are especially trained in music and art, perhaps a teacher who could play the guitar or zither, who had some art education, for example, which is quite a sophisticated specialty in itself, a teacher who would circulate from classroom to classroom and specialize in the visual and performing arts, a teacher who had experience in involving the kids as participants rather than just observers; isn't that enough of a specialty to justify teachers who have special competence?

Dr. HYMES. Mr. Scheuer, I think in practice one would find occasionally special teachers of music. This is not unheard of. But the basic training of a good teacher, and this seems to me essential to a program, does include a very major concentration of time on both art and music, so that it would be the rare trained teacher of young children who did not feel, I will say, reasonably well qualified especially in art and probably also qualified in music. I think I would be right in saying there would be no program of teacher training at this early age level anywhere in the country that did not give a very solid block of time to making this a part of a teacher's basic skill. It was for that reason I fear—and I think I have seen it in operation—having someone else come in, not always proving helpful, but very frequently distorting the program, because the person is not really bringing something that the group teacher does not have.

I think it does come back to the question, What does a teacher have in her repertoire of ability? Not uncommonly, people who know they

are going to work with young children have these talents and they are strengthened and reinforced and deepened in their training.

Mr. SCHEUER. I would think there might be some teachers, certainly my experience as a student would testify to this, who are excellent teachers and who communicated beautifully but who might be tone deaf, who might have absolutely no sensitivity to music form, even to the art form. They have no sense of creativity, or very little, to give to the kids in specific areas of music or art, but still in terms of reading and language and accounting skills are a marvelous inspiration to the children. I am not sure all people have that renaissance quality of totality of interest and competence.

Dr. HYMES. This is in a sense the heart of the problem in any what is called self-contained classroom, where the teacher is expected to be the renaissance man who can do everything. I think that the weight of present experience might indicate a need of help for the teacher rather than help directly to the children. Because the teacher, even of young children, does have to be skilled in art and music and in science and in math and in almost every area.

This is what one would want in a good day care center, a really well-educated human who knew how to interpret special content to the age of the child. Obviously no one can be equally good in each of these areas, but I think most people have found that there is the greatest payoff when the teacher gets help in strengthening her background on the job rather than having someone come in from outside and work with the children.

Now, I could not honestly say that it always works out badly to have such a special teacher but I would have to say quite strongly there is the probability that special teachers do not work out as well as one would wish.

Mr. SCHEUER. Have you had any experience in the use of parent aides or community aides working under the supervision of the teacher programs, an individual out of the neighborhood who had particular sensitivity to music or art working with the kids, a Puerto Rican parent or neighborhood aide who might enjoy music or might play an instrument? Has your experience been that they can be given enough training so that under the supervision of a teacher professional they can function effectively?

Dr. HYMES. Yes; I would think I would have no question in saying yes to that. The basic concept of every group of young children is: there must be a teaching staff of more than one. In fact in almost any State where there is legislation the law would specify that there would have to be two people. The second teacher may range all the way from a student teacher in some settings to cooperative parents in others to paid aides and volunteers, and so forth.

There is a difference related in the two questions: The aide or parent, or whomever the second or third person might be, is someone within the group with the youngsters and is part of the daily program and knows the children and the use of her talent emerges out of the program as it moves along.

Mr. SCHEUER. Would you say the same thing might be true of an older child, perhaps a high school student?

Dr. HYMES. Yes; I think so. I think we may at this point be talking of something different.

Mr. SCHEUER. I mean an older child, high school student, who might work as an aide in a child day-school center who had a particular aptitude that he might bring.

Dr. HYMES. Yes, I think there is a place for utilizing all of the youngsters, even younger than high school students—sixth grade and on up—because their own behavior and their capacity to build relationships seems to make them unusually effective, I will say, as nonprofessional teachers; I mean by that not only what they say but how they act. The greatest use of such people being made, I think; as volunteers coming in, because basically these are people in school.

Mr. SCHEUER. Afternoon?

Dr. HYMES. Right, or even depending on the location of settings, during the schoolday, because in their role as student, there really is no more important part of their general education in my view than their having experiences to help them know about children.

There are occasional day-care centers, for example, located in high schools. Normally the connection would be with the home economics program, so students can be released to work during the hours of the schoolday.

Mr. SCHEUER. I have enjoyed your testimony very much.

Mrs. MINK. I am in complete agreement, Dr. Hymes, with your statement. I do think, however, that what you are presenting is an entirely different kind of a bill which would have really been my preference if it were possible, because I can't agree with you more enthusiastically that the basic need for child care is that we need more of it, that we need to build new facilities and to actually provide those basic services which you have outlined so well in your statement, and that we need to start from the ground up providing for health nutritional services and all of the other aspects of a well-run center, including the teacher.

However, in examining the budgetary situation, and the limitations under which we must present our legislation, it seemed to me that to get something passed we had to take what seemed possible at least as a first step.

So the bill is constructed around the concept of utilizing the centers that are now in existence and attempting to provide those supplemental services which are necessary in order to upgrade the kind of services that these centers are providing.

Now, given that definition of our limitation and what we are working with, I would be interested in your comments as to whether we do have teachers in our centers whom we can supplement as you describe in your statement or is the basic issue that of providing the teacher per se. As you well stated in your comments, most of our day-care centers are now nothing more than parking lots which I thought was a very well put statement.

Dr. HYMES. Let me say: I feel that was a harsh statement. I hope that you always know I said there are some exceptions.

Mrs. Mink, I puzzled at great length about what to say because I assumed, without knowing the background, that there almost surely were reasons why you had chosen to approach the problem through supplementary services. Without being as knowledgeable as all of you are, it was very hard for me to know how to make the most helpful contribution.

I can tell you some of the things that crossed my mind if that would be of help. You will notice I did conclude my suggestions on supplementary services by saying: I offer this part very tentatively.

I couldn't be sure. I think it would be fair to say that in general in the day care centers supported through the Office of Economic Opportunity there has been a very earnest effort, successful at times and unsuccessful at other times, to secure well-trained teachers and to have an adequate salary and to build in a training program.

In many of the private nonprofit programs—the problem is finances. Many a private program with the highest aspirations is unable to get the public charitable aid and other help to enable it to hire the staff that it knows it should have and would love to have. It occurred to me that a possibility for supplementary services might be to supplement salaries. I don't know if this is possible. I kept searching my own mind for some form of supplementation that would not be fragmentary and that would not run the risk of waste.

I suspect of all of the points specified, I perhaps was most troubled by the notion of audiovisual aids, because I have seen how easily they can be sold and how attractive they can seem to be.

I do, as I was indicating to Mr. Scheuer, have real fear about supplementary art teachers, because I think most teachers do this job rather well, but I couldn't honestly argue strongly against a special music teacher if she knew the children and were an intimate part of the program.

I kept searching for how one could best supplement, recognizing that probably supplementation is not the original need. I had one other notion growing out of my strong statement of the need for paid teachers, trained teachers. There is a great shortage of training opportunities. I think a bill could make a major contribution either by giving aid to individuals who then would seek training or aid to institutions. I don't know the best way of doing it. I think there probably are supplementary services that could strengthen the field but I was not able to think of any that I could with confidence say, "This is the answer."

Mrs. MINK. Would it be your recommendation, Dr. Hymes, that the bill specifically exclude from the definition of educational services the purchase of equipment?

Dr. HYMES. Mrs. Mink, I honestly don't know what to say, because of the dilemma. The best guarantee, although not an infallible one, of the wise purchasing of equipment is a well-trained teacher. Many groups do need equipment; there is no question about it.

Mrs. MINK. Do you think the controls within the bill calling for a commission to be established to review the plans and to decide what kinds of programs will be funded would be adequate control so we don't have the kind of waste which you describe as helter-skelter purchase of equipment which would not be a reasonable supplement to a preschool center?

Dr. HYMES. Well, I do think that some standard setting and reviewing agency would be a real help, so I think I would have to say yes. But whether it would be an adequate help, I don't know. I was indicating some reservations about the proposed composition of the State agency. Many States do now have State advisory agencies on day care. I am not in a position to know how widespread this is the country over.

My fear stems from this fact: that everyone—and I include myself very much in this, too—who has been concerned in the day-care field throughout all of the years, always finds himself having to settle for what is possible rather than for what is good. Whenever there is a question of setting standards, for example, at the State level—and I have worked on this in Tennessee where I lived and in Maryland, where I am now located—one knows what the standards ought to be and then recognizes that if you specify these, you are being unrealistic. You eventually come to specify standards that you know don't really constitute standards.

So I just don't know. I think it is important, and I felt there was in this bill a real move in this direction, to have the establishment of, whether it is agencies or commissions, both at the Federal and State level, who really feel a deep concern for day care.

One of the tragedies of the field has been that day care has been "no one's baby." No one was nurturing it. No one concerned about it. No one troubled about quality. By and large, the departments of welfare the country over have shown more leadership and concern. Yet many of them recognize that day care is not essentially a welfare program, although it has welfare aspects.

So I think any move that places defined responsibility for standard setting would be a very desirable move. I would, however, hope it would be done on some cross-disciplinary approach.

Mrs. MINK. The commission organization specifies not only those representative of the day-care centers but other child education groups, and I wondered if that general description of the membership of this commission would not meet your criticism. Do you feel it should be further defined and extended to specifically include others?

Dr. HYMES. Again, I have very real ignorance of what is appropriate and effective wording. My feeling, as I read that term, was one of being glad to see the proposed commission being broadened out. But, for instance, it is important for medical people to be involved in day care; I wondered whether they would be thought of as included under "child educational groups." It is important for social work, for public health nursing, for psychology, all to be included. I was not quite sure how broadly or narrowly that phrase might be interpreted but that phrase might be a means of insuring the representation needed.

What I think is really needed is some agency which is made up of many disciplines and people of different experiences, really feeling responsible for the development of day care in their State.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. HAWKINS. Is it your understanding on page 4 of the bill that the language in lines 12 through 14 mean that a grant would only be used to provide supplementary services and not allow the establishment of new centers?

Mrs. MINK. Yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. I didn't know the bill was so confined in terms of the point raised by Dr. Hymes in his presentation, with which I agree; I thought, however, that there was a misunderstanding as to what the bill might actually accomplish.

Mrs. MINK. May I define my answer to that question by saying that since we don't provide any construction funds for the actual

creation of new centers, it is designed to provide supplementary services to those that are actually in existence.

Mr. HAWKINS. What I had reference to was the basic support, not necessarily construction money.

Let us assume that a school facility is available and that a child care center is needed in a particular neighborhood. As I read the restriction in the bill now, that would not make it possible to obtain Federal assistance to establish this center in the sense of providing teachers and equipment for a basic program, but only in the instance that a program is already, let us say, operating, already has a facility, already has the teachers, and so forth, would this bill become operative as I read it the way it is now. Is that correct?

Mrs. MINK. I certainly didn't intend that interpretation. Perhaps the language ought to be corrected. As long as there are no construction requirements to actually open the center, it would seem to me that such an application should be included within the context of this bill.

Mr. HAWKINS. I thought Dr. Hymes' statement was good in this connection, and I certainly agree with him.

Also on page 5, Dr. Hymes, in which you speak of the State responsibility for day care centers and you refer to a State commission, there, are you referring to a newly created State commission or, let us say, a State board of education?

Dr. HYMES. Mr. Hawkins, I was basing my statement on page 2, where any State which wishes to participate shall designate or establish for that purpose a State agency broadly representative of public and private groups. Since it says "designate," I assume this could mean an existing agency or a newly established one. I was trying to give support to the notion of an agency or commission that would feel responsible for both establishing standards for this bill and coordinating other efforts in day care in the State.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, in some States, particularly in California, for example, child care centers are administered through the State department of education, and I am quite sure they would look with great disfavor on any other agency doing it. I can't imagine the State board of education becoming more broadly represented to the extent they would, let us say, admit or become composed of some of the other groups not ordinarily identified with the academic community.

Dr. HYMES. Mr. Hawkins, California has been, in my judgment, the leader in this field. Insofar as I know, it is the only State that has expressed statewide concern. But California illustrates the problem. While in California the responsibility is in the State department of education, in other States—and I say this with shame as one very closely identified with education—most education departments have not wanted to work with day care. They almost wash their hands of the field.

So one of the problems is, in a sense, a national lack of clarity as to "Whose baby is this?" I think you might want to be careful and I assume this care from the way the bill is worded, "designate or establish," so as not to interfere with any well-established program.

Mr. HAWKINS. To give enforcement?

Dr. HYMES. Right, to give enforcement to many States not as far along as California is.

Mr. HAWKINS. One other point, with respect to need of teachers, I certainly do not disagree; however, I found, in my own experience, and I think you indicated some experience yourself in the nonprofit field at the community level with groups under the Office of Economic Opportunity that have operated very excellent centers, that there is a great need for the involvement of parents, volunteers, of even older children, and other persons in the community in the operation of these centers, and it seems to me great value can be obtained by this involvement.

I see in your statement you did not mention that. Would you agree or disagree?

Dr. HYMES. I would agree just thoroughly that any group, day care or any program for young children, benefits by making the widest possible use of all age levels—the young that Mrs. Mink was questioning on, as well as much older people, of trained personnel and of untrained personnel, of people who come from the immediate neighborhood being served, of volunteers who have a social conscience and interest who come from the community as a whole.

But I do think the effective use of volunteers depends basically on trained leadership, so that my insistence on trained leadership was not really intended in the least to minimize the role of other not so well-trained people but really to say that unless there is a knowledgeable person, money or services or time are wasted and overlooked.

So I would give the greatest support to the use of nontrained personnel in all programs, but I would urge that these services become a most effective thing when there is trained leadership to tap this potential.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you very much.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much, Dr. Hymes. We certainly appreciate your testimony.

Dr. HYMES. May I say I would be pleased to help in any way, because day care is so tremendously important.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much; we appreciate your excellent testimony.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. MARIAN TIGNOR, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN,
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY, KINDERGARTEN, AND NURSERY
EDUCATION, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION**

Mrs. MINK. The next witness is Marian Tignor, legislative chairman, department of elementary, kindergarten, and nursery education, National Education Association.

We welcome you before the committee and you may approach your testimony in any way you wish. We would be happy to insert it in the record and have your comment, if this is the way you care to proceed.

Mrs. TIGNOR. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman and members of the committee.

My name is Mrs. Marian P. Tignor. I am a teacher of language arts in the District of Columbia public schools. I am here today, however, as a representative of the executive committee of the department of elementary, kindergarten, and nursery education, a department of the National Education Association.

Membership in EKNE includes teachers, supervisors, teacher education institution personnel, and, indeed, any member of the NEA primarily concerned with the education of young children who wishes to join our department.

I should make it clear that the views expressed today are those of the EKNE department's executive committee and not necessarily those of the National Education Association.

The EKNE executive committee, at a meeting on January 26, 1968, gave general support of the purposes of H.R. 10572, the "Pre-school Centers Supplementary Education Act." We are impressed with the number of sponsors this proposal has had in the Congress and are pleased at this evidence of the recognition by so many distinguished Members of Congress of the value of early childhood education.

We applaud, as an important breakthrough, the enactment of the provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1967 which provide for expanding day care programs for children whose mothers work.

That legislation requires that programs aided under the act must provide for coordination of education and health authorities with child welfare agencies in developing and supervising education and health service for children in day care centers.

We believe this is an effective structure for involving the health and education agencies in the day care program. We question the advisability of providing for the establishment of a separate state commission as H.R. 10572 proposed in Sec. 5. Every State has a State education agency with legal responsibility for establishing standards and administering State and Federal education programs.

We suggest that an advisory committee to the existing State education agency would be preferable to the creation of another State commission for early childhood education. The advisory committee should be broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups. However, the legal State responsibility for education should not be fragmented as section 5 proposes.

The bill further provides that, after a State plan has been developed according to the criteria in section 5 under regulations established by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the local day care centers submit applications directly to the U.S. commissioner for approval.

It would seem that the role of the State agency is merely to develop the State plan, and to certify that there are sufficient funds in the State's allotment to make the grant. We believe this is contrary to sound principles of educational administration and places too much control at the Federal level and will weaken State responsibility for education.

We believe that the State education agency should make the determination as to which programs should be funded, providing, of course, that only those public and private nonprofit day care centers licensed by the appropriate State agency are eligible.

The authorization for \$300 million is somewhat excessive in light of the fact that the latest available data from the Children's Bureau shows that, in the entire country, there are only 473,000 places for children in licensed facilities of all types—including private homes which accommodate only three or four children. About 66 percent of these places are in profit-making commercial operations.

Thus, at the present time, there are in existence about 150,000 places in licensed public or private nonprofit day care centers. This means that the bill proposes over \$2,000 per child presently eligible for education alone. Actually, the per capita allotment would be closer to \$3,000, since the 150,000 figure includes children younger and older than the 3 to 5 age limit proposed in H.R. 10572.

Under the 1967 day care amendment to the Social Security Act, on an 85 to 15 matching basis, the Federal agency has committed \$5 million for the remainder of the present fiscal year and is requesting \$35 million for fiscal year 1969. We recognize that the day care program in the Social Security Act is basically limited to programs of the Labor Department to encourage employment of mothers who are able to work.

However, there is evidence that the Labor Department's comparatively modest estimates are based, in part, on a realistic assessment of the number of early childhood specialists currently or foreseeably available.

We believe H.R. 10572 could be improved by providing a program as an addition to the Education Professions Development Act which will concentrate in the immediate future on developing programs and providing stipends for persons specializing in early childhood education. There simply are not enough qualified persons at this time to justify an authorization of the size contained in H.R. 10572.

While there have been exciting experiments using technological devices for educating young children, these are far from perfected. We do not believe the very young child who is separated from his mother for most of his waking day should be placed in a situation where he bestows his filial devotion on a computer. All people need people, but little people need them most of all.

We would hope that through a federally aided program for teacher education for early childhood education specialists, a large number of teacher-training institutions would be encouraged to enter this field. With such facilities, the present shortage of qualified personnel would be alleviated.

The concurrent expansion of suitable day care centers can be anticipated. Hopefully, day care centers of highly professional caliber will be available to all children of working mothers. Parents who can afford to do so should pay for this service. Others less affluent should be given financial assistance.

The children, however, should not be segregated on an economic or any other basis. Very young children can be saved from the social and racial prejudices with which too many of us adults are afflicted if the programs in which they are involved accent the worth of the individual rather than his economic or social status.

In closing, I would like to add to the record a statement of guidelines for daytime programs for children developed by representatives of nine national organizations concerned with early childhood education. These organizations are listed at the beginning of the guidelines statement.

(The information follows:)

DAYTIME PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN

Guidelines prepared by representatives of:

- American Association of University Women
- Association for Childhood Education International
- National Association for the Education of Young Children
- National Committee for Children and Youth
- National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Inc.
- National Committee for Support of Public Schools
- National Congress of Parents and Teachers
- National Education Association
- Department of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education, NEA

All daytime programs for children promote specific goals and foster a quality of living that provides for total and continuous growth. They should:

1. Meet the basic needs of children for:
 - Good health and physical development;
 - Attention, acceptance, and affection;
 - Opportunities to experience success and to test their mental, physical and social powers;
 - Self-identity and a sense of competence and worth;
 - Security of gentle discipline;
 - Relations with adults and children that recognize individual rights and those of others;
 - Respect of adults and children.
 2. Foster the unique abilities and meet the individual needs of each child.
 3. Use related knowledge from all professions and resources of the community in developing programs for children and their families.
 4. Provide adequate and appropriate adult guidance and health, education, and welfare services for the child to be:
 - Physically and mentally healthy;
 - Increasingly skillful in using language and understanding concepts;
 - Able to perceive and cope with problems;
 - Observant and attentive;
 - Responsible, self-directed, and self-disciplined.
 5. Help children feel at ease about being away from home and able to accept involvement with adults.
 6. Strengthen family ties and, through participation in the program, to help parents better understand their children.
 7. Develop between the child and his family and the community, responsible attitudes toward each other.
- Programs will differ but certain conditions are fundamental to the attainment of the above goals.
- Fundamental criteria are:
1. The home is recognized as the base for the child; the program supplements.
 2. Responsible sponsorship for the program is assured.
 3. Staff is educationally qualified, experienced, and adequate in number.
 4. The unique responsibilities of the family, the staff, and the community agencies are defined.
 5. Licensing and accreditation require supervision to ensure quality of program, adequate preparation of personnel, and comprehensive health and safety standards of the facilities.
 6. A quality program includes health, education and welfare components.
 7. Findings of research studies are utilized in planning, organizing, and directing the program.
 8. Funds are made available to cover essential services.

Because of the variety of child needs, program philosophies, and ways of working, rigidity in the direction of a stereotype for all programs is not desirable. Nevertheless certain basic elements are essential to every daytime program for children, three through five years of age:

1. The environment invites and nurtures the child's joy in discovery and excitement about learning and knowledge by providing:
 - Spacious and cheerful physical surroundings which are flexible, safe, and hygienic; and allow for each child at least 50 square feet for indoor, and 100 square feet for outdoor work and play.

Varied equipment and materials for outdoor and indoor play that encourage dramatic play and creativity, and invite learning by discovery, such as: paint, books, clay, magnets, wheeled toys, records, wood, dress up clothes, paper, puzzles, blocks, apparatus for active play, rhythm and music instruments, water, sand, and earth, animals and plants.

Opportunities for the child to discover similarities he shares with other children and to become aware of the richness of differences.

Group living which facilitates the child's social growth and adjustment: learning his own rights and how and when to assert them and understanding the rights and feelings of others.

Freedom and administrative support to the teacher to seek, create and test new ideas.

2. A harmoniously working staff includes persons who are physically and emotionally healthy.

A teacher who recognizes and respects the individual child's uniqueness and levels of development, and is aware of the impact of his personality on each child. His broad liberal education includes professional preparation in early childhood education, child psychology, human growth and development, nutrition, mental hygiene, curriculum planning, parent education, and family and community relations.

Professional and service staff members who welcome and respect parents as individuals and accept their feelings toward their child; encourage parents to observe and talk things over and participate in the program. They work with parents supportively helping them to gain insights into their child's growth and learning and to be objective in appraisal of their child.

Sufficient staff to assure a capable adult present at all times with a pupil-teacher ratio not to exceed the following:

Age 3 years—10 to 12 children and 1 teacher and nonprofessional helpers.

Age 4 years—12 to 15 children and 1 teacher and nonprofessional helpers.

Age 5 years—15 to 20 children and 1 teacher and nonprofessional helpers.

Readily available help and guidance of a pediatrician, a psychologist, a social worker, and a consultant in early childhood education.

Established working relationships with all appropriate community services including health, education, and welfare agencies.

3. The program is geared to the individual child and includes:

Confidential and comprehensive cumulative records for each child.

Conditions that are essential to optimum health and physical growth: rest, snacks, and balanced meals if the program is more than 3 hours long; daily health checks; first aid; and periodic medical examinations at least once a year with follow-up care as necessary.

A planned but flexible and informal curriculum that includes sensory, creative and intellectual experiences in music, art, language and literature, science and mathematics, and social studies and opportunities for the child to talk freely, thus developing facility in the use of language.

Experiences designed for the child's level of development so that he can gain feelings of mastery, success and adequacy.

Utilization of past experiences to afford continuing clarification, refinement and expansion of concepts.

Freedom to move from group activities to solitary ones, from rigorous physical to passive, quiet activities.

Mrs. TIGNOR. On behalf of the department of elementary-kindergarten-nursery education, NEA, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on H.R. 10572 and again commend the sponsors and the chairman and members of the subcommittee for their sincere concern for our Nation's youngest future citizens.

Mrs. MINK. Congressman Hawkins, any questions?

Mr. HAWKINS. Mrs. Tignor, I am apt to disagree with you in some of your statements and maybe we need some clarification.

On page 2, you indicate that the authorization of \$300 million is somewhat excessive and I get the impression that you make that statement based on confining the bill merely to supplementing certain child-care centers which may be in existence, on what basis I don't know, but with the number of children of parents today that are

working and with the new amendment to the Social Security Act which provides that now we are going to try to get parents off of welfare and get them jobs, it seems to me, that \$300 million is pathetically small to provide child-care centers for the children of working parents.

Is my impression incorrect?

Mrs. TIGNOR. I did not understand the money was to provide child-care centers but an act to supplement the educational services in already existing child-care centers. We said we do not have sufficient properly trained personnel to administer these in existence.

We prefer putting much more money into a total program for a child. This bill covers only educational services and does not provide more money toward trained personnel, so we could have better programs.

Mr. HAWKINS. I could understand your criticism perhaps of the bill in that the bill itself should be amended to provide additional services. Perhaps we just don't understand each other.

Mrs. TIGNOR. Probably so.

Mr. HAWKINS. You are confining the \$300 million then to the confines of the bill as it is now drafted and not to the real need that does exist, is that it?

Mrs. TIGNOR. That is our understanding.

Mr. HAWKINS. Would you say that if the bill is broadened to include more basic support of the child-care centers, that that \$300 million would certainly be effectively used?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Well, the data upon which the amount of money was selected included probably children older than the age group which the bill indicates, ages 3 to 5 generally, and your appropriation, and you may correct me if I am incorrect, was based on some formula covering the Labor Department statistics for working mothers and assumed that so many of these children would be in this age group for working mothers.

Mr. HAWKINS. I am afraid I don't see in your statement a very strong support for a program in these days when much more money should go into doing what we are already doing and in improving and expanding the services of child-care centers, not only for those that are already being served, but for the many not being served now.

Mrs. TIGNOR. Well, now, in the centers which are already in existence for which the bill provides supplementary services and materials, in those centers, we do not have vacancies for the many more children who need day care. We do not have trained persons for these.

Mr. HAWKINS. Are you saying we have to confine it to those?

Mrs. TIGNOR. The bill implies it is confined to the already existing day-care programs.

Mr. HAWKINS. It seems to me your criticism should be directed to the bill itself and that the bill is not broad enough.

Mrs. TIGNOR. We do not object to the bill. We generally favor the bill.

Mr. HAWKINS. May I ask, do you favor extending the bill to care more adequately for the needs of the child-care centers?

Mrs. TIGNOR. I think that would be a much better statement and I would generally support that.

Mr. HAWKINS. You generally support that?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Yes.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mrs. MINK. Thanks very much, Mr. Hawkins.

May I say that the statistics that are available to determine exactly the number of children that are being cared for other than by their parents during the time that they must work are very sparse indeed. The statistics which you refer to are only those children in licensed facilities and this, by no means, is an accurate count of the number of children who are now being cared for in centers and whose care during the day is in some way being paid for by working parents.

I know this is true in my State. We have no comprehensive licensing provisions and, therefore, no way of knowing exactly the number that are being cared for in centers that might qualify for assistance under this act.

Therefore, the number I would suspect that would qualify would be much larger than the number which you referred to in your statement and that would be my first comment.

On the second point which you raise about not proliferating the responsibility for the administration of this program and your suggestion that we have an advisory committee, if such an advisory committee were created who would make the actual decisions recommending which centers would qualify for a grant under this act?

Mrs. TIGNOR. We feel that the appropriate State agency should recommend which centers would qualify providing they meet the State standards for licensing.

Mr. HAWKINS. What would be the appropriate State agency?

Mrs. TIGNOR. In the various States I can't say. Some have State board agencies and some departments. They would have whatever State agency is given the responsibility for the overall governing of the educational program.

Mrs. MINK. You would have no objection to the Governor appointing an existing agency to administer the program?

Mrs. TIGNOR. The State education department.

Mr. HAWKINS. You are specific in your recommendation that it be an education agency?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. Not the social services department or social welfare department?

Mrs. TIGNOR. No, but we would envision this—

Mrs. MINK. Or State commission on children and youth or some other agency already interested in the field?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Since it involves the education of children naturally we would be more inclined to support an educational agency but hope they would include in the advisory committee a good selection of health, education, and welfare and other agencies involved in the total child care.

Mrs. MINK. What would be the purpose of an advisory committee?

Mrs. TIGNOR. In your bill you mentioned either creating a new agency or designating an existing State agency, in the event a State agency has not previously participated, probably, in early childhood programs or does not wish to assume total responsibility. There is a great variance in the States in the various programs. Some do approve and some don't. Therefore, an advisory committee would assist in

developing the intent of your bill and other pertinent problems in expanding the educational services in the child-day care centers.

Mrs. MINK. You would be opposed to establishing a commission which would have the authority to make the decision on the grants?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Only for the reason there are already so many commissions and agencies with so many names and that they are all concerned with early childhood education. Why can't they then work within the framework of this existing agency?

Mrs. MINK. In so many instances, our State departments of education are disinterested in preschool education and have so many other responsibilities. Many people have expressed a feeling they would not want to see the education departments given any preference in administering this act but that in each instance the Governor should decide whether it shall be the State department of education, and to also have the alternative of designating some other department or indeed creating its own commission for this specific purpose.

Do you see any fault with that idea?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Well, I can't speak for the committee. I would only be able to indicate my own personal opinion on that.

Mrs. MINK. Do you think that the bill ought to specify that it shall be the State Department of Education?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Now, I would say that would be our position.

Mrs. MINK. Do you have any further questions, Mr. Hawkins?

Mr. HAWKINS. No, I was just wondering, Madam Chairman, the point that was raised with respect to the applicant dealing directly with the Federal Government. In what part of the bill does that come up?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Where it designates the applications on page 2, section 5.

Mr. HAWKINS. Which part of section 5?

Mrs. TIGNOR. Line 13.

Mr. HAWKINS. You mean 13 on page 2?

Mrs. MINK. Page 4, line 10.

Mr. HAWKINS. Page 4, line 10.

Mrs. TIGNOR. I thought you said submission of requests, I am sorry. The Commissioner refers then to the Federal Government rather than a State agency.

Mrs. MINK. Yes, in the Office of Education.

Mr. HAWKINS. So that the applicant would deal directly with the Commissioner?

Mrs. MINK. No, the applicant goes through the State department of education or welfare or whoever is designated or the new commission as specified.

Mr. HAWKINS. In her statement on page 2 she says the applicant would deal directly with the commission, I thought that was your criticism?

Mrs. TIGNOR. That is not it; no. We felt that the State should submit the names of agencies whom they feel are child day care centers who are eligible under their licensing programs to benefit from the programs rather than these groups submitting it directly over the heads of any State agencies.

Mr. HAWKINS. Is that possible? I didn't think it was possible.

Mrs. MINK. No; the bill provides that all of the local centers who wish to be considered for funds would apply to the State. No one

could go over the head of the State to deal directly with Washington. It would have to be done on the State level. The State then would recommend, as noted on page 3, line 3. The State agency would approve and recommend to the Commissioner. Again, this is restated on page 4, line 22, the Commissioner could not approve any application that was not previously approved by the appropriate State commission, so this provides the mechanism for State control. The Commissioner's role is simply to make sure that the overall purposes of the act have been satisfied.

Mrs. TIGNOR. It would appear there is not as much of a conflict as maybe we interpreted it.

Mr. HAWKINS. The day-care centers would submit applications directly to the U.S. Commissioner for approval and I don't read the bill as actually providing that.

Mrs. TIGNOR. No. Well, let's see.

Mr. HAWKINS. I was wondering what is the basis for that statement? Certainly it is not the intent.

Mrs. TIGNOR. No; it may be a matter of intent and interpretation.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes; my understanding from the author of the bill is it is not the intent.

Mrs. TIGNOR. Yes; we accept that as a clarification.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you, very much, Mrs. Tignor.

Mrs. TIGNOR. Thank you for the opportunity of permitting me to appear.

STATEMENT OF MRS. HELEN WYNNE, NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA, CHILD DAY CARE ASSOCIATION, INC.

Mrs. MINK. I would like to call the next witness, Mrs. Helen Wynne, National Capital Area, Child Day Care Association, Inc., Washington, D.C.

We welcome you to the committee. You may have your statement inserted in the record and make your comment informally or read your statement, as you prefer. You may follow whichever procedure you prefer.

Mrs. WYNNE. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

My name is Helen Wynne. For the past 2½ years I have been employed by the National Capital Area Child Day Care Association as a program director.

The association is principally supported by OEO funds and conducts 13 day care centers for poor children in the District. I supervise three of these centers serving 112 children from 2½ to 6 years of age. The opinions I express here will reflect my own judgment and are not the official position of my employer.

Let me tell you of my relevant background: I worked as a social investigator for the New York City Department of Welfare for 2½ years and as a psychiatric social worker for New York State Department of Mental Hygiene for 1½ years. I have been the president of two cooperative nursery schools (one of which I founded) and vice president of a third.

I have also been employed as a paid nursery schoolteacher, a staff member in the national office of the OEO Headstart program, and as

a social worker for a summer Headstart program in Washington. I have a bachelor's degree and some credits toward a master's in social work.

I am grateful for a chance to testify in support of H.R. 10572. I believe this bill is an important first step toward helping many children receive the type of day care service they vitally need. The sponsors of the bill, and this subcommittee, are to be congratulated for the energy and concern they are focusing on this serious problem. I hope the Congress as a whole will share this concern.

In any large first step such as this bill, there will be differing opinions among supporters about better ways to stride ahead. I would like to give you the suggestions that come to my mind as a result of my experiences with children and parents, especially poor families that need day-care help.

My first observation is that the bill's focus on "Supplementary educational services and equipment" overlooks the major shortcoming in American day care centers—insufficient funds and resources to support basic programs for preschool children.

To make this important point very clear I must give you some detailed background. Today, many, perhaps most, poor children receive second- and third-rate day care service. On the whole, poor families cannot afford the tuition fees necessary to finance adequate services. Unless their children attend centers that are subsidized by Government funds or private philanthropy, it is unlikely that the staff or resources of the centers are of minimum quality.

It's true that most centers are inspected or licensed by various authorities, but the standards applied are essentially concerned with safety and sanitation. I have never heard of inspectors being concerned about whether teachers or supervisors had the temperament, intelligence, or training to satisfactorily care for young children, and they are not concerned with teacher-pupil ratios.

It is not too hard to understand why local standards for unsubsidized programs are often so low. Given the low fees poor parents can afford, what talents and services can these schools afford to buy? Should the regulators shut down the schools and (1) cut the parents' incomes even further, by forcing mothers to stay at home; or, (2) force the family to leave the child at home under even less satisfactory conditions?

Let me give you a few firsthand examples of what it's like. Jackie was a 19-year-old girl who had been apprenticed to one of my centers as an aide while she completed high school. Jackie showed sensitivity and promise, and we hoped to hire her as a full-time aide at graduation.

She would have been employed under a full-time teacher (a college graduate) and the two of them would have taught 15 children. She would have been paid \$2 an hour.

Things don't always go the way one plans, and we weren't able to hire Jackie upon her graduation. After some seeking, she found herself a job in a privately sponsored nonprofit day-care center. She is paid \$1.40 per hour, not \$2 per hour, and she teaches 20 children by herself, without an aide.

In other words, the children in that center are receiving less skilled services, and the services are spread two and a half times as thin. If

and when we are able to hire Jackie, I am sure she will leave her present job for us, and perhaps be replaced by someone with less qualifications. And I don't believe that the sponsor of that private center is getting paid a big salary.

It is not that such a center exploits the poor; it's just that there is no money to pay for what is necessary.

Let me spend a moment explaining what cutting corners, and cutting essentials, can mean for these children. We all recognize that these young years are of crucial importance in the shaping of a child's development and values. When parents are at work all day, the child is deprived of his or her normal adult contacts for the core of the day.

Even when he is at home, adult contacts are circumscribed, and sometimes strained; getting the children off to school in the morning, preparing supper after a full day's work and household chores. All these factors mean that special responsibilities are placed upon the day-care center—the home away from home. The responsibilities are compounded when we recognize that children from poor families have a special need for quality preschool programs to enable them to familiarize themselves with the attitudes and styles that will assist them in elementary school.

A day-care program that assigns an underpaid, undertrained high school graduate to babysit for 20 children in a room with a TV set is an abomination. And I have known unsubsidized programs that give one teacher 25 and more children. I fear that such programs promote—rather than correct—deprivation.

Let me give you another indication of the problem. I took the annual budget for our day-care association, divided it by the approximate number of children we serve, and estimated our annual per child cost at about \$2,700.

The poor parents in my area have trouble paying private schools \$15 per week, the going rate in nonsubsidized, nonprofit schools. This means their annual costs per child are \$780. Something has got to give.

"Supplementary services," under these circumstances, are like bandaging a serious wound without stitching it or applying antiseptic. They are covering the heart of the problem.

I am especially perplexed when I see that the bill (section 6), seems to aim at children "most in need." Presumably, these are poor children. Either they attend subsidized centers, (and often, I believe, receive adequate supplementary services), or attend unsubsidized centers and don't have their minimum needs met. Is it possible to amend the bill, and provide subsidies to supplement the basic fees paid by poor parents?

Such subsidies could also have another important benefit. We know that many more poor families need day care than there are slots available. Even the unsatisfactory private centers I have described to you, have waiting lists. The low level of fees possible, makes it unprofitable to open new centers, or run well centers that are opened.

The subsidies might make feasible more centers plus better run centers. It is possible, too, that if poor parents had more choice because there were more centers, the pressures of competition might inspire private centers to upgrade their staffs and services.

My subsidiary proposal might be tied in with a requirement for matching funds from the State or other governing entity. In other

words, the National Government might put in \$1 for every dollar from a poor parent, plus a second dollar for every dollar the State puts in. I am sure other sound combinations can be devised.

I understand that Congress is reluctant to pass legislation providing general support for education, but I don't think that that principle should apply to day care. Day care is not strictly an educational program. It does not have curriculum in the technical sense, and is more concerned with affecting emotions, attitudes, and learning readiness, rather than transmitting information. My proposal is further focused on helping poor children rather than all classes of children.

There are two more brief suggestions I would like to make in conclusion:

(1) My main proposal is not hostile to "supplementary services." I just give them a lesser priority. Supplementary services should be expanded to clearly cover (a) the costs of inservice training for staff, so they can help supply the services and, (b) health services so that where existing local facilities are inadequate, doctors, dentists, and other health screening, as well as psychologists, can help the children.

(2) The bill should explicitly direct the Commissioner to develop and maintain a framework for the periodic evaluation of State policies and local day-care programs. Information which will stimulate continuous improvement should be routinely collected and analyzed. Funds should be authorized for this purpose.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much for your statement, Mrs. Wynne.

Mr. Hawkins, any questions?

Mr. HAWKINS. First, Mrs. Wynne, on page 3, you speak of the example of "Jackie", that you couldn't employ. Why couldn't you?

Mrs. WYNNE. You want to know the real reason?

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, why?

Mrs. WYNNE. We were turned down by the Office of Economic Opportunity. We receive Headstart funds. One of the requirements of the public program bill is that we hire dropouts, not high school graduates, and unfortunately Jackie, who is a very lovely girl and very sensitive, and was attending Marquette Washington High School here in District of Columbia, where she was getting her high school diploma in nursery education could not be hired as a staff member because she was a high school graduate and this is the honest truth and it is something that has bothered us a great deal.

There are a lot of people that one has to help. We have been rather successful in hiring people off the street and training them as aides where they do receive \$2 an hour. These are young men and women who have been out of school for one reason or another and many of them have never had a decent job and have never been able to hold on to anything before.

Many of them have a great affinity for doing a very good job. I invite you to come out to my day care centers and meet some of these children. Of course, at the same time we feel badly in the case of a girl who has gone through high school as we want them all to go through and has a diploma, then we can't hire her in our program because we are supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity and we must follow the regulations of the poverty program.

Mr. HAWKINS. Is that a local regulation?

Mrs. WYNNE. No, it is a national regulation, as far as I know. It comes out of "OEO." We are supposed to hire people out of poverty in the nonprofessional positions, not only out of poverty but also that they should be from the neighborhood.

Mr. HAWKINS. She was in the poverty class?

Mrs. WYNNE. She was, no question about it, but she is a high school graduate and we have been limited.

Mr. HAWKINS. I think the recommendation has to be further considered.

Mrs. WYNNE. I would appreciate that tremendously. That would be wonderful.

I had Jackie's mother call the United Planning Organization at the time this came about to make a complaint and it was handled but nothing ever came out of it.

Mrs. MINK. I suspect, Mr. Hawkins, it is the local requirement of the United Planning requirement.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes, I think so. I don't want to get into what may be an individual case.

Mrs. WYNNE. The reason I brought up Jackie was I thought it was a good example, knowing it personally.

Mr. HAWKINS. I was wondering how typical it is and if it is typical it is only a matter of a local regulation and we are not opposed to it.

Mrs. WYNNE. I brought it up not only because we were not able to hire her but to use as an example of the kind of thing where here is a girl who would have been in our program which is subsidized, an aide with a qualified teacher for 15 children and I know now that she is a teacher of 20 children with no assistants.

Mr. HAWKINS. Well, if this situation is allowed, or if this is so and there are other cases such as this, I assume it would be, it certainly would be against the intent of the poverty program itself, and it would seem to me we would be defeating the very intent of the program.

That is the only reason I wanted a clarification of it.

Mrs. WYNNE. Yes, I used the term actually not to get at what was going on with the United Planning Organization, but to try to more clearly show how many, many of the nonprofit nonsubsidized day care centers staff themselves, need to staff themselves, because of insufficient funds to pay people to do a really good job.

Mr. HAWKINS. I have just one other question.

On page 5, you say day care is not strictly an educational program. Do you mean "not strictly" in the sense it is not exclusively or that it should not be considered an educational program?

Mrs. WYNNE. No, I was under the impression that there is a tendency, and correct me if I am wrong, there is a tendency in educational bills, and I thought it followed in H.R. 10572, that is, following very much along the lines of supplementary aid to primary and secondary education, that it was easier to get bills through Congress when they were earmarked for specific things rather than general aid, so I just thought how it was best to get around the idea that child day care centers are, of course, an educational experience for children, for young children, but they are so many other things because they have a home there away from home, you know, they are education, but they are also mother and if you are lucky enough to have a male

aide they are father in the center and it is a place where you sleep and it is a place where you eat. You know, they have everything that goes on in a child's life.

Mr. HAWKINS. You are comparing them with, let us say, the Headstart concept as perhaps being the closest concept which incorporates these various ideas you express?

Mrs. WYNNE. I don't think Headstart is a home away from home because the children are in Headstart programs for 3 or 4 hours a day.

Mr. HAWKINS. I am not saying it is identical but it does have some other factors other than education?

Mrs. WYNNE. I guess I would say so because I know here in the District of Columbia and probably in many places all over the country **day** care is not a good word, it is not a positive word, it is not a word that makes people feel very good at all.

Mr. HAWKINS. Yes.

Mrs. WYNNE. We use the words "all day Headstart" when I describe the program to people and say "What have you there" and I say, "We have an all day day care Headstart program." That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. HAWKINS. But by your statement you are not implying the program should not be educational?

Mrs. WYNNE. No, not at all.

Mr. HAWKINS. Thank you.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Steiger, any questions?

Mr. STEIGER. Mrs. Wynne, I was very interested in your testimony. I wonder what standards does the District of Columbia require for day-care centers?

Mrs. WYNNE. Sanitation and safety.

Mr. STEIGER. Those two?

Mrs. WYNNE. That is all.

Well, you have to have a certain number of square feet, and you have to have a front exit and back exit. You have to have a fire alarm system, these kinds of things. We know it is true of Chicago, where I have lived, and I know it is true of areas in New York State where I have lived. They don't get into—well, I am not sure they have even gotten into these kinds of standards for nursery schools, for the short 2- and 3- and 4-hour day kind of thing and certainly not in day-care programs.

Mr. STEIGER. Do you happen to know whether or not the centers that are in operation in the District of Columbia have to be licensed?

Mrs. WYNNE. You mean all centers?

Mr. STEIGER. Yes.

Mrs. WYNNE. I think they are. All centers that everybody knows about.

Mr. HAWKINS. What other centers are there?

Mrs. WYNNE. I think maybe that the word "center" is sometimes a little loose. Maybe you don't have to be licensed if you have less than six or seven children and who knows whether you have six or seven children unless the lady down the block you know calls up to tell somebody down at the health department that there is a lady over there who has 10 kids in her house and "Does she have a license?"

Mr. STEIGER. In the District of Columbia, is the Health Department the licensing authority?

Mrs. WYNNE. That is right, Health and Fire Department.

Mr. STEIGER. Both?

Mrs. WYNNE. Yes.

Mr. STEIGER. What is the relationship, in your judgment, between this legislation and what is being funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mrs. WYNNE. As I understand it, what is funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity composes very few situations around the country as we happen to have, and we are very lucky, I think. It is a good thing because the District of Columbia is far, far behind in everything, so we have 13 centers here which are under the Office of Economic Opportunity. These don't begin to fill the need right here in the District of Columbia which is really a very small population.

I don't think that the Headstart funds were planned basically to cover or to even think of covering the needs of day care around the country. I understood Headstart was, what it said, primarily, that is a Headstart.

Now, a day-care center is, of course, a Headstart because it is an educational program which involves all of these other services for young children, but we can never get away from what a day-care center also is, which is a service to working families to take care of their children all day long and it is a much more expensive program than running a 3- or 4-hour-a-day program for a child.

Mr. STEIGER. My concern in this in large measure is because you do have OEO's Headstart program and OEO funded day-care programs?

Mrs. WYNNE. Out of Headstart funds?

Mr. STEIGER. Yes.

Mrs. WYNNE. Not too many.

Mr. STEIGER. That is correct. You do have the social security amendments of 1967 and its day care center program. You have title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which has some day care center programs that have begun to some extent. Now, we have additional day care centers, and this poses some problems in proliferation of agencies, all of whom are working in attempting to try to solve a problem which we recognize does need attention.

So I suppose I am saying: Where do we go in this? Do we take them and put them into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare? Do we operate them through the Office of Education? Do we do them in OEO? Do you have any ideas that you would like to give to the committee as to how this ought to be handled?

Mrs. WYNNE. I think the most exciting thing with H.R. 10572 is that it is specifically dealing with child day care. You know, OEO funds have come out of Headstart but they were not specifically for day care. Day care, as people have said in previous testimony, has been a tremendously neglected field. I don't know very much about where the legislation belongs. We all know that it is a tremendous problem, that even with all of the possibilities of all of the legislation that you mentioned, it does not begin, you know, to answer the needs.

Social security is just going to take care of those. I don't know how it is going to work out, but when it does work out, however, it will just take care, I assume, of centers for those mothers coming off of welfare, because here in the District of Columbia, people hate to be

on welfare and there are many, many people you know who should be on welfare who are not and who don't have their kids in day-care centers and are taking care of their children in an inadequate way, so they would be, you know, taken care of by this social security thing. Maybe it belongs in Health, Education, and Welfare, because this is the total picture of what a young child's development is, I mean, "health," this is all of your medical facilities, including your psychologists, that this is welfare because this is your social services, this is your parent involvement, this is the other side of it, and then there is the whole educational experience.

Mr. STEIGER. I have two more questions, Madam Chairman.

No. 1, how high a priority do you put on the day-care concept? Is this, in your judgment, an area in which we should place high priority, because its long-range impact can obviate some of the difficulties we get from some of the younger people later on?

Secondly, in the work that is done and in the ideas that we have now before us in this legislation, I have a concern about parental involvement and whether or not, in your judgment, the bill places strong enough emphasis on parental involvement as an integral part of the day care center?

Mrs. WYNNE. No. 1, the question was, what is the priority for day-care centers in terms of the maximum all of the many, many problems we have in the social and welfare area in our country?

Mr. STEIGER. Yes.

Mrs. WYNNE. I think it is very, very important. I think that it is very difficult to run and to operate a good day-care program, and it takes a great deal of working at, because it is not something that has been generally done and I think that in the course of spending moneys and expending energies, of course, there will be a certain amount which is wasted in learning, you know, how to do it and how important it is, but I think it is certainly as equally important as putting money into Headstart.

I think if anything it might be more important although more expensive because these are kids who are all day away from everybody. This is their experience. We have centers that care for children from 2½ to 3 years old to 6 and in some cases 7, but as Dr. Hymes said, there is that whole area of kids in Washington who are not covered by day-care programs, and that is all of the infants and all of the 1-year-olds and all of the 2-year-olds who do not have adequate care, and if we are concerned about what is happening to our population and where we are all going, I guess we have to be very concerned about the children who are not really cared for so many, many hours of the day adequately, you know.

We have had, you know, working in the day-care centers I could tell you, just a million stories that would raise your hair just all over the place. I can remember very simply a woman coming in—well, I work in areas of the District of Columbia which maybe you have read about in the newspapers "Anacostia and Congress Heights, the proverbially neglected areas on the other side of the Anacostia River.

I can remember very vividly after we opened a short period of time on Nichols Avenue, which is the main drag coming down into Anacostia, a lady coming in one day and having her son in tow, and saying, "I just must have a day-care center, I don't know what this is, I don't

know why you are here but I have my son and I just got home now because I got a call from another neighbor who heard him screaming. The babysitter, for whatever reason she did it, took my son's bottom and placed it on the radiator."

So she took her son's bottom and pulled down his drawers and she showed me. You know, he had been burned.

You know, I am sure this is not the first time this has happened to a child or the last time. There are many other dramatics of this sort of thing. It has been a very, I think, important and a very exciting thing and I think what makes day care the kind of job that some people like to be in or feel is important, is that when a parent comes to you and says "You know I can now work and I don't have to worry about where my kid is," and, "I know my kid is not only safe and sound but my kid is being prepared for a school situation, that my kid is getting a socialization experience here, that my kid is learning some of the things that are going to be important to my kid when he moves into the larger society."

So I think this is a mighty important thing.

What was the second question?

Mr. STEIGER. Should we strengthen the bill to insure parental involvement becomes an integral part of a basic day care center program?

Mrs. WYNNE. Here, I want to make sure I refer back to the thing I said before, "The opinions I express here express my own judgment and not the positions of my employer." I think parental involvement is very important. We can get hung up on it. I know it was the thing stressed for OEO last year.

This year we are on nutrition. I think these things are important, and I think they do help focus you on things. I think that in parental involvement we have gotten, and I can only speak from my experience in the three centers, we have had some exciting things happen with parents.

I think if your parental involvement is going to end up with primarily fundraising by parents for centers, then I don't think it is as worthwhile as it can be in many other ways. We have tried to involve parents in the running of the centers and making decisions about the center. This is pretty difficult.

You can do it with a very small number of people. These people work all day and work longer hours than you or I do and usually travel much farther to where they are working than you or I. I think there are a lot of important things the parents can get out of it. I think some of the most important things about parent involvement is when you have a day-care center and have staffs that can do an adequate job that there are regularly scheduled times when a teacher sees a mother, and that we make this as mandatory as we possibly can and write them sometimes nasty notes to get them in to see the teacher because "this is your kid and your kid is here with us all day long from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. in the evening."

I think that, well, I just don't like to see things get hung up too much in the peripheral kinds of parent involvement, but we have had the kinds of parent meetings, if you occasionally get a good speaker down, where parents will sit around the table and a lot of these people don't have that much time to sit around a table, and with a good discussion leader in talking about their problems, in talking about their hopes and ideas and feelings for their children, and you

can have some of the most wonderful sharing of feelings and exchange of ideas, exchange of experiences amongst people.

I think these are the kinds of exciting things that can come out of parent involvement.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much, Mrs. Wynne. We certainly enjoyed your testimony. You have made some very valuable suggestions and contributions to this committee.

STATEMENT OF MRS. IDA Z. ALPHIN, SUPERVISOR, DAY CARE UNITS, DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mrs. MINK. I would like to call the next witness, Mrs. Ida Z. Alphin, supervisor of day care units, department of institutions and agencies.

In the interest of time, Mrs. Alphin, I apologize that the hour is late and we must conclude the committee hearings very shortly. Might I suggest that we enter your testimony in the record and ask you to summarize your comments for the benefit of the committee.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. IDA Z. ALPHIN, ACSW SUPERVISOR, DAY CARE SERVICES UNIT, DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS AND AGENCIES, DIVISION OF PUBLIC WELFARE, BUREAU OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES, TRENTON, N.J.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: The Bill H.R. 10572, "to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private non-profit child care centers" should receive support and endorsement by all those who profess an interest in and desire for a better world. If we continue to permit children in their most formative years to attend substandard and inadequate day care programs we can only expect a crop of inadequate and substandard adults in the years to come. Today, in many areas we in the United States are reaping the results from the lack of or inadequately financed day care provisions 15, 20 and 30 years ago. Good day care, as you no doubt know, is fast gaining recognition as an essential child welfare service that strengthens family life thereby abating the development of delinquency and dependency.

It seems wise at this point to set forth some of the values of good child care programs as a frame of reference for later discussion. Good child care programs offer children who need it the wonderful opportunity for building a good basic foundation for later education. Newer concepts of education attack the idea of fixed intelligence and support experiences as a major determinant of a person's intelligence. In a child care center the child develops emotionally as he associates with his peers, learning to give and take and to be tolerant. Everything that a child does in a center is developmental. Children will naturally grow and learn wherever they are. A child care center sets the stage for *wholesome, desirable*, development. The child's physical and mental growth is stimulated by well-planned trips and the availability of play materials, small and large muscle building equipment, visual aids, nutritious food and a well-balanced day of rest and play. Mothers can better meet their daily responsibilities without tension and anxiety knowing that their children are happy and being well cared for.

The provisions of H.R. 10572 would without question meet a definite need. There is, throughout New Jersey, and I believe the conditions in my state are fairly representative of existing conditions throughout most of our Nation, many day care programs hobbling along and attempting to render a service to children without sufficient funds for adequate staff and equipment. It has been established that a day care center must provide more than custodial care for children. A good day care service should meet the total needs of each individual child, physically, mentally and socially. The cost of such a total service is tremendous, compelling the average center to cut corners—denying the children a well-balanced program. I do not want to infer that child care is expensive. On the contrary, it is economical when its value is assessed.

The developmental value of day care to children will be in proportion to the centers' standards of operation. Ninety-five percent of the value of a day care center is dependent upon the quality of its staff. In fact, there are some Early Childhood specialists who go so far as to say, "The center is the staff". To obtain good staff the day care center must compete with the public schools' pay scale. The average day care center cannot compete with the public school pay scale. The ability of the parents to pay for day care controls the budget and this competition with the public schools makes securing a well-trained staff a real problem for most day care centers. Much too frequently an unemployed teacher takes a position in a day care center but meanwhile continues applying to public schools and generally is lured away by higher pay after a few weeks in the day care center. This leaves the director little choice—either to discontinue the day care service or to hire a person not qualified for public school employment, perhaps a half-trained person.

Many directors arrive at the decision to hire an undertrained person after much soul-searching because they fully realize the importance of a well-trained staff. Even when there is a well-trained teacher, the demands of 12 to 20 children on her are so great that she finds it physically impossible to meet all of the children's growing needs. Besides it is a mammoth job to attempt to be a teacher of art, communication, science, dance, music, etc. The authors of H.R. 10572 show a deep sensitivity and understanding of children's needs by writing into the Bill provisions for the services of teachers trained as specialists in the fields of art, music, communication, dance and the like.

I do not mean to minimize the need for adequate and appropriate equipment. The child's day in a day care center is a *long* one—eight hours—and sometimes more. To counteract apathy and boredom, with its accompanying disciplinary problems, a wide variety of educational equipment should be available. Included should be items for small and large muscle development. There is no more pitiful sight than a roomful of young children screaming at each other, crying and unhappy in general because there is nothing to do. Children need to be kept happy and challenged. Children must have many opportunities to be active, to explore, to experiment, to create and to learn how to deal with real life situations through play experiences. Each day should be carefully and constructively planned. Good enrichment materials of necessity include records, visual aids and, of course, well-written and graded books. Good books are expensive and, so, many centers are forced to settle for books of inferior quality. The backs soon drop off, the pages tear, the pictures lose their gloss and the books in general are unappealing to the children and frequently do not meet their developmental needs.

The writers of this Bill realizing that those services essential for developing strong, healthy bodies and minds should be available to all children, included provision for the services of psychologists and other child development specialists. Many public and private non-profit child care centers fully aware of their responsibility to meet the total needs of the child, make a futile attempt to provide these types of services. Such services are expensive and limited budgets do have to be watched. Occasionally, there are a few big-hearted specialists who will give a center special rates and *once* in a while there are volunteer services available. However, there is a need to guarantee the services of psychologists, pediatricians, dentists and other child development specialists to every child who might be able to enjoy a fuller, better life by receiving such services. Every child is entitled to the best possible care and our Federal Government should take the leadership role in making this possible.

I strongly urge that you support this bill. Money invested in good child care programs is an investment—a *wise* investment. Such money does more than provide a happy experience for children at the moment—for the day or even for the semester. It assures us of good, strong, happy, ethical citizens in the years to come. Citizens capable of making and contributing to a secure democracy. Everyone gains from good child care services—child, parent, community and the Nation.

I thank you.

Mrs. ALPHIN. All right. I am very happy to have this opportunity to talk on the subject that is very close to my heart, but before I go into my own statement I would like to comment on the point just raised because I say it every time I get an opportunity. So I don't think I should pass up this opportunity. It is this—I have a strong conviction that if we provide more good day care programs we would not need Headstart. Headstart takes the child usually around the age

of 4 while a day care program starts with a child much younger. If we have a well-rounded day care program we can even start a child of 1 or younger in a family day care home. We could then do away with Headstart and even better foundations would be laid for a child to go into kindergarten than you now get with the Headstart which is a program for 4-year-olds.

I would also like to make one other comment about the statement that was made earlier which was going to be my one criticism of the bill H.R. 10572. I question the desirability of stating, as the bill does on page 1, line 7, "Millions of pre-school-age children whose parents work have no opportunity of this kind for experience."

I think we ought to be moving more and more into the area where we will stop drawing lines of differences. I am sure the picture that comes into the mind of anyone reading this would be one of children from a low economic level. We all are aware of the fact that day care is a service that many, many children could benefit from even though there are parents at home, even though the mother is home.

We should not continue to group children from one socioeconomic level together because children will learn wherever they are, whether in a bad situation or good situation, whether they are at home or whether they are in a day care program. They are learning all the time. They learn from the people around them, they learn from the children with whom they play. So a program should include a good cross section of children. This separation of children is not desirable by many people. When Headstart was first organized, I was at a PTA meeting talking to some parents, many of them were furious because Headstart designated children in the low economic level. These people who were fairly capable of taking care of their own financial situation said, "What about my child? If there is something good I want my child to have it, even though my husband has a fairly decent job."

Along that same line, just yesterday I was talking to a woman who has just made a study of 1,100 graduate nurses at home where there is a real need for nurses to be out and doing a job. There is a big shortage in New Jersey, as elsewhere, of nurses. The answers they sent back indicated that more than two-thirds of these women would go to work if they had good day care programs for their children. So, there are people who go to work as graduate nurses, social workers, teachers, as charwomen, and so forth, and they all have children and all of them need day care. I would highly recommend that the bill would not designate only children of parents who work for enrollment in day-care programs. Children are children regardless of economic situations and let's begin thinking of them in this manner.

There are many, varied types of situations where day care is needed. I suppose I am kind of a strange animal here today because most of the people seem to be educators. I am sort of a cross, since I first was an educator then I took social work. I can see the problem of day care from two viewpoints.

Let's take a look at some of the many situations that justify taking a child out of his home and placing him in day care.

What about the child in a family where there are many children, even though the mother is home? She may have three, four, five, or six children in the home. After she sends three of them off to school she still has three to take care of, she is overburdened. She could use day care. Some attitudes about providing day care for mothers in

the home are: "I am not going to baby sit for that mother so she can be free." There is no sensitivity to what the mother as a human being has a right to. That mother has a right to have some time to herself, to go to the beauty parlor or shopping. Yet an educator stated no longer than last year, that he was not going to permit children to come to his day-care type Headstart program if the mothers were in the home.

How about the situation where we find children in families where there are strained marital relationships which set up all kinds of tensions in the home, which is not a wholesome environment in which a child should grow? A few hours out of the home for that child means a great deal to the development of that child and the mother is a better mother when that child comes home to her.

Then there is a child in the single parent family. The mother may have financial stability, but at the same time this only child needs contact with peers. I might go on indicating other situations where day care would serve a need of child and family. I am very pleased with the bill H.R. 10572 because it is the kind of bill I have dreamed of. I know that there are many things that we, in the field of day care, would like to see happening, but I am sure that all cannot be encompassed in one bill, so if one bill takes care of this phase of day care and another bill takes care of another phase of it, and so on, I feel we will gradually get good day care programs. It will be a long uphill journey, I know, but I think by having one bill concentrate on one angle, another bill on another angle, we will probably come out in a few years with real good programs for all children who need it.

However, we must realize that money invested in child care is not just for today, it is for the future of America. If we are at all interested in a real democracy where we have secure, independent individuals living wholesome happy contributing lives, then this is the kind of program we need to move into now.

I have seen so many needy centers, speaking, of course, of my own State, as unfortunately I have very little experience otherwise. (I lived in Washington, D.C., many years ago and my own child attended a District of Columbia program, because I was a working mother.) When I went to New Jersey I became interested in day care and I have been involved in it for the last 20 years. Many people only think of it as a passing thing, as a palliative sort of program, but it is actually an investment for many years to come. Perhaps if 30 years ago or even 20 years ago, more emphasis had been put on day care, we would be living in a different kind of world in the United States today. I thank you.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much.

Mr. Steiger, any questions?

Mr. STEIGER. Mrs. Alphin, we have little time and I regret that, but can you give us a little information about the New Jersey situation? How many licensed day care centers are there, for example, in New Jersey?

Mrs. ALPHIN. We have a fairly good situation in New Jersey. The licensing, we call it approving—the same idea—as the responsibility of the department of education. It does the approving of child-care centers for children ages 2 to 5 and they spell out clearly in detail what is required in order to be an approved child-care center. These

details state that the director must be a person graduating from a college with courses on child care and development. It also indicates the number of children in a particular age group, for one person or for two persons. They give the minimum space required for each child, 20 to 30 square feet per child indoors and 50 to 75 or 100 square feet for outdoors. The general program has to be approved and you are licensed for a period of 3 years.

In New Jersey, we have about 500 child-care programs but only about one-third of these are day care programs.

Mr. STEIGER. How many of the 500 that are approved are profit versus nonprofit?

Mrs. ALPHIN. The majority are privately run. Very few are nonprofit.

Mr. STEIGER. Do you have any estimate at all as to the number that may not be approved that are still in this business?

Mrs. ALPHIN. These 500 are all approved. But there are a few, there always will be some, you know, that will sneak in and say "I didn't know I had to have a certificate in order to do this." Once in a while they are turning up. We feel in New Jersey that the majority of child-care programs are being supervised by the department of education.

Mr. STEIGER. Well, the number that are nonsupervised, nonapproved, they are not great?

Mrs. ALPHIN. No, that number is not great.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much for your testimony.

STATEMENT OF MRS. COVEY OLIVER, MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE DAY CARE OF CHILDREN, INC., MEMBER OF WEST PHILADELPHIA DAY CARE COMMITTEE, FORMER PRESIDENT OF BOARD OF JARDIN INFANTILE IN BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, A DAY CARE CENTER FOR 110 CHILDREN OF WORKING MOTHERS

Mrs. MINK. I would like to call the last witness, Mrs. Covey Oliver of the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Inc. I want to express my appreciation for your staying so late with the committee and I apologize. We have not the time to fully discuss your views on the legislation but we have your prepared testimony and with the permission of the committee will insert your statement in full in the record at this point.

(The statement referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. COVEY OLIVER, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR THE DAY CARE OF CHILDREN, INC.

Mr. Chairman, members of this Committee, I am Mrs. Covey Oliver, and I represent the National Committee for the Day Care of Children, Inc., a private, voluntary organization of lay and professional citizens and interested agencies, organized in 1960 for the purpose of promoting public understanding of and support for good day time programs for children and their families.

The National Committee for the Day Care of Children, welcomes this opportunity to recognize the efforts of Representative Mink and the other members of the House of Representatives who have sponsored H.R. 10572. We are grateful for the recognition by Mrs. Mink and her colleagues of the continuing need to improve programs affecting children.

The National Committee for Day Care has for many years been engaged in an effort to educate the public to the fact that good day care programs must provide more than custodial care. A good day care program must be a child development program in the full sense of the word and must include education, health and social service components. For this reason, we wish to suggest that the definition of "supplementary education" as contained in H.R. 10572 probably would not cover Mrs. Mink's generous intent in proposing this bill. The greatest needs in the 10572 field of day care, we feel, are for additional staff to provide adequate training for the day care personnel in existing centers throughout the country, and to provide a larger number of quality programs for the many children now being neglected or not receiving any care whatsoever.

There are many other questions which we hope will be considered further before reporting this legislation. By placing the administration of this act in the Office of Education the bill raises a serious problem of coordination with other Federal programs. There are already several different Federal agencies (the Children's Bureau at HEW, the Manpower Administration at the Labor Department, and the Office of Economic Opportunity name the most important) involved in administering seven different Federal authorizations for programs dealing with day care. Efforts must be made to coordinate and integrate all the programs dealing with day care immediately. We would hope that more attention will be given to insuring a maintenance of high standards in the operation of day care centers and to coordinate funds under any new programs with the other Federal programs for day care. In addition we would hope that more thought would be given to providing for citizen participation in the program and to ways to facilitate the integration of services within a program funded under such legislation.

The National Committee for the Day Care of Children hopes that this committee's interest in the day care field will continue and that your intention to provide supplementary assistance to present day care programs through legislation passed during this Congress will be achieved.

We are eager to provide you and your staff with the assistance which our resources permit as you continue your consideration of H.R. 10572.

As a people, we have an immense job to do. The Children's Bureau estimates that there are over 4 million children under the age of six whose mothers are working. This is probably a conservative estimate. Of these probably fewer than 3% are in group centers. Although how we manage existing centers may affect only a relatively small number of children, it will set an important precedent for the future.

Mrs. MINK. Now, if you would like to make any comment either on your statement or other aspects of the hearing you heard this morning, please go ahead as you choose.

Mrs. OLIVER. First, I would like to say, Mrs. Mink, that the president of the National Committee for Day Care, Mrs. Richard Lansburgh, who is also the founder and president of the Maryland Committee for Day Care, she was terribly sorry she couldn't come to this meeting. She has been working steadily for 3 years on day care matters and her husband took her away for vacation.

I would like really to add one or two points to my testimony and I can't really say the things I am going to bring up have been cleared by the National Day Care Committee, because they have not, but it seems to me that the general wish of everybody here, keeping the aim within the bill's general framework is the improvement of the day care centers as they exist.

We are more hung up on the one word "supplemental," it seems to me, than anything else and I wondered if there is any possibility of, for instance, in line 11 on the first page of the bill, I am sorry, line 3, of inserting "Preschool Centers and Education and Supplementary Service Act," and then down on line 11 changing the wording to "The Nation's child care centers by providing better educational advice," rather than "supplementary," and it seems to me in this way, or the States in their plans could say, "We want to supplement our education in preschool centers by giving subsidies for inservice

training or further continuing education of the people, at whatever level they be, including so and so," and it would make this primary job of personnel improvement a lot easier. For example, yesterday Mrs. Weir was talking to us later about the California situation, and she said, "The day care centers in California, with the sole exception of San Francisco, pay their teachers a lower wage than the primary schools do."

Now, perhaps the most wonderful thing you could do to improve day care centers would be for the States to take this money and say, "All teachers or directors," or let us say "The head teachers in these programs would be paid the same wage as your primary school teachers."

This, it seems to me, would mean that you would keep your good people in day care and you would not lose them as you do to private nursery schools and also to just administrative jobs in education. Of course, this is a problem in all fields.

The other thing I wanted to mention was the question of parental responsibility and involvement in day care. There are many ways of doing this. As you may know, in Israel, in certain of the day care centers the mothers spend a month out of every year in the day care centers. This is mandatory. I don't think we could do it that way but there might be some provision for paying the mother's wage while she went to the school for a week, let us say, and got some idea of what the day care centers aims were in the general program. However, she couldn't do it unless there was some provision again for her salary during that time and otherwise it would be unrealistic.

I think that is all I have to add.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much.

I am interested in one of your comments about the administration of this program in the Office of Education and your statement that "several other agencies are already involved in day care management" and you cite the Children's Bureau and Manpower Administration. I wonder if you could clarify the administrative responsibilities that the Children's Bureau has in this area as well as the Manpower Administration?

Mrs. OLIVER. Well, I don't think I would be very good at clarifying it because I think it is very confused. In fact, I have suggested that we prepare a sort of case history for the people who are interested in day care in the variety of agencies where a State, or municipality, can go to get money for day care.

It is quite a complicated field and I certainly don't feel qualified at this time to clarify the situation. For instance, somebody in the Labor Department was telling us they have set up a whole series of day care centers in Oakland, Calif., under the Manpower Training Act. Obviously, Oakland was really "on the ball," as we would say, and got going forward with the program and got the Labor Department to get the money for it in order to carry out their manpower training.

Mrs. MINK. Was this training of personnel for centers or did they actually operate centers?

Mrs. OLIVER. No, I understand just the general MDTA.

Mrs. MINK. Training of personnel for centers?

Mrs. OLIVER. No. Just the general manpower training, Manpower Development and Training Act. That is what I understood.

Mrs. MINK. Well, the purpose of that, as I understand, is to train personnel for job placement and job opportunities.

Mrs. OLIVER. In order to train the people, in this case women, they had to be able to take care of their children and that is why they set up day care.

Mrs. MINK. Any questions, Mr. Steiger?

Mr. STEIGER. No. You touched, Madam Chairman, on the one question. Mrs. Oliver, the National Committee for Day Care of Children has planned to go ahead and I would encourage you to go to work immediately. Because I think it would be valuable to have for the committee's benefit any kind of analysis you may have available or can make available on this question of agencies that are involved in the proliferation. This is a matter of serious concern, for if you are going to do it, I think you then have to do it on some kind of reasonable basis. So I would ask that you proceed and I would be interested in any of your results.

Mrs. OLIVER. Well, the next newsletter we are sending out will be a summary of the present legislation, including the new provisions under the social security amendment.

Mr. STEIGER. I think we would be interested, and I know I would as a member of the committee, in back copies of your newsletter and any information you may have.

Mrs. OLIVER. I will be very happy to send them.

Mr. STEIGER. Plus any new ones that come out?

Mrs. OLIVER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. I might say for the benefit of my colleague we will certainly be in touch with the Children's Bureau and the Labor Department and perhaps request they come in at a later hearing to give us testimony concerning their administrative authority over existing day care centers.

I had understood that the Children's Bureau was interested in individual placement and support of the children for which they were responsible and that the Labor Department had concerns with respect to manpower training for personnel. I was not aware of this additional element which Mrs. Oliver brought before the committee. We will certainly have an opportunity to examine this very carefully with the Federal agencies mentioned.

I want to thank you, Mrs. Oliver, for your patience and for your testimony.

The committee now stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

PRESCHOOL CENTERS SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT

SATURDAY, JUNE 15, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
San Francisco, Calif.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, San Francisco, Calif., Hon. Dominick V. Daniels (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representative Daniels, Mink, and Burton.

Mr. DANIELS. The Select Subcommittee on Education will come to order.

My name is Dominick V. Daniels, chairman of the subcommittee, a Member of Congress from the State of New Jersey.

To my left is Congresswoman Patsy Mink of the State of Hawaii.

And to my right is Congressman Phillip Burton of California, one who is very, very well known to most of you people in the room this morning.

I would like to call upon my colleague from California to make some opening remarks.

Mr. BURTON. Thank you very much, Chairman Daniels.

I am very pleased that our subcommittee has seen fit to give those of us in this area an opportunity to testify on child day care center legislation.

We are very fortunate to have with us a man of the caliber of Congressman Daniels, who served for a number of years in the House as chairman of our subcommittee. And we are equally fortunate to have someone of the attractiveness of our distinguished colleague from Hawaii, Mrs. Mink.

I think I will say no more than we are delighted to have you, Dom and Patsy, in our wonderful city.

Mr. DANIELS. We are meeting today for the purpose of considering H.R. 10572 and related bills. The principal sponsor of this important measure is the Honorable Patsy T. Mink, Representative from Hawaii.

This bill, known as the "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act," will provide to millions of preschool children not just the barest custodial care but critically needed supplementary educational services through child care and education centers.

It seems entirely fitting for the Select Subcommittee on Education to hold hearings this morning on this exceedingly worthwhile legislation here in San Francisco. The State of California has been a pioneer in establishing child day care programs.

During the past 25 years, the California Legislature has originated legislation which recognized the need for services for children of working mothers.

In 1943, the California Legislature enacted a bill authorizing the establishment of a statewide child care centers program under the administration of the State department of education and local school districts.

As a result, the San Francisco Unified School District has administered and operated children's centers since May 1943 and has developed one of the best child care programs in the Nation.

The bill which we are to consider today would authorize \$300 million annually in the form of grants. Each State will be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all States as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

As a precondition for State participation, a State must designate or establish a State agency which is broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care groups in the State.

The Commissioner of Education shall, by regulation, prescribe basic criteria for determining which day care centers shall receive grants.

These grants may be used only to provide supplementary educational services and educational equipment for day care centers. Supplementary educational services and educational equipment are defined as services and related equipment which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day care center's program, such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists and other child development specialists, as well as the use of books and audiovisual material and equipment.

The child day care centers envisioned in this bill are to provide at least 8 hours of supervision for at least a majority of children, and a majority of children in each center will be age 3 to 5 years, inclusive.

H.R. 10572 makes it explicitly clear that no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under the authority of this act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

In conclusion, I want to commend Mrs. Mink, who has demonstrated such a strong interest in this legislation now before our subcommittee.

A major expansion of day care services seems inevitable in view of the steady march of women into employment. In a way, the future of many millions of individuals may depend on what we do during the course of deliberations on this important bill.

Our first witness this morning will be Mrs. Theresa S. Mahler, director of the Children's Centers Division, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco, Calif.

You may proceed, Mrs. Mahler

TESTIMONY OF THERESA S. MAHLER, DIRECTOR CHILDREN'S CENTERS DIVISION, SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mrs. MAHLER. For the record, I am Theresa Mahler. I am director of of the Children's Center in San Francisco. I am very delighted to be able to speak to this measure.

Before talking to the measure, however, H.R. 10572, I would like to make a few further comments on California's unique day care program. I thought for a moment, Chairman Daniels, that you were going to give my speech. I was going to say, well, that's just wonderful if the chairman makes all the points you had intended to make.

But our program is unique, as you pointed out, because it is educationally oriented, because we are the only State in the Nation that has a statewide program under the State department of education in local school districts.

And, Congresswoman Mink, I don't know whether you initiated this, but I have on my desk a letter from a gentleman in Hilo and he wants to know, as he put it, all about our program, because they are interested in getting one started there. And in my answer, my reply to him, I am asking him if he doesn't need a consultant, that I could really tell him in person. I would love to go back there.

This is why I am so interested in this measure, because to my knowledge it's the first measure I see, either on State or Federal level, that plans to supplement with educational services a day care program, whether public or private. And I think that this is a very forward-reaching sort of thing.

As you pointed out, Chairman Daniels, we have been in operation for a quarter of a century now, and it is true, as I am sure others will point out, that when we began it was on the basis of getting women into business and industry, particularly in defense industry.

The legislation which was adopted in January 1943 talked just about care and supervision. It's interesting though that when this Federal legislation was being enacted and a group of people were called together, just as you have done today, calling these people together to talk about a measure, they met in Washington and decided, even though the legislature said nothing about education, that if you are going to have children gathered together in groups education goes on of some kind one way or another and something had better be done about it.

California as a State got into the picture when the Federal funds were withdrawn in September and October of 1945, and we asked for an extension until January when our own legislature met and decided to take over the responsibility, the fiscal responsibility for the program although the State had already taken over the actual responsibility of placing the federally financed child-care centers under the State department of education.

Now, as I pointed out, the original why of the program was to provide a safe haven for children, the children of women who were needed in the labor force.

But over the years, and I am not going to go into this in detail because probably Mr. Weber will bring some of it out and it is listed in the several fact sheets, the base of the program has broadened by bringing in other categories of families. A means-test ceiling was imposed early in the history of the centers so parents who were beyond that ceiling who once they earned a \$1 or 50 cents more had to leave the program were continued eligible by modification of the law. Mothers who want to continue their education in order to become self-supporting have been included, and so on.

Now, another category was added later; that is, children of mothers who are receiving public assistance under the aid to families with dependent children.

And more recently, in 1965, we were permitted to include children under what we call here the Unruh Act, AB 1331. These were children who could be brought in for 4 hours of "an educational component."

I am going to touch on this in connection with what I will say later about other possibilities which I see in your bill.

The function of the program, how does it function? It provides within nursery and school-age centers supervision and instruction for children from 2 years of age through the elementary school year. Now, this is extremely important and is very much overlooked by practically all legislation, including H.R. 10572, because we are talking here just about "the preschool child," the child below kindergarten or first-grade level, where actually our program, and it is the only broad program, provides care and instruction, supervision, and instruction for children in the elementary school. And a kindergarten or first grader or second grader, as I am sure you know, or even a child older than that, can't be on his own before and after school so when my friends say—our schools are closed for the summer—"Oh, good, now you are on vacation." We are not, because we have the elementary school-age children all day.

Now, I don't know whether this can come within the purview of the bill, but I think it is an extremely important point to keep in mind. I am sure, too, that Mr. Weber will talk about the numbers of centers, 274, in the State scattered from Eureka in the north to San Diego in the south, from Porterville on the east border of the State and San Francisco on the west.

The programs are operated by school districts or they may be operated out of county offices. I am not going to dwell on financing because again I think the State supervisor will talk about this.

It is financed by State funds and parent fees on a 3-to-1 basis, and many people don't understand this comes out of a special children's center fund, it doesn't come out of a general school fund although we are so closely allied with public education.

But one of the things that has provided an increasingly large problem over the years is that although we have the State funds now in the Governor's budget as part of his budget so we don't have to go on hands and knees every year, every 6 months as we used to: please, please will you give us money to go on another year? We don't have to do that.

Although some school districts like our own are putting in special tax money to supplement what we get from the State and the parent fees, there has never been any overall provision for capital outlay now, we are battling to get a release of \$2 million in the legislature now, and I doubt very much that that bill will go through. It's up time and time again. There has been no appropriation for moneys, as I say, for capital outlay for rehabilitation of buildings, for extension of services, this in spite of the fact that I don't think a school district in the State that operates programs doesn't have as many children or families on the waiting list as they have within the centers themselves.

We have this tremendous interest, you see now, in education of young children, and so many different pieces of legislation being proposed, but over and over again we come up against the blank wall: well, is there money to build buildings, to buy land?

Now, in the Unruh bill it is true you can lease portable buildings, but it isn't the kind of provision that we really need. I am going to talk about that in relation to 10572.

You spoke about the continuing need of mothers and families where they support partially or totally support the families for this kind of service, and I was trying to get some figures to add here to my remarks. I found that in the monthly labor review, I think it was March 1967, 26.5 percent of the mothers and families with children under 6 were in the labor force as compared with only 18.6 percent in March of 1960. And of all women going into the labor force, these younger women with younger children are rapidly climbing up to the numbers of women with school-age or older children who are in the labor force. It is predicted that in California, and I think these figures are correct, by 1975 we will have 3½ million women workers.

What is the influence on the economy? I'll just make one or two comments here. Mr. Weber and the directors of other programs helped us to compile these figures for our brief on the California program, which I think you have. We brought the figures up to date as to the earning power of the families using the centers and we estimated that just in this current year they would be earning a total of more than \$49 million.

Now, over 80 percent of the parents in our centers are sole parents. They have to support their families. They are also in this means test ceiling limited classification, so that the money they earn goes right back into the economy of the State.

Now it is true that we don't have to convince you people of the need for day care because you are convinced, but I am sure that there are other Members of Congress, just as there are other members of our legislature, whom we do have to convince that this is really a money-paying proposition if we provide adequate supervision for these young children, not to mention what happens to mothers when there isn't adequate day care. How can they work 8 hours a day, run a family and not have mental breakdowns or anxieties when they don't know what is happening to their kids? So the question isn't whether we should have it.

I have been working legislatively—and mother never told me when I talked about going into teaching that I was going to have to become a lobbyist, but I am an officially registered one at that but only for children centers, because I so believe in them—no one told me that I would have to convince people, not on the basis of need of education of young children, but on the basis of all these other things, that it is economically wise to have such programs.

We do have other programs in the State. Mrs. Marian Anderson, who will testify, will talk about various kinds of programs for young children. The State department of social welfare, and this is always confusing to people outside the State, also licenses the day care, not the day care under our program, but they license day care. And Mrs. Gordon, who is in the audience, was very fine to give us hot-off-the-griddle figure that in March of 1968 there were more than 60,000 children enrolled in the 1,679 licensed day nurseries in the State. Now how many of those are day care type programs, I'm sure she has that figure. I don't have it.

But the uniqueness of our program, I would like to emphasize again, is that it is under education. We can't estimate the impact of influence of Children Centers or similar programs on the children themselves, with new emphasis on the importance of education in the early years and with more widespread recognition and acceptance of this continuing increase in the numbers of women who must work to support their families.

With the tremendous amount of Federal money now available for new programs for the disadvantaged, there has been this tremendous legislative activity to establish new programs and to expand or improve existing ones. That is why I think this bill H.R. 10572 is so important, because it is uniquely an educational program.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, may I seek unanimous consent that the balance of Mrs. Mahler's statement be put into the record so we can get an opportunity to ask her questions?

Mrs. MAHLER. I would like to make one more point, Congressman Burton, if I may, and that is that programs such as this cost money, because young children need more of everything. And there is in addition to the more space, more equipment, more services that you spoke of—and written into the bill—there is one aspect, one major need which I hope could be written into the bill, and that is the need for funds for capital outlay. Now, I don't know what the ramifications are, whether there are limitations on this. But I wish the bill could provide at least some moneys on a matching fund basis for expansion of programs for purchase of land and for construction of buildings.

Now, there are other technical matters which I have listed in the testimony, and I would be glad to speak to them or to answer questions.

Mr. DANIELS. Without objection, Mrs. Mahler, your full statement will be printed in the record at this point. We will assure you that I will bring the statement to the attention of all the members of the committee and see that they read it and list some of the points you are making here today. I want to compliment you on the testimony you have given so far. It is enlightening.

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF THERESA S. MAHLER

Before commenting on the subject bill of today's hearing, H.R. 10572, I believe you might be interested in California's unique day care program, unique in that it is educationally oriented, and now celebrating its 25th year. This program is in addition to day care under the usual auspices of State social welfare, philanthropic groups, and by private persons for profit. For many years, indeed since their inception I have been associated with California's children's centers—until 1965 called child care centers—and am the director of that program, administered by the San Francisco Unified School District. It is a pleasure to be here today and to be able to tell you that the fine thinking that lies behind H.R. 10572 of supplementing day care centers with educational services has been put into practice here on a State-wide basis in the children's centers under the jurisdiction of the State Department of Education.

THE WHY OF CHILDREN'S CENTERS (CHILD CARE CENTERS)

In January, 1943, almost a quarter of a century ago, the California Legislature enacted a measure authorizing the establishment of a State-wide program of child care centers to be administered by the State Department of Education and local school districts. The bill was an urgency measure, adopted to permit the State to avail itself of federal funds which had been appropriated under the Lanham Act to assist communities impacted by the country's defense and war needs. The centers were to provide "care and supervision" for children when such

care and supervision could not be provided in the home because of the employment of the parents in military service or in defense industries. Authority was granted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to establish standards and to issue permits to properly qualified persons who were to be employed in the provision of the "care and supervision."

In September of 1945, after the cessation of hostilities in that war, the federal government announced that the funds were to be withdrawn and the centers closed down as of October 1. But the face of California had already begun to change. Women who had been encouraged to come into the factories and offices to help in the war effort were staying on their jobs for a variety of reasons—mostly because they had to support their families. Leaders in business and industry, concerned over the short supply of labor, and satisfied with their women workers, petitioned the government in Washington to extend the funding until the State Legislature convened in January and could decide whether California as a state would assume fiscal responsibility for the program it had already accepted as a responsibility within the State's educational framework. The government agreed and in January, 1946, the Legislature did take such action, though on a guarded and piecemeal basis.

The original "why" of the "Child Care Centers," renamed "Children's Centers" by the 1965 Legislature, was to provide a safe haven for the children of women needed in the labor force. Since the origin of the program as a service to California's children, other purposes have been incorporated by numerous modifications of the existing legislation. A means-test ceiling was imposed early in the history of the centers, limiting the amount of money a family could earn and still be eligible for the service. These income ceilings have been raised from time to time but are still limiting, especially for two-parent families.

Other exemptions have been written in to allow use of the centers by special groups. For instance, sole parents who earn more than the means-test ceiling may, by paying higher fees on a sliding scale, retain the service providing the total gross income does not rise to more than three times the means-test ceiling. Mothers who wish to continue or complete their education in order to become self-supporting and those who are enrolled in rehabilitation or vocational training classes may also avail themselves of the centers for their children.

Another category of eligibles are children whose parents are receiving public assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program—and even more recently, at the 1965 session of the Legislature, the Act was amended to permit use of the centers, where space is available, for incorporation of pre-school children who, under AB 1331 (the Unruh Act), are eligible for reasons of compensatory education.

HOW DOES THE PROGRAM FUNCTION?

The function of the program is to provide within nursery and school-age centers supervision and instruction for children from two years of age through the elementary school years during the long hours their mothers are at work or are in school. As indicated above, children's centers are under the administration of the State Department of Education and local school districts. Centers may also be operated by county superintendents of schools and this may be done jointly with other agencies. At present there are 274 children's centers in California, of which five programs are operated out of county offices and 56 programs by school districts.

State funds and parent fees on a three-to-one basis provide the major financial support for the children's centers. The State portion comes from a special appropriation and not from the general school fund. In more recent years an increasing number of school districts have made available additional support through local tax levies. Unfortunately, throughout the long years during which the centers have been in operation, no over-all provision has been made by the State for appropriation of moneys for capital outlays, for rehabilitation of facilities, nor for building new centers. A few communities, faced with crisis situations, have used local funds to renovate or replace old buildings.

Somehow, although the program came a-borning, not because of the needs of children, but because of a national defense need, and somehow although the program has moved along on a legislative vehicle that more nearly resembles a Rube Goldberg patchwork conveyance than anything that ingenious cartoonist ever dreamed of, somehow, although from the very beginning the aims and goals as far as children were concerned were only vaguely defined, somehow, since

1946 more than 750,000 children in California and their families, have been exposed to the children's centers and, in one way or another, have felt the impact or been influenced by their experiences in these centers.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHILDREN'S CENTERS

The presence or absence in a community of a children's center certainly makes a difference to the economy, the children, and education itself. The child should come first in our analysis, but let's be very businesslike and think in terms of economics. Earlier I mentioned that this program was first established to bring women into the labor force and was continued after the war because of the still-existing demand for women in business, industry and the professions. There were those who expected that with the end of World War II, women would "go back to their kitchens" and all need for such supplementing services as child care centers would vanish. Available data on women in the labor force points up the fact that more and more of them will be needing day care for their young children.

One of the most outstanding labor force developments in the 1960's has been the ever-increasing proportion of married women, particularly the mothers of pre-school-age children who continue to go into the labor force. Although labor-force rates of married women with children under 6 years have not reached those of wives with older or no school-age children, statistics given in the April, 1968, *Monthly Labor Review*, U.S. Department of Labor, indicates that in March, 1967, 26.5% of mothers in families with children under 6 were in the labor force as compared with only 18.6% in March 1960. Factors affecting the acceleration of movement of women with young children into the labor force are, among others, the demand for labor in the economy, the rising cost of living, and the availability of adequate child-care facilities. It is anticipated that by 1975 California will have 3½ million women workers.¹

In May of this year the State Department of Education estimated, and the estimate was based upon a previous actual survey, that the total earnings of all the parents enrolling their children in the children's centers—and over 80 percent are sole parents—total more than \$49 million per year. Since 95 percent of the families using the centers are eligible under the so-called means-test, their earnings of necessity are spent for life essentials, plowed back into the economy of the State for food, clothing and shelter.

The influence on the community is indeed tremendous, whether we look at the situation from a purely monetary point of view as business lost if all operations grind to a halt, or if we look at it from a mental health point of view. What happens to mothers when, having no other alternative but to work to support their families, they must do eight hours of work each day every day of the year, wondering what is happening to their children because no adequate, affordable program is readily available? The question is not whether there will be or should be day care, but rather what kind of day care?

If every businessman were to tote up the amount of money lost by turnover of good employees simply because these women must struggle endlessly with care of their children by elderly relatives or too young neighborhood adolescents or too non-caring babysitters, possibly a rather good-sized program could be financed just out of the savings effected when women who work can do their work eight hours a day without anxiety or concern about their young ones.

The working woman is apart of our economy. In order to carry on her responsibilities to the community in a wide variety of ways and yet not neglect her primary concern and responsibility to her family, she requires many kinds of services that once were not thought necessary. Parenthetically, day care was thought of years ago, the first day-care program having been established in New York City in 1954 and the first one in California soon thereafter. So there is nothing new under the sun. But children's centers are a service we need more of.

There are other day-care services available in California besides those operated as children's centers. There are private nursery schools and those operated under church and other philanthropic auspices. We are told by the State Department of Social Welfare which licenses such groups that on March 31, 1968, they had some 60,000 children enrolled in 1,697 licensed day nurseries (day care). The uniqueness of the children's centers program is that it is under the jurisdiction of the

¹ California womanpower, State of California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Labor Statistics and Research, July, 1966.

State Department of Education and local school districts. Another unique factor is that service is provided for elementary school children as well as for preschoolers—and this provision is found in very few other programs.

In communities where children's centers are available, many mothers can be removed from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program as soon as they have completed training which enables them to become self-supporting. With more and more money having to be spent in attempts to curb juvenile delinquency, it is worth noting that the initial processing of one delinquent youngster through a youth guidance facility costs more than does children's center service for one child for one year. All of these factors can be evaluated on a monetary basis. It is no longer a debatable fact that business, industry and agriculture must have women workers or grind to a standstill, and it is certainly an acknowledged fact that the availability of children's centers makes it more possible for women to work outside the home in order to maintain or re-establish the economic independence of the family which we believe to be essential to our way of life.

INFLUENCE ON THE CHILD

But what is the impact or influence of the children's centers experience on the children? With the new emphasis on the importance of education in the early years and with more widespread recognition—and acceptance—of the reality of a continuing increase in the numbers of women who must work to support their families, and with the tremendous amounts of federal money now available for new programs for the disadvantaged, there has been a flurry of legislative activity to establish new programs and—hopefully—to expand existing ones. H.R. 10572 is one such legislative vehicle which invokes tremendous interest because it is uniquely an educational proposal in connection with “day care.”

“Day care” in the long ago of 1854 and in some localities still is thought of as a custodial care program which should provide reasonably adequate shelter, food and necessary physical attention for children who cannot be so provided for in their own homes. But this philosophy of considering “day care” or “child care” as being oriented only to provide “care and supervision” of children, with perhaps some educational overtones, is an outmoded concept. Long years of research bearing upon the growth and development of young children and upon the ways in which children learn have led to a more enlightened view. We now know that what the child learns in the earliest years will influence his ability to achieve in other and more difficult learning tasks as he enters upon his formal education. Or conversely, what he fails to learn in the years before 5 or 6 may already have determined that he'll be a failure and a drop-out. Therefore, it is incumbent upon those responsible for any program for young children to see to it that it is oriented around an educational core, whether it be a “children's center” in San Francisco, or a “day care center” in Honolulu, or a “Head Start” center in the deep South, or a parent cooperative preschool in a great church on Riverside Drive.

But the education of young children costs money—it's expensive—because, if these children are to be helped to make the very most of their capacities for learning the so-called “educational process” must be all-involving. Environmental factors of home and family life, health, nutrition, all must become a part of that total process. The young child in any group situation—day care or other—needs “more” of everything—more space, more equipment, more and the best of teachers, more and better supplementary health and community services—if the goal is truly to be that of helping him learn to live adequately and satisfactorily in his society, and to learn to become a dynamic, responsible, contributing member of that society.

That's where H.R. 10572 comes in. There are literally thousands of group programs for children under 6 in our 50 states. Comparatively few—and I have no official statistics to support this—but it would be my considered judgment that comparatively few, aside from federally funded programs such as ESEA pre-kindergartens and Head Start development centers are really adequately funded to provide the kind of rich educational experiences young children need.

We could make a long list of needs for supplementary educational services for young children. Some are listed in H.R. 10572, but one of the major if not THE major need is not provided for, and that is the need for adequate, suitable facilities. We have too long paid lip service to “educational services for young children” and expected such services miraculously to blossom in the barren ground of a store front, a church basement, or the back room of a laundrymat. I'd be the

last to say that children can't learn in such environments, because they do indeed learn. But are they learning what we want them to learn? Are their learnings the kind that will help them build the foundations they need for future learning?

H.R. 10572, if enacted by the Congress, can do much for young children. But I wish it could do more—I wish it could provide at least some funds, perhaps on a matching basis, so that at long last there would be capital outlay for buildings as well as for all the other aspects of fine educational services for our youngest citizens.

This is not "self-serving" for as the measure is now drafted, there are limitations which could preclude participation by California's children's centers.

For example, Section 6(1) states that preference shall be given "to day care centers where the Federal grant will provide the greatest educational and cultural enrichment to children most in need thereof." Could this be interpreted to mean that grants under this Act would be restricted to children of families residing in poverty areas? Families using children's centers are limited by income eligibility requirements but the centers often are located in areas other than designated poverty areas.

Another example: Section 11-(2)B states "a majority of the children involved are aged three to five, inclusive." Our program provides supervision and instruction for children ages two through the elementary school years.

There are other technical questions regarding procedures for determining "broadly representative membership" for the proposed State agency; more specific definition of what is meant by "working mothers"; provision for use of funds for supervision, in-service education and the like to aid in establishing and maintaining educational standards. These and other technical details will no doubt be worked out as further study is given to this forward-looking and far-reaching measure.

We congratulate Mrs. Mink and the co-authors of H.R. 10572 for their interest—and courage—in introducing this measure which could have such tremendous impact on the educational future of thousands of young children in our Nation. And we wish to express our thanks for this opportunity to speak to the measure.

Mr. DANIELS. Now, usually after a witness testifies we follow by asking questions, and I would like to start off the questioning and ask you: What are the number of day-care centers now in operation in the State of California? Can you give this committee any idea?

Mrs. MAHLER. 274 under Children's center program. Now, there are the social welfare day care I mentioned, philanthropically supported day care, and enumerable privately owned day care. I don't know whether Mrs. Anderson might have those figures or not.

Mr. DANIELS. Are these day-care centers licensed?

Mrs. MAHLER. The ones under social welfare are licensed, yes, and the private ones are supposed to be licensed under social welfare.

Mr. DANIELS. So both your public and private centers either for profit or nonprofit all come under the jurisdiction of the State?

Mrs. MAHLER. One way or another.

Mr. DANIELS. And there must be, I presume, certain minimum standards?

Mrs. MAHLER. Right.

Mr. DANIELS. Can you tell us what the important standards are so far as the State is concerned?

Mrs. MAHLER. Well, in the children's centers the person who is doing the teaching must have either a valid California teacher credential or what is called a children's centers permit, which is issued by the office of certification as one standard. There are certain standards for health and safety of children. I notice that you mention standards in the bill, health, safety and sanitation, and I think that this should expand to include standards for educational programs, which raises another question—I know you are supposed to be questioning me—but

another question that is very important, and that is that funds be made available for supervision, because you can't have standards—now, in school districts we are obligated to supervise, but when you are talking about all kinds of programs, and I know my friends in the department of social welfare are very concerned because they don't have enough people to do the kind of supervision they would like to do.

MR. DANIELS. You have made reference to the fact that moneys should be provided for capital outlay, and by that I believe you mean for construction?

MRS. MAHLER. Yes.

MR. DANIELS. Do you feel that this money should come directly from the Federal Government or should be in the nature of a grant or grants to the States?

MRS. MAHLER. I think to the States.

MR. DANIELS. Do you have any particular recommendation along that line?

MRS. MAHLER. Well, I think possibly, as we have had to do in our legislation which we haven't even got through on that basis, that it might be more palatable if it were made on a matching fund basis.

MR. DANIELS. Fifty-fifty?

MRS. MAHLER. Possibly.

I think, and I am speaking very frankly here and I don't mind being quoted, I think that we are too much—not just in California, but everywhere—saying you know, there is this big pot of gold in Washington and I envisioned it sitting up above the Capitol dome with everybody kind of reaching in to get some of the money. And I think if we believe in California or New York or Hawaii that this is a good program and it should be for all children, and not just for certain groups of children, then in the State and in the local districts we should be willing to put out money for it as well as getting supplementary funds. Now, if this be hearsay, so be it. I'm not speaking for the school district; I am speaking for myself.

MR. DANIELS. Now, do you have any specific recommendation to make concerning construction?

MRS. MAHLER. I would recommend that the bill be broadened to do both, that where possible to add on to existing structures, but where this isn't possible, for instance in our Chinatown area you can't hang another child on another hook in any of the elementary schools because of the tremendous influx of people from Hong Kong, and we don't know where we are going to put children in the space that we are using in that elementary school for children center. When you want to reduce class size you have increased enrollment adding on, and it isn't going to work. Somehow we have to find land, purchase and build facilities.

MR. DANIELS. What thoughts have you on the question of equipment? Do you think the child-care centers should have certain equipment which should be standard in each and every one?

MRS. MAHLER. I don't think it should be standard to follow completely a pattern, because the kind of equipment you have is determined to some extent not only by the ages of the children but also by your facilities, space, yard space, and so forth. I think there should be minimum standards, but I am much more concerned with minimum

standards for what goes into the curriculum, so that when we say we're running educational programs we are really doing this.

Now, we have been very fortunate in California because we have been under education. This is not to say we can't improve. And there are other services.

Let me ask you a question this way: If you were going to say, "We only have so much money. Would you rather put it into service, education, supervision, additional educational services or equipment?" I would rather put it over here in the educational services.

Mr. DANIELS. You anticipated my next question, which was: What services would you recommend to be required of day-care centers? Bearing in mind that we are covering children from 2 to 5 years of age; that is, preelementary schoolchildren.

Mrs. MAHLER. Well, I think, and I don't know whether I am going to say these in order of priorities, I think first of all, inasmuch as we must still take teachers with backgrounds from a variety of fields, if we were to try to staff every center in California just with people with California teaching credentials, we couldn't do it. So we take them from related fields. And, of course, in the smaller communities they haven't the advantages the larger cities have. Inservice is more difficult to provide.

I would say first I would try to build up the knowledgeability and sensitivity of teachers of young children. This would be one service.

I would want to have money for supervision, not the kind that sits in the office, but the kind that goes out and works with the teachers to help them to do a better job with children.

I would want to have, in areas where they are not using the special services of school districts such as you mentioned, art, music, and so forth.

I would want these kinds of services. I would want—you know, I'm dreaming now, but you asked me this—I would want money to bring together—there has been a lot of research, and some of it is good and some of it pretty crazy—but I would want money to bring together people who could set out what do we really want to teach these children, what do they need to learn, how can we help them most in these early years? There is so much available knowledge, but all of us who run 48-hour day jobs haven't the time and we haven't the money to pull this together. So this is just touching on some of the area, the tremendous one.

Mr. DANIELS. I don't want to preempt all the time. My two colleagues, I am sure, have questions to ask. But I would like to ask you: Under the laws of the State of California, what agencies of the government have jurisdiction over child care centers and in what manner? From what I have learned yesterday in Los Angeles, this committee visited several child care centers and we were told that they received licenses from the State, but apparently from two different sources. Could you elaborate on that?

Mrs. MAHLER. The children centers—and I have confined most of my remarks to the children centers—are under the State department of education and local school district. Private and philanthropic day care and some day care operated under the 1962 and subsequent amendments of the Social Security Act, are also under the State department of social welfare.

Now, there are Headstart programs which are in essence not day care but some run all day and they are called that, and they are under the, as you know, Office of Economic Opportunity.

You have the preschool program under 1331, which I mentioned, and many of these other programs labeled preschool are under the jurisdiction, as far as channeling of funds and so forth, under the State department, the office of compensatory education, which is an arm of the State department of education.

And if I sound confused, Chairman Daniels, it is only because it is very complex, and even to us who should know all the details, confusing picture. I don't think I will live long enough, but I hope you people will see the day when all educational services for poor children will be under education.

Now, this is not to preclude the contributing services of all other departments, such as health and welfare, but that the educational corps, and again I will say that is why I think this bill is so important, because it can open the door to something very fruitful.

Mr. DANIELS. You would not confine this program merely to the recipients of welfare?

Mrs. MAHLER. No; I would not.

Mr. DANIELS. You would broaden it to include not only welfare recipients but also working mothers?

Mrs. MAHLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to call on my colleague from Hawaii, Congresswoman Mink.

Have you any questions?

Mrs. MINK. Yes; I do.

May I first commend you for your very comprehensive statement and for your obvious knowledge and experience in the field as being presented by consideration of this bill H.R. 10572. I certainly join in your statements with regard to the fact, which is well recognized, that California is a leader in the field of child care services, and that is one of the reasons the subcommittee selected investigation to include California. We are hopeful that we may be able to visit other cities as well, where perhaps no programs are in existence that can come anywhere near the one that has been established for so many years here in California.

One of the points that you raised, which I think perhaps is the most important provision of the bill, calls for the creation of a statewide advisory commission to oversee this program. The reason for the establishment of such a State commission is to try to pull together all the various government agencies and private groups and others in the community interested in preschool education, to come together to at least have a meeting of the minds as to what the needs might be and how the program might be better coordinated within the State.

I would like to ask you whether you think this is possible in the State of California, to bring together all of these groups so that they could work together to implement the purposes of this bill.

Mrs. MAHLER. I think it is possible, Congresswoman Mink, but I think it will take quite a bit of doing. There is an advisory commission having to do with compensatory education programs. I think the California Association for the Education of Young Children—Mrs. Anderson will speak for them—has been doing a fine job of bringing

people together. But I think, and that was a question I was asking you, what were your recommendations for how would you go about choosing membership? Obviously representatives from the three major areas of health, education, and welfare should be on such an advisory committee, as well as people representing private day care. But when you get in the field of private day care, you see there are so many different kinds of it. You have preschool programs even under adult education. But I think that possibly, if you are asking me for a concrete clue or lead, that it would be possible to get some of the people in the State who work together in any way on legislation to sit down and think through: Well, who would be the individuals? Perhaps, regardless of whether they are affiliated with an agency or not, who would make a real contribution.

We have, by the way, in the audience, Dr. Katheryn Landers over here with the white hat on, who is one of the leading specialists, a most eminent specialist, in the field of child education. Well, a person like this could be invaluable in talking about what kinds of education services. How do you go about pulling all these people together? I would hope that we could find a way, all of us.

Mrs. MINK. Has there been any effort in the State to try to bring together the two large areas that now exist, your own child centers and the nursery centers that we visited yesterday that are under your Social Welfare Department? Has there been any effort to bring these two operating groups together so they would be administered by one State agency?

Mrs. MAHLER. This happens in a variety of ways. When Mr. Unruh and other members of the assembly introduced the AB 1331 and we worked on some aspects of it and we were not successful in getting them to make the changes we thought would have improved the measure, the thought was that this program financed with money coming through the Social Security Act and channeled to social welfare and the State money, that this would reach 50,000 or 60,000 more children, and we said then—and it has been proven; I don't want to say I told you so to a man as powerful as Mr. Unruh and his coauthors who were sincere in their efforts—that you can't put 60,000 more or 6,000 more or 600 more children into a program where you have already got them bulging the walls out as long as you don't have money to expand services. Now, they have been expanded in some places under the Unruh Act by leasing buildings, but this was one effort to try to mesh programs. And the Office of Compensatory Education has been very active in pushing for these multifunding of programs.

This presents problems. Mr. Weber, I think, is more competent to speak on this, because he sees it operating from the financial angle.

But I have seen so many things happen in 30 years in this field, Congresswoman Mink, many things which people kept telling me I was crazy, and you can't have that and you can't have tenure for your teacher, one thing and another, it can never be called education because parents pay fees, but these have come to pass so I believe whenever you want to do something—and you must have the same belief or you wouldn't have introduced this bill—that ways could be found to do it.

Mrs. MINK. Are you saying that the laws of California prevent State assistance to the separate nursery centers that are, say, operated

by a church like the one we visited yesterday, the Second Baptist Church has a nursery program going, do the laws of California prevent assistance now to such a program?

Mrs. MAHLER. I wouldn't say so. For instance, a minister calls up and says, "We have a wing of our building that we use for Sunday school. We would like to have a children's center in that wing." Now, if they will meet the requirements, if they will enroll children of all families in the neighborhood, and if this is not to be a religious school and if the State says, "Yes, we have enough money in the pot so you can open one more center," then that State money can be channeled to that facility as well as to one in a public school building.

Now, I know that the head start programs and 1331 are being operated by many kinds of sponsors, so I don't think the law prevents this. Now again, Mr. Weber is closer to that than I am.

Mrs. MINK. How many children do you have in your 274 units?

Mrs. MAHLER. Well, we have about 1,600 in San Francisco, and we usually represent a tenth of the State enrollment.

John, is that about right?

Mr. WEBER. 17,000.

Mrs. MINK. In the entire State?

Mrs. MAHLER. In the entire State, just in the children centers.

Mrs. MINK. Are these preschool children or do these include—

Mrs. MAHLER. Extended day: What you would call extended day we call school age children, elementary school age.

Mrs. MINK. How many of the 17,000 are in this preschool age between 2 and 5?

Mrs. MAHLER. Well again, if you use our program as a sample, about 45 percent between 2 and 5 and 55 percent between kindergarten 4-9 here and about 10-11 years of age. You know, our law says we can take children from 2 to 16. I don't know whoever put that in, because we have never had teenagers in the program. It isn't a practical kind of thing. Maybe someday that will be changed to bring that upper age level to a more realistic say 12 years.

Mrs. MINK. Does California have a compulsory kindergarten program?

Mrs. MAHLER. It isn't compulsory, but children may be enrolled at 4-9. Just at the last session the legislation was changed to lower the compulsory age from 8 to 6.

Mrs. MINK. What percentage of your children are enrolled in the kindergarten program?

Mrs. MAHLER. In the State I would guess almost 100 percent, unless perhaps in rural areas, but almost every parent who can put his or her child enrolls them in kindergarten.

Mrs. MINK. What are the ranges of fees that parents pay for your child centers?

Mrs. MAHLER. Well, that is awfully hard to answer because the fees are determined by the total gross family income—that's without deductions—the size of the family, the number of dependents in the family, and the hours of service. A mother with two children in nursery school age would be more hours than a mother who has one at nursery age and one-third greater, say, who comes before and after school during the school year.

I picked up a few of these, and I don't like to have them quoted because every family is interviewed and it is a different picture.

If we take a sole parent family with a nursery age child earning an income between \$331 and \$363, enrolling that nursery age child for 50 hours a week would be \$9 fee.

Let's say you had five in the family, two school age and two nursery children, that's a mother and four children, the income is between \$364 and \$396, now that mother would be paying \$13.95 a week. You see, she uses less time for the school age children, only 25 hours a week, 50 hours each for the nursery children, and she has a reduced fee for the second, third and fourth child. The rate goes down as low as two cents an hour and on up depending on income.

We just picked these out of the file, because I am usually asked that question. But if you wanted additional information on this, I am sure Mr. Weber has a fee schedule, and we could figure out—see, it would be higher here in San Francisco because our salaries are higher than they would be in Lodi or Porterville, for instance.

Mrs. MINK. In your position have you had an opportunity either to conduct a study or survey or to have seen a survey made comparing your child centers operated by the Department of Education in comparison with those operated outside the Department of Education in terms of their educational content and value?

Mrs. MAHLER. No. I'm so busy, Congresswoman Mink, trying to keep one step ahead of what needs being done in my own district and doing a little consultant work, and I don't know how valuable this kind of a survey would be.

I think the kind of research I pointed out, and I think maybe Mrs. Snyder is going to talk on—one of the kinds of things Mrs. Snyder is going to talk on—one of the kinds of things we want to help all children learn would be more profitable because you could go in this State in our own programs and see the best and the worst. You could visit the 26 centers in San Francisco and maybe you will strike one—I hope it wouldn't be any worse—but it may be a bad day, and how would you compare them with another center?

I think if we look at—why do we want to help children, what must they learn if they are to succeed later on in school, and then say—well, are we doing these things, are we helping children learn? I'm not talking about a structure program where you sit children in chairs for 5 hours and say—now, they have spelling and arithmetic or reading. We are talking here primarily of the very young children.

Mrs. MINK. If your program is reaching 8,500-plus preschool children, and private nurseries are reaching about 60,000, I believe you stated in California—

Mrs. MAHLER. In the day nurseries. Now, I think perhaps Mrs. Gordon—she was not asked to testify and I don't know whether she has the figures with her—but certainly she could get figures for you on how many of the day nurseries are actually day care? This might be a nursery for very young children below age two.

Mrs. MINK. Well, if we assume that this is a figure which includes all ranges of ages in the private area of 60,000 and you combine the two, what percentage of need is being met by your program and theirs?

Mrs. MAHLER. No one knows. I don't think anyone knows because we don't even know in San Francisco. All we can do is take the figures, the national figures, for the numbers of working women. I was going to ask you that: How are you going to compute this? When you say workingwomen, is that all workingwomen, workingwomen with children under 18, or workingwomen with children under 6, or what? All we can do is take those national figures and say, "Well, in San Francisco we know there are more workingwomen because it is a regional center for many large companies," and then we have to apply the formula and say, "We guessed that there are about this many women who have children under 6 or under 12."

All I can say is that each year we keep a record of every inquiry that comes to us either by telephone or out in the centers of people wanting service, and we total those up. And aside from the people who got in, we always have more on the list than are in the centers.

Mr. BURTON. Do the children in the day-care centers receive the benefit of the school lunch, the Federal school lunch or milk programs?

Mrs. MAHLER. Yes, we do; and that has recently been expanded so that we get some benefit for the children below school age. At one time we just got it for school age.

Mr. BURTON. How long has that been the case?

Mrs. MAHLER. Oh, John, when was that changed? Two years ago?

Mr. WEBER. No; it has been more recent, within the last 6 months.

Mrs. MAHLER. We were getting some before that.

Mr. WEBER. They get a monetary return for type A school lunch if they serve one-half of the nutrient requirement in the school lunch. So essentially, it was 5 cents per lunch; and I think, because of the shortage of funds, it has been reduced to 3 cents for public schools, which also includes preschool and school age children centers programs.

Mr. DANIELS. Any other questions, Congressman Burton?

Mr. BURTON. No. Thank you.

Mr. DANIELS. Mrs. Mahler, you indicated in responding to Congresswoman Mink that child day-care centers should not be opened to teenagers, at least you conveyed to me the idea that they should be confined to children of lesser age. Now, is it not true that there are broken homes with parents either divorced, or there is only just one parent supervising the child and the head of the household; the mother of necessity must go to work to support her children. What would we do with the teenager?

Mrs. MAHLER. Well, I quite agree with what you are saying. I did not mean to imply that they should not be welcomed. I believe I said that they have never served teenagers, partly because of the program but mostly again of the facilities.

If you will visit our program here, for instance, or many other areas, you will see that it is tailored for younger children. There is no reason why, if money were available and facilities could be expanded, that you couldn't build a program which would meet the needs. It is needed.

Mr. DANIELS. The point you are making is there is not enough money in the program? You would need a lot more money?

Mrs. MAHLER. You would need a lot more money to do the things you might like to do.

It's interesting it costs in San Francisco—I don't know about elsewhere—it costs between \$1,500 and \$1,800 to process one child through youth guidance. Now, this is not the monthly service, but to process one child, which is more than the total cost of the State of one child in the children's centers, which I would guess, would run between a \$1,000 and \$1,200.

Mr. DANIELS. For what period of time?

Mrs. MAHLER. For a year's service in the public school framework.

Mr. DANIELS. Mrs. Mahler, I want to thank you on behalf of the committee for coming here this morning and giving us the benefit of your views.

Mrs. MAHLER. Thank you for asking me. This is one of the few committees I really enjoyed testifying before.

Mr. DANIELS. Our next witness is Mrs. Marian P. Anderson, president of the California Association for the Education of Young Children.

TESTIMONY OF MARIAN P. ANDERSON, PRESIDENT, CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION FOR THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN, BRODERICK, CALIF.

Mrs. ANDERSON. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. I feel somewhat at home since the first legislative body I ever spoke at, more years ago than I care to remember, was before the Assembly Social Welfare Committee when Congressman Burton was chairman. Possibly Congresswoman Mink knows Dr. Cramer at the University of Hawaii who was my professor, and two of the coauthors of the bill are well known to me. One of them is my own Congressman, Mr. Leggett. The other is Mr. Moss, who is the Congressman of Sacramento where I am employed.

It is a real pleasure to be able to speak for a bill that is forward thinking and it does not divide children up into care and education.

I cannot help but respond to some of the previous questions. One reason that we have not drawn together the programs a bit more in California is that no one in State government has the responsibility for collecting any facts and figures. Another reason is that there is this division of thinking, that care is one thing and education is another thing, and many people who are in policymaking decisions are not yet sophisticated enough in their thinking about these programs to see that they are really all intimately connected.

Mr. DANIELS. May I interrupt at this point?

Where do you think we should focus our attention?

Mrs. ANDERSON. I have some recommendations in my report. I think that one of the things that might help is the wording in section V on the establishment of a State commission. I don't have the bill with me. But it says something to the effect that the State either designate or create an agency which shall be the State commission.

This would not help us a bit in California, because there would not be any State agency which is broadly representative. I would like to suggest that instead—this is on page 2 of my testimony about the middle of the page:

Any State which wishes to participate in the grant program under this act shall designate or establish a state agency to administer this program. If the designated agency is not the State's Department of Public Instruction, the state

commission shall have the authority to contract with, or otherwise secure educational services from the State Department of Public Instruction. The state commission shall have as part of its administration a Day Care Educational Services Commission * * *.

I would like it to be not just advisory. I feel it should have some really administrative functions. Then the commission could be broadly representative of the State agencies concerned with day care and other groups and organizations.

Some of the members should also be the same members who serve on the State department of social welfare day-care advisory committee which is required under the Social Security Act. I feel that in California this is the only way we can do this.

One of the responsibilities of this commission could be to do some studying, to do collecting of facts and information. The association that I represent is actually doing the only research that I know of. We are spending approximately \$50 million of public funds in California on various kinds of programs of pre-school-age children, and even with this, to me, tremendous investment, there is not yet any drawing together.

One of your questions earlier was how this might be accomplished. It is being accomplished through the professional people themselves in the lower echelons. But there is no legislative intent or no legislative assistance yet in doing this. I'm not sure we want to do it completely.

But there is overlapping, especially in a school district that has—in the chart on the back page everything on the left-hand side of the page is under the department of education. A school district could use a total of, I think, six different funds to sponsor preschool programs, and this inevitably leads to waste in terms of writing applications, and having to keep separate pools of money, this kind of thing.

There is a possibility that we could have some kind of a commission just below the Governor's office. All the agencies except education report to the Governor's agency on health and welfare. It is kind of a super agency in California. But we have an elected superintendent of instruction, so this leaves education out. And until you can get the two together some way, you just are never going to be able to draw them all together. I have given a great deal of thought to this and yet I still haven't come out with any clear-cut answer.

I would like to point out that in addition to education that sponsors day-care programs, and the department of social welfare, we also have day-care facilities for physically handicapped children licensed by the department of public health, for the mentally handicapped and emotionally handicapped children by the department of mental hygiene, and migrant day-care programs under the Governor's office. It is OEO, but it is administered separately from Headstart.

In California—I'm not sure whether this is a legal opinion or how this decision came about—but agencies, State agencies which license and/or operate day care do not have to have a department of social welfare license.

So actually, there are five State departments in this picture in California, and I am most concerned that the ones in public health and mental hygiene in the Governor's office be included in any kind of legislation, because they, the public health and hygiene, use hospital stand-

ards. They do not have the minimum standards for education and social services and so on that we have. It is extremely unfortunate to divide children up in this way.

Mrs. MINK. May I say that the intent of section V is for each State to put together such a commission that you are describing. It does not contemplate using one existing agency as the commission which will determine how the money is to be spent in any particular State. The language calls for the State designating or establishing for the purposes of this act an agency which is broadly representative. Then it will be the responsibility of leaders such as yourself to insist that all of the various groups interested in preschool education be included in the overall commission. It is not merely advisory. Section V provides that once such an agency is established that it will administer this program, that it will establish the criteria and standards for determining how the grants ought to be distributed and awarded to the various governments and agencies within the State. And it would also be responsible for reviewing all of the applications and for giving an opportunity for a hearing to those applicants whose grants have been disapproved. So the intent of section V is to try to bring together all of these groups that are interested, both public and private, so that we can have for the first time some sort of a working central agency within each of the States to put together all of the programs, both public and private, Headstart and all of the other groups that are now involved, and to make this agency then the central agency for administering the funds that are provided under this act. I think we are trying to meet those points that you have so well stated.

Mrs. ANDERSON. I am delighted that this is the case. I do feel that a little bit of change in the wording would make it easier, because an agency is not usually broadly representative. Do you see what I mean? Please take this in consideration.

I think that, of course, it is likely that if this bill is enacted that there will be State legislation required, and then it is our fight. I know I am well aware of this. However, you could make our job immeasurably easier if you would require that funds be equally available for application to all State agencies licensing and/or administering group programs for young children.

Along with some of the very powerful people in the legislature we also have some very narrowed-minded ones who know only one program or feel very strongly about one situation or another, and we are still likely to end up with a good part of our programs left out. I know this is the situation in other States also where there is more than one State agency involved.

I would like to comment briefly on your supplementary educational services and equipment section, which is in section XI. Mrs. Mahler used the term "supervision." I think I have pretty much used the term "consultation" throughout.

It is my experience that we need to have in our State departments broader kinds of personnel. It hasn't seemed to be possible up to now at any rate, for example, for children centers to have someone who is skilled in social services attached to their department. I think this is probably the thriftiest operation in the whole United States. Mr. Weber is only working halftime on a program this large.

And, at the same time, I would like to see in the department of social welfare and the department of mental hygiene and the department of public health and the Governor's office of economic opportunity for migrant programs someone who is skilled in the education of young children and child development. And if it were possible for the definition to include this kind of sharing of staff among agencies, maybe this again is something that can be worked out in State plan.

I have also recommended that the definition include planned sequences of inservice education. I'm not sure now that that is the proper term. Perhaps "staff development" would be a better term. Equipment, supplies are very, very important. However, I have visited the day-care centers, and if you have visited long enough you will find them too where all the supplies are stacked up in a cupboard and have been there ever since the center opened because there is no one on the staff who knows how to use them. And I have also visited centers which the sandbox is kept closed because the children fight when they are in the sandbox. So this points out how very important it is that the staff know how to use equipment with children and how to supervise children. This will require consultation.

Most of the people—well, everyone I will say, that works in these programs are well meaning, they are capable of changing, they are capable of growing, and if it is offered to them in a way that does not make them feel uneasy, they will do a very fine job in making use of any kind of services that are available.

I would like to recommend one more thing, that in California the State department of social welfare through the county welfare departments can purchase care for certain categories of children. It is listed under the county welfare departments on my chart. They can purchase day care for families who are poor, have retarded children, who are migrant farmers, or who have specified training programs in private licensed agencies. This means then that, in effect, they are receiving public funds for the care of those particular children.

So I think it is most important for this legislation to have the greatest impact in California that your definition of "nonprofit" be extended to include facilities receiving public funds, Federal, State, or county funds, for care of children. I know this is a difficult one to get to, but you see you will be leaving some of the agencies that are not in need of this kind of a bill if we don't define it, make some slight change in the definition here.

I do not know if other States have this provision, but in California the State department of social welfare through the county purchases care.

I appreciate this opportunity to represent the California Association for the Education of Young Children (CAEYC) before your committee as it considers this positive measure. CAEYC is an affiliate of the National Association for the Education of Young Children from which you have already heard testimony. The purpose of CAEYC is to " * * * encourage the study, interpretation, and improvement of the education and general well-being of young children, to improve and increase professional standards and opportunities of their teachers, and to cooperate with other groups having compatible purposes." The more than 2,500 CAEYC members in our 40-year-old association represent every

kind of out-of-home group program for young children in California. Many are staff members in day-care programs. The chart attached to this testimony shows the complicated structure and administration of such programs in California.

In California, an educational component in day care is listed in the manual the department of social welfare used for licensing facilities. Education as a main focus of the children's centers operated for 25 years by local school districts through the State department of education was legislatively recognized a few years ago.

Newer programs, especially OEO day care programs stressing Head-start components, also acknowledge the importance of early education. It is self-evident to those of us who work with young children that care and education cannot be separated, any more than the child himself can be divided. Outstanding educational programs are provided in day care by some individuals and agencies in California. However, overall, educational services for children in all day programs in California need to be expanded and strengthened.

It is encouraging to find legislation such as H.R. 10572 containing concepts and funding which seeks to end the dichotomizing of education and care in programs for young children. H.R. 10572 could have a positive effect on children in many of California's day care programs. The following suggestions are offered as a means to strengthen the bill and make it most useful in California.

SECTION 5

(a) It is essential that the State commission have authority to deal with a number of existing State agencies. In California, major day care programs are administered by both the State department of education and the State department of social welfare with three other State agencies involved in smaller programs. The State commission in California should help draw together programs, rather than separate them. I recognize that this may be a task for State legislation. The task would be easier if the meaning of lines 14 through 17 were clarified. In California no single agency would be "broadly representative of public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups." The wording might be somewhat as follows: Any State which wishes to participate in the grant program under this act shall designate or establish a State agency to administer this program. If the designated agency is not the State's department of public instruction, the State commission shall have the authority to contract with, or otherwise secure educational services from the State department of public instruction. The State commission shall have as part of its administration a day care educational services commission which is broadly representative of State agencies concerned with day care public and private nonprofit day care staff, child education groups and organizations, and others concerned with day care. Some of the members of the day care education service commission shall also serve on the State department of social welfare's day care advisory committee as required by Public Law 90-248.

(b) Require that funds be equally available by application to all State agencies licensing and/or administering 8 hours or longer group programs for young children.

SECTION 11

(a) Extend the definition in (1) of "supplementary educational services and equipment" to include consultation to or placement of staff within State agencies licensing and/or administering day-care programs. Include planned sequences of in-service education.

(b) In California, child welfare services funds administered by the State department of social welfare and by county welfare departments can be used to purchase day care from private (proprietary) facilities. In addition to nonprofit, extend the definition of (2) "Child day-care center" to include facilities receiving public funds—Federal, State, or county—for care of children. Include education as one of the purposes of centers along with care, guidance, and supervision.

(c) Add day-care educational services commission in these definitions.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you, Mrs. Anderson, for a very fine statement.

The organization which you head, known as the California Association for the Education of Young Children, is that a private or State organization, and if private, is it a private nonprofit organization?

Mrs. ANDERSON. Yes. We are a private nonprofit educational and charitable organization, because we give some scholarship funds.

Mr. DANIELS. And the membership is open to the general public?

Mrs. ANDERSON. Yes. To anyone who is interested in young children. Our staff members are members in every kind of public programs in California, everything that is on this page and probably a few others besides.

We are an arm of the National Association for Education of Young Children.

Mr. DANIELS. Are you employed in any capacity by the State of California in the educational area?

Mrs. ANDERSON. Not at the present. I worked with the State department of compensatory education at the time that the Unruh programs went into effect. But I am a private citizen in my capacity in which I speak to you.

Mr. DANIELS. You have displayed a wealth of knowledge on the subject matter. That's the reason that prompted me to ask that question.

You testified that various agencies of the State deal in one type of program or another. Would you recommend that the activities of these various agencies of the State be coordinated and come under the jurisdiction of one department?

Mrs. ANDERSON. I have given it some thought. I would rather see a commission of some type be established to administer standards and to pool funds at a level above these various departments. I think that every program in this State should meet a certain minimum standard, and that is not the case at present.

Mr. DANIELS. Does the State of California, after it issues a license to a child care center, whether it be under the social program or the educational program, make any attempt to inspect the centers to see that their health and safety requirements are upheld?

Mrs. ANDERSON. In the department of social welfare the licenses are renewed annually, and this includes what might be called an inspection service, although the people in the department of social welfare ter-

tainly do not like that term. They would like to think it is more than just an inspection.

Mr. DANIELS. Is it just an inspection made prior to the renewal of the license?

Mrs. ANDERSON. They have the authority to enter facilities at any time.

Mr. DANIELS. So it is a continuing inspection?

Mrs. ANDERSON. Yes, it is continual. But you may have heard we have had some cutbacks in State funds or State programs, especially welfare in California, and their staff is greatly reduced. They, themselves, are the first to say that they can nowhere near meet the needs that exist. This is why your bill offers us some hope that can be improved.

Mr. DANIELS. Now, as to those day care centers coming under the jurisdiction of the department of education, does the same problem exist there, too?

Mrs. ANDERSON. They are under the supervision of either a principal or county superintendent of schools, and there is an ongoing kind of evaluation and inspection at all times. However, as Mrs. Mahler said, they have many building problems and space problems in terms of not having available buildings.

You see, all the proliferation of all the different programs keeps eating up space, so people literally are using closets and other facilities.

Mr. DANIELS. So inasmuch as they come under the jurisdiction of the local school district, you will find a variation of day care centers and child centers from place to place?

Mrs. ANDERSON. That's right; yes.

Mr. DANIELS. Should a Federal preschool division be established under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare? What would you recommend with respect to attention being focused either on education, social welfare, or any other particular area?

Mrs. ANDERSON. That is a difficult question. I hope that such a division is established. I hope that it deals with the whole age level of early childhood education, not with just—when we say this, we mean ages approximately 3 to 8. Children before 3 are better off in family-like situations in most cases.

I think that education has logically a very large piece of this, and so possibly education is the focus, because anything and everything that happens to the children happens around the classroom, or around the living space if it is an all-day program because it is more than a classroom, it is their actual living space and home away from home. So what happens to that child in that group depends upon all this range of services that come in from outside. We need social welfare in the picture. We need them to be involved, and this is why perhaps combining the two in some way is the best.

Mr. DANIELS. Well, the point that I was trying to make is this: Should the primary focus of this legislation be on education; should it be cultural; should it be welfare in this age group from 2 to 5? Now, with your experience in this field what would you recommend to this committee?

Mrs. ANDERSON. I will try to answer it directly, but I am not sure I can.

There is more deprivation of a child's intellectual growth that cannot be remediated after a certain point, or up to a certain point. A child whose intellectual capacities are not fully developed when he is a preschool age is greatly handicapped perhaps the rest of his life.

Now, a part of his intellectual development depends upon his health and his nutrition, so you can't separate that completely.

The social development that a child achieves is also a very important one, but this seems not to be so damaged by deprivation and a sterile custodial programs as the physical and intellectual capacities are, because people can see the need for keeping children warm and clean and fed. I think the focus at this point needs to be on the educational component.

Mr. DANIELS. Well, you would coordinate all of these activities, I take it?

Mrs. ANDERSON. It just has to be, because you can't divide the child up. Part of him can't go one place for help and the other part someplace else. It all has to take place in one physical spot.

There are different ways of doing this. One is pooling money. The other is sharing staff. There are different ways to achieve it. But the important thing is it has to be done to have a really topnotch program.

Mr. DANIELS. What part do you think the parent ought to take in the operation of these day care centers?

Mrs. ANDERSON. I am delighted you brought this up. I felt this was something that was left out of my program. I think that one of the reasons we have the variety and the vitality programs that we have in California is because of the tremendous parent involvement.

As important as it is to give education to the children in the classroom, it is going to have not a great deal of carryover effect unless the parents are also involved.

Now, the new Federal social security amendments require parent participation, and the department of social welfare had hearings the day before yesterday on establishing advisory committees, half of which shall be parents for both the local and the State advisory committee.

I think that they can be involved in a variety of ways. One, in the administration through concurring on the director, the hiring of the director, through meetings and conferences, having someone available to discuss their children with them.

I think probably you have run into the same problems I do in legislation. People cannot focus on the legislation long enough to even determine what it is about. Their immediate reaction is: Aren't we encouraging women to go to work, little kiddies should be home with their mothers, or that mothers should be watching them even if they are in the lettuce field.

So part of the way parents should be involved in the childhood education is in the classroom with their children as much as possible. If this is not possible, if they are working, then they should have freedom to be involved with the staff members as much as possible.

Day care is not the answer for every situation. If a woman has had a fight with her husband and walks or he walks out and she goes out and gets a job, maybe what she needs is another kind of counseling. Maybe day care isn't what she needs.

Mr. DANIELS. Psychology?

Mrs. ANDERSON. Something. I'm not sure I'll say what. But day care isn't the answer for everyone.

Mr. DANIELS. Inasmuch as you approve of the idea of education playing an important part in these child day-care centers, do you feel that the standards should be established as to minimum requirements of the personnel engaged to work and to operate these things?

Mrs. ANDERSON. Absolutely. Now, we are finally after many years moving in this direction in California. It is a long, slow haul, because whenever we talk about standards we immediately threaten the parent image that each of us has, and our immediate reaction is that, well, my wife could do that job very well, I think it's partly our lack of sophistication in realizing that group programs for children require a different level of skills and knowledge than foster day care. Foster day care you fit a child into your family. In this program you create an entirely different environment with different adults of different children of different ages. I think that there is a tremendous resistance to the establishment of the standards. However, we have to think of it in terms of becoming and not what is, and I think that it is perfectly reasonable to require that the person in charge, the person totally in charge, have some skill and knowledge. I think it is also reasonable to expect those who have not yet achieved this to be working on it.

In California we have a very active junior college 2-year program. Unfortunately, they are not yet focused on day-care aspects completely of the childhood education. But we have good basic programs under-way.

Then you immediately get into whether or not certification should be required. We do have something like five credentials and permits under which people can work, but you can get any one of them and not know anything about young children. So there is a definite need for establishing a flexible standard toward people who can be expected to move at a reasonable rate. Our association is very interested in this, and this has been a focus of their interest for a long time.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you very much.

Congresswoman Mink, any questions?

Mrs. MINK. No questions.

Mr. BURTON. No questions.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that her entire statement be inserted in the record.

Mr. DANIELS. Without objection, her statement will be inserted preceding her questions and answers.

Our next witness is Mrs. Phyllis Lair, president of the San Francisco Parents' Association for Children's Centers.

TESTIMONY OF PHYLLIS LAIR, PRESIDENT, SAN FRANCISCO PARENTS' ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN'S CENTERS, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mrs. LAIR. Chairman Daniels, I would like to ask Mr. Taylor, our public relations representative for the State of California, to join me

Mr. DANIELS. Do you have a prepared statement, Mrs. Lair?

Mrs. LAIR. Yes; I do.

Mr. DANIELS. All right, Mrs. Lair. You may proceed.

Do you desire to testify, sir?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I would.

Mr. DANIELS. For the purpose of the record, Mrs. Lair, will you identify the gentleman who accompanies you here?

Mrs. LAIR. Chairman Daniels, this is Mr. Dave Taylor. He is our public relations representative for the State of California representing the State council.

Mr. DANIELS. All right. You may proceed in any manner you desire. If you want to read your statement, you may do so, or you may offer the statement for the record.

Mrs. LAIR. I would like to preface my written statement with a word, that I represent the parents' association, and we are very actively engaged in both legislative measures and in the overall picture here in San Francisco of child centers.

Mr. DANIELS. Without objection, your statement will be incorporated in the record at this point.

(The statement follows:)

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF MRS. LAIR

Twenty-five years ago, the children centers were established in California to provide necessary day care for mothers occupied in the war effort. Since then, they have provided for the needs of an ever growing concern. Over the span of twenty-five years, the needs have grown, in more than one area. In view of our steadily more sophisticated society, the needs of our children have changed. No longer should a mother be satisfied with just a safe place for her child, while she earns the daily bread. The changing world around us demands that our children adjust at a younger age. He must learn to coordinate daily life with the sophisticated machinery, new math, expanded vocabulary and the expedient rate of the changing world. In order to do this it is important to provide for the child in addition to a safe environment, a challenging one. Programs, such as those offered through the California Children's Centers answer these needs.

Briefly I will outline some experiences we have benefited from through our affiliation with the centers.

1. Centers provide environment for the child's safety, physical needs, and emotional development.

2. It provides through education the benefit of new experiences, both within the confines of the center and outside contacts. Field trips outside the center provide a knowledge of the child's surroundings, as simple as a gopher hole in the park, to the complexities of Far Eastern art, at a nearby museum. Perhaps, just a visit to the tea gardens to broaden the child's understanding of another culture.

3. He is encouraged by trained and interested teachers to broaden his world with records, books, visual aids or just a simple cardboard box, to create and develop his imagination.

Throughout the existence of the centers, a constant problem plagues the administration and parents. Funds are never sufficient and often threatened to facilitate the existing centers and complete new structures, so desperately needed. Our parents association keeps a close contact with our state and social representatives, in hope we can persuade them to remember the important needs these centers provide. Many of our parents who are fighting so hard to stay off the welfare rolls and provide a stimulating atmosphere for their children, would be forced to return to the welfare rolls, should the centers cease to exist.

I deeply feel the desperate need for these children to be provided with a safe, cultural and organized program. To develop interests and patterns to be carried forward in life keeping the children off the streets and out of the juvenile courts. Our main concern as parents and interested citizens, is the development of a secure and worthwhile future of our children, the future of our country rests in such programs, as are offered through facilities as the child care programs. To entrust my child's future in less capable hands is to deny him his right as a completely versatile and responsible future American.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you.

Mr. Taylor, you may proceed now.

Mr. TAYLOR. As I was reading Mrs. Lair's statement it occurred to me that perhaps it would be nice to add a footnote. It's on a very personal scale, but it should be added, I thought, because I didn't realize myself until I was reading it that 25 years ago when these centers were established I was a product of these centers. I am a product of a broken home. I had the benefit of the children's centers as I was growing up for a span of years.

And also, after I had decided that I would return to school after the age of 28, it would have been impossible more for me to have done so had it not been for the children's centers.

I don't know for what it's worth, perhaps it is not possible to measure how you have grown as a result of the influence of children centers, but I know for sure I wouldn't be able to be in the position of considering perhaps going on to a Ph. D. today had it not been for the benefits of such a program. Perhaps our family as a young boy would not be together today had it not been for such a program.

As a result, I realize a very special obligation to the community that has made such a vehicle available to me. And it is with no element of transaction or no element of obligation that I feel I must become involved in this program to whatever level I can, and that is why I have become involved, my wife has become involved, Mrs. Lair has been involved in the parents for children's centers. And to advocate and promote the mission that is so pure, so good and so perfect in that it deals with children, we must do as much as we possibly can to bring this to whomever will listen. And the fact that you have a major bill before the Congress of the United States makes it well worth while to me and to all those concerned who care and who feel any obligation or any sense of community.

Mr. DANIELS. I want to commend you for your enthusiasm and your spirit as well as your support of this legislation.

Mrs. MINK. I certainly want to join with the chairman in both of your statements and your most personal testimony to the value of these centers which I have come to realize and appreciate. Thank you.

Mr. BURTON. I would like to echo the remarks of my two colleagues.

Mr. DANIELS. Our next witness is Mr. John R. Weber, supervisor, Children's Centers Services, State Department of Education, Sacramento, California.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN R. WEBER, SUPERVISOR, CHILDREN'S CENTERS SERVICES, STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Mr. WEBER. Chairman Daniels, Congresswoman Mink, Congressman Burton, I am John Weber, State department of education. I have been associated with the department for 22 years now and I have been intensely involved with this program from the very time I started with it, and I have a rather lengthy testimony, so I am going to just throw this out a little bit and maybe talk to two or three different points I think are pertinent to the discussion we are having today.

Mr. DANIELS. Without objection, then, your statement will be printed in the record at this point.

(The statement follows:)

PREPARED TESTIMONY OF JOHN R. WEBER

California's child care program (redefined as Children's Centers by the 1965 Legislature), and the interest of the State in the program, is unique. There is in this nation no similar program. Nowhere in the nation has the state taken an interest in both control and support for children's centers, and nowhere else in the nation is a children's centers program tied so closely to the public schools. These two facts make the program unique.

In January of 1943 the California Legislature passed a bill permitting the establishment of child care centers by school districts. The bill was an urgency measure, becoming effective immediately, and provided that the governing board of a school district might establish and maintain child care centers to care for and supervise children when such care and supervision could not be provided in the home because of the employment of the parents. The centers established under this initial authority were supported by parent fees and federal funds. Authority was granted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction to establish standards for child care centers and to issue permits to properly qualified persons to be employed in child care centers.

Federal support for child care centers ended in California on February 28, 1946. The Legislature made two appropriations (Stats. 1946, Ch. 35 and Stats. 1947, Ch. 7) to support operation of child care centers from March 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, without change in the basic law. In 1947 child care legislation was enacted with major changes. One of the most significant program modifications was made by the California Legislature in 1965 when the title of the Act was changed from "Child Care Centers" to Children's Centers and also the legislative intent was changed from "providing care and supervision" to "providing supervision and instruction for children".

It is interesting to note that the action of the Legislature in 1943 was to authorize the operation of child care centers by school districts, indicating that such care can best be provided by school districts. There are a number of reasons why such a decision was made:

"1. The school is the community institution accepted by all people as a center for child care.

"2. The school has budgeting and auditing facilities which can immediately take over the receipt and expenditures of the necessary funds.

"3. The school has in many instances suitable housing and playgrounds for the school-age program or has established standards for facilities upon the basis of which adequate situations may be selected.

"4. The school has personnel trained in the understanding and care of children. These persons can assist in organizing and supervising the program and can help in the training of additional personnel.

"5. Some school systems have already had experience in organizing preschool centers; in carrying on the health, protection, and training program appropriate to preschool children. Recreation programs have also been conducted in connection with schools."¹

PROGRAM ADVANCES SINCE 1943

The following program advances for children's centers have been made during the past twenty-five years:

1. Clarification of eligibility for use of services and "financial means test" of families.

2. Determination of priority for use—use by exempt groups.

3. Recognition of special need for single parent families—adoption of sliding fee scale.

4. Standardization of fee schedule by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

5. Objective method of apportioning State funds—determination of the extent of State support—authorization of district by use of district taxes to provide program in excess of minimum provided by fees and State support.

6. Children's center employees made members of the State Employees' Retirement System.

7. Regulations adopted by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, now in effect, have raised the standards required of professional children's centers employees.

¹ *California Program for the Care of Children of Working Parents*, vol. XII, No. 6, Aug. 1943, Calif. State Dept. of Educ., pp. 12-13.

8. Pupil accounting procedures have been simplified and the payment of State support for absence due to illness has been established.

9. The State Department of Education has passed responsibility for administration to local districts.

10. The program has become permanent.

11. Children's center personnel responsible for the supervision and instruction of children have been given professional status.

12. The function of children's centers has been redefined to "provide supervision and instruction."

NEW CHALLENGES

Senate Bill 740, passed by the 1959 Legislature (Ch. 2096), foresaw the importance of children's center services as they apply to the physically handicapped and mentally retarded child. Authorization was granted for the establishment of such centers on a pilot basis to determine their effectiveness in providing relief for State institutions that must now ultimately enroll such children, and at the same time continue home and parental contact for these minors.

These centers, retitled Development Centers for Handicapped Minors, have served to not only relieve State expense and parental pressure but have provided benefits to children and families never before realized. From the original two pilot centers the program has now expanded to 27 centers.

Assembly Bill 1281 (Chapter 1717, Statutes of 1965), permits the use of children's centers by disadvantaged preschool-age children for a preschool educational period not to exceed four hours daily when the family is certified by a county welfare department.

The above legislative act also authorizes service for children of A.F.D.C. recipients who are receiving training or instruction in order to develop work skills for entrance into employment. Six hundred sixty (660) families are currently enrolling nine hundred forty-five (945) children in the centers under this eligibility.

PROBLEMS WHICH NEED SOLVING

Even after 25 years of operation this unique Children's Center Program is still "young" as a social institution but, as one leading educator has said, "It has persisted, has outlived its original purpose, and is now fulfilling a need in our present-day social and economic structure." But there are problems to be faced and to be solved.

Buildings, many of a temporary nature, and others which have outlived their safety and usefulness as centers, will have to be replaced. The need for children's centers where there are no such facilities available will have to be viewed as a part of the total problem of providing adequate services for children and families of our exploding population.

There is a growing demand in all fields that those who work with children, especially with young children, have better educational preparation. Ultimately, this cannot help but result in more adequate compensation and professional recognition for the teachers in the children's centers. No doubt these goals will be achieved, as progress has come about in the last two decades, through gradual evolution.

FUNDS AND ENROLLMENT

Today, California's Children's Centers Program maintained by school districts and county superintendents expends about 18.5 million dollars annually. About 67 per cent of this total comes from State sources, 20 per cent from parent fees, and the remaining 13 per cent from district taxes levied for children's centers purposes and from miscellaneous sources.

There are presently 278 children's centers administered by 53 school districts and 5 county superintendents of schools in 22 out of the 58 counties, which provide supervision and instruction for 17,000 children daily, from two years of age through the elementary school years before and after school and during vacation periods, during the long hours their parents work. The centers are open 12 hours a day, five days a week, 52 weeks a year.

Attendance has increased in children's centers each year during the last five at a greater rate than regular school population has increased. The increase in

1967-68 is greater than any previous year with the establishment of 37 new centers. The State Department of Education has received requests from school agencies to establish 57 new centers this next fiscal year.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The income for support of the Children's Centers Program is derived from five sources: State support, parents' fees, general fund of the district, a permissive children's centers tax levied by some districts, and miscellaneous income.

Prior to 1951, income for Children's Centers Programs was derived almost entirely from parent fees and State support. During the next several years, an increasing number of districts it necessary to supplement these two major sources of income.

Prior to 1951, income for Children's Centers Programs was derived almost entirely from parent fees and State support. During the next several years, an increasing number of districts found it necessary to supplement these two major sources of income and currently fourteen districts require some additional means of support. In 1967-68 districts have levied children's center override taxes in the amount of \$4,012,962.

FOUNDATION GUARANTEE

The basic combination of parent fees and State support has been commonly referred to as the "Hourly Foundation Guarantee".

A formula was devised and enacted into law July 1, 1951, which guaranteed an hourly foundation program based on a 2:1 ratio of State support and parents' fees. At the 1967 legislative session the "hourly guarantee" was increased to fifty-six cents (\$.56) and the ratio of State support and parents fees was modified to $\frac{3}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{4}$.

During the 1967 legislative session the Legislature passed A.B. 272 (Chapter 1209, Statutes of 1967) which provided a fifty per cent (50%) increase in hourly State support from twenty-eight to forty-two cents an hour for children's centers and funds for expansion of program plus \$100,000 was appropriated to the State Department of Education to apportion to school districts and county superintendents for preoperational costs of newly approved centers including but not limited to preoperational salaries, leasing or renovation of facilities, and purchase of equipment and supplies.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction has approved thirty-seven additional children's centers this fiscal year out of the current appropriation of \$11,490,202.

CHILDREN'S CENTER PROGRAM

The Children's Centers Program operates eleven to twelve hours daily, five days a week, fifty-two weeks a year, for children from two years of age through the elementary school grades. The program is designed to provide supervision and instruction appropriate to the age of the child. Provision is made for a strong nutrition (hot noon lunch and mid-morning and afternoon snacks) and health program based on the individual child's needs. Excerpts from the California Administration Code, Title 5, Education, "Standards for Children's Centers" are contained in Section 7916.

7916. (a) The day for children in the children's center shall take into account the stages of child development, the ways in which children learn, and the ages of the children in the program. The curriculum shall be designed to provide a planned social, educational, and physical environment in which each child can grow to his fullest potential. The objectives of the curriculum are—

- (1) To promote and protect the child's physical health;
- (2) To promote emotional stability;
- (3) To encourage the development of self-identity;
- (4) To create an environment in which each child may participate as an individual within the group;
- (5) To provide social experiences which will stimulate a sense of personal responsibility and an awareness of the rights of others;
- (6) To provide a wide range of creative experiences;
- (7) To encourage the development of language and conceptual skills;
- (8) To help the child develop habits which lead to effective learning;

(9) To offer a variety of experiences that will satisfy and stimulate the child's curiosity about the world around him; and

(10) To help parents achieve increased understanding of children and of their parental role.

(b) The before-and-after-school and vacation program for school-age children shall be designed to meet the above program objectives but shall also take into consideration the following special needs and experiences of school-age children:

(1) To increase the child's range of experiences, interests and his skills: physical, social, emotional, and intellectual; and

(2) To extend and supplement the learning experiences of the home, the classroom, and the community.

CERTIFICATION OF STAFF

The California Education Code defines the work of the teacher in a children's center as the "supervision and instruction" of children, the term "instruction" placing it without question in an educational framework. The Children's Centers Program from its inception has been supervised by the State Department of Education and under the jurisdiction of local boards of education. Standards for the program are established by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and implemented through the children's center permit structure with specified educational preparation for teacher and supervisory personnel. (See attachment—Permit Authorizing Service in Instruction in Children's Centers.)

The education of an individual is the product of his interaction with all the factors of his environment from birth throughout life. It does not begin with entrance into public school nor is it confined to classroom instruction. The period, however, of greatest and most rapid learning in life—learning which most profoundly affects all later development—is that of infancy and early childhood. Goodwin Watson, Professor of Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, recently stated, "The average child achieves about half his total mental growth by the age of five." The level of learning that occurs during these highly impressionable years is dependent to a great extent upon those who control and shape the child's environment. In a children's center this person is the teacher. It is not enough for this teacher to like and protect the children for whom she is responsible; she also must recognize growth readiness in the child and create an environment in which appropriate learning may take place.

For children's center teachers of preschool children, the area of specialization is nursery education; the teacher of school-age children might appropriately major in child development or psychology, with special emphasis on the middle years of childhood. All children's center teachers need courses in the family in today's culture, the dynamics of parent-child-teacher relationships, mental hygiene, social and economic pressures affecting families, and the personal and professional development of the teacher. A broad general education is as necessary for this teacher of children in children's centers who works with staff, parents, school personnel and community as it is for the classroom teacher.

BENEFITS

The benefits of the children's centers program during the World War II and the period of defense activity following the war were largely seen as an increase in workers in essential industries during an emergency. Since that period, other benefits—not temporary in nature but continuing and extremely worthwhile to our way of life—have become evident. These worthwhile benefits constitute the major reasons of the Department of Education for supporting and continuing the program:

1. *Opportunity for Self-Support.*—By far the largest percentage (over 80 percent) of children enrolled in centers are from single parent homes, and generally the supporting parent is the mother. The children's center allows the mother to be gainfully employed, independently and with initiative supporting herself and the family. She is not dependent upon government aid for support of herself and her children. The encouragement of self-dependent should not be lessened. The problem of the self-respecting, sole parent with one or more children to support will be with us always.

2. *Strengthening of Family Life.*—There is no doubt that the availability of children's centers enhances a fundamental purpose of our society—that of reinforcing and maintaining family life. When children must be excluded from centers, and particularly where there is a sole parent who must work, there

is no alternative but to send the children to a far-distant place for care, or to attempt to place them in a foster home, which of course destroys the family unit. The statement of one parent to the Senate Interim Committee makes the point more clearly than I could:

"Before I came to California, I lived in Boston, Massachusetts, and I had the same problem. I went to every organization I could find in Boston, including religious, state, and city groups. Not one person knew of any way I could work and have my children live with me.

"I took what savings I had and brought one of my children with me to California in the hope that there would be some way here. Within a month I found the Alexandria Public Child Care Center and sent for my other son to be with me.

"The facilities of the child care center allow me to earn a living, to pay towards the care of my two children, to have them with me every day and to give them the advantages of the best possible training, educational and health programs. In my circumstances, it is the help that makes the impossible, possible."*

3. *Juvenile Delinquency Control.*—Juvenile delinquency is a continuing and a pressing problem. The organized care and supervision of children of working mothers—in place of the sometimes haphazard care received at the hands of neighbors and relatives—is surely a factor in preventing delinquency. The children in children's centers are not roaming the streets unsupervised.

4. *Change in the Place of Women in Business and Industry.*—Trends and data both reveal that working women are becoming an increasingly large proportion of the labor force. There should no longer be any question that working mothers are a permanent and essential part of the economy of the State and that their continued work is a necessary contribution to our expanding economic life. In return for this contribution, the question may appropriately be asked, "Does the State have an obligation to insure that the children of these mothers shall grow into good and responsible citizens, and to free these mothers from worry as to the care and supervision the children will receive when they are at work?"

5. *Fiscal Interest of the State in Continuance of the Program.*—The load on the Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and other support programs, would be increased greatly were sole parents denied the opportunity to work.

A true assessment of the past contributions of Children's Centers services and their potential prospects as a force in the expanding social and economic aspects of society in our State will surely lead to a firm determination that continued support of the Children's Centers Program is highly justified.

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, BUREAU OF TEACHER EDUCATION AND CERTIFICATION

PERMIT AUTHORIZING SERVICE IN INSTRUCTION IN CHILDREN'S CENTERS¹

An applicant for the instructional permit for service in a children's center shall present—

(a) Verification of

- (1) Bachelor's or higher degree from an approved institution and
- (2) one of the following:

(A) a degree major in—

anthropology
child development
child psychology
early childhood education
family life education
home economics education with emphasis on child
development or family life education or both
nursery education
psychology
sociology
other appropriate behavioral sciences

- (B) Twelve semester hours of course work selected from a field or fields listed in Section (A) above except anthropology and sociology.

(b) Postponement of requirements.

*Report of the Senate Interim Committee on Social Welfare, Part Six, *The Child Care Center Program, Senate of the State of California*, 1955, p. 57.

¹ A summary adapted from California Education Code and Administrative Code, Title 5.

An instructional permit may be issued once for a two-year period to an applicant who verifies one of the following:

- (1) A bachelor's or higher degree from an approved institution
- (2) Both of the following:
 - (A) Sixty semester hours of course work including at least 12 semester hours selected from a field or fields listed under Section (a)(2)(A) above except anthropology and sociology.
 - (B) Two years² of successful experience as an assistant under a teacher or supervisor in preschool educational programs or as a teacher in a preschool program operated by a public or private school agency or in a licensed day nursery as defined in³ California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7930.

Term and Renewal

An instructional permit shall be issued for a two-year period and may be renewed as follows:

(a) When issued under subsection (a) above the permit shall be renewed for life upon formal application (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7932) and verification of a year of successful experience within the two years immediately preceding application in any program for which a children's center permit is required by the California Education Code.

(b) When issued on postponement the permit shall be valid for a two-year period and may be renewed for successive two-year periods upon formal application (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7932) and completion of four semester hours toward requirements under subsection (a)(2).

Authorization

An instructional permit authorizes supervision and instruction of children in a children's center.

A valid California regular kindergarten-primary, general elementary or standard teaching credential with specialization in elementary teaching is deemed to be a children's center permit authorizing—

- (a) supervision and instruction of children, or
- (b) supervision of any number of children's centers in a children's center program.

Permits for Persons Employed on September 15, 1961

An appropriate regular children's center permit valid for life shall be issued to an applicant who was employed on September 15, 1961, and for the three consecutive years immediately preceding that date in a child care program in a position pertaining to the supervision and instruction or supervision of a child care program.

Such an applicant must file formal application as defined in California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7932 and meet other requirements under California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7939. Such permit shall be stamped "Issued pursuant to California Education Code, Section 16625.3".

Permits Issued Before But Expiring After October 21, 1966

Regular or provisional permits issued before but expiring after October 21, 1966, may be renewed in accordance with regulations in effect immediately prior to October 21, 1966. When an applicant holding a valid provisional permit issued previous to October 21, 1966, completes all requirements for the regular permit in effect immediately prior to October 21, 1966, he may be issued the regular permit which was effective until October 21, 1966. Regular or provisional permits issued or renewed in accordance with the above regulations shall carry a notation that the permit was issued or renewed under provisions of California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7940.

²A "year of experience" means paid or volunteer service in a licensed day nursery for not less than three hours a day for at least 100 working days. This may be accumulated over a period of five fiscal years.

³"Day nursery" means any type of group day care program for children operated by a person, association, or organization holding a license or permit to conduct the day nursery issued by the state in which the day nursery is maintained. Group day care programs include but are not limited to the following: day nurseries for the children of working mothers; (2) nursery schools for children under the minimum age for admission to public schools; (3) parent-cooperative nursery schools; (4) play groups for preschool children; and (5) programs giving after-school care to school children.

PERMIT AUTHORIZING SERVICE IN INSTRUCTION IN CHILDREN'S CENTERS¹

An applicant for the provisional instructional permit shall verify one of the following:

- (a) Sixty semester hours of course work.
- (b) One year² of successful experience as an assistant under a teacher or supervisor in preschool educational programs or as a teacher of public or private preschool program or a licensed day nursery (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7930)³ and one of the following:

- (1) Thirty semester hours of course work.
- (2) Completion of a college or university program in preschool education approved by the State Board of Education.
- (3) Current enrollment⁴ in a four year college or junior college program acceptable toward a bachelor's degree.
- (c) Four years² of successful experience as an assistant under a teacher or supervisor in preschool educational programs or as a teacher in a public or private preschool program or in a licensed day nursery as defined in California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7930.³
- (d) Verification of a provisional permit previously held and completion of 4 semester hours of course work completed since issuance of this previous permit in courses selected from—

- Child development
- Child psychology
- Early childhood education
- Family life education
- Home economics education with emphasis on child development or family life education or both
- Nursery education
- Psychology

Term and Renewal

The provisional instructional permit may be issued prior to January 1, 1972, but not thereafter and shall be valid for two years. It may be renewed for successive two-year periods upon formal application (California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7932) and—

- (a) Verification of a year of successful experience performed under authorization of the document during the preceding two-year period; or
- (b) Verification of completion of four semester hours of course work during preceding two-year period in a field or fields listed in subsection (d) above until he has completed 12 semester hours in such field or fields.

Authorization

A provisional instructional permit authorizes supervision and instruction of children.

A valid California regular kindergarten-primary, general elementary or standard teaching credential with specialization in elementary teaching is deemed to be a children's center permit authorizing—

- (a) supervision and instruction of children, or
- (b) supervision of any number of children's centers in a children's center program.

Permits for Persons Employed on September 15, 1961

An appropriate regular children's center permit valid for life shall be issued to an applicant who was employed on September 15, 1961, and for the three consecutive years immediately preceding that date in a child care program in a position

¹ A summary adapted from California Education Code and Administrative Code, Title 5.

² A "year of experience" means paid or volunteer service in a licensed day nursery for not less than three hours a day for at least 100 working days. This may be accumulated over a period of five fiscal years.

³ "Day nursery" means any type of group day care program for children operated by a person, association, or organization holding a license or permit to conduct the day nursery issued by the state in which the day nursery is maintained. Group day care programs include but are not limited to the following: (1) day nurseries for the children of working mothers; (2) nursery schools for children under the minimum age for admission to public schools; (3) parent-cooperative nursery schools; (4) play groups for preschool children; and (5) programs giving after-school care to school children.

⁴ Current enrollment must be verified by a letter from the registrar of the institution.

pertaining to the supervision and instruction of children or supervision of a child care program.

Such an applicant must file formal application as defined in California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7932 and meet other requirements under California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7939. Such permit shall be stamped "Issued pursuant to California Education Code, Section 16625.3".

Permits Issued Before But Expiring After October 21, 1966

Regular or provisional permits issued before but expiring after October 21, 1966, may be renewed in accordance with regulations in effect immediately prior to October 21, 1966. When an applicant holding a valid provisional permit issued previous to October 21, 1966, completes all requirements for the regular permit in effect immediately prior to October 21, 1966, he may be issued the regular permit which was effective until October 21, 1966. Regular or provisional permits issued or renewed in accordance with the above regulations shall carry a notation that the permit was issued or renewed under provisions of California Administrative Code, Title 5, Section 7940.

Mr. DANIELS. You may proceed then, Mr. Weber.

Mr. WEBER. I would like to start out in saying—I wanted to make one or two points, but first, I am simply enthusiastic about having through legislative means some sort of a commission or a body which would have legal authority to do the things that we have not been able to do in California. Mrs. Mahler indicated the complexity of the programs. Mrs. Anderson again showed you this long sheet. I think there is a great amount of work done cooperatively, and perhaps coordinatedly among State agencies, and was indicated perhaps by people at a lower echelon that perhaps it has not been able to accomplish many of the things we would like to see happen in California.

It is true the program started here in California in 1943. I think it is unique in the fact that nowhere in the Nation, nowhere in the State, has there been a continuing interest in the control and support of programs, and nowhere else in the Nation have they been so closely connected to the public schools of our State or our Nation. I think these two facts really make the program very unique here in California.

We know there are many things yet to be done, and I think we might just as a note here—it's interesting to note—that way back in 1943 when the legislature did authorize the operation of centers by school districts, and since that time that has been expanded to also include county superintendents of schools in our more sparsely populated areas of the State, that there are a number of reasons why they made this—"The school is a community institution accepted by all people as a center for child care."

The school has budgeting and auditing facilities which can immediately take over the receipt and expenditure of necessary funds. The school has in many instances, and I say many but not all, suitable houses and playgrounds for school-age programs or has established standards for facilities upon the basis of which there would be adequate—that is, adequate housing could be selected.

The school has personnel trained in the understanding and care of children. These persons can assist in organizing and supervising programs and can help in the training of additional personnel. Many school districts have already had experience in organized preschool centers in carrying on the help and the protection program appropriate to preschool children. Recreation programs have also been conducted in connection with schools.

There have been many program advances. They are on page 2, and I will not go into them.

We have had a couple of challenges within recent years. One of them was back in 1959 in which we had found we had throughout the State quite a few number of children who were severely either mentally or physically handicapped. There were about 150 of these children. Some of them were nonambulatory, some in wheelchairs, blind, deaf. And the district directors indicated so much enthusiasm for what was happening to these children which had not been able to be accomplished in special education programs, that a joint committee of the senate and the assembly decided to investigate this, and as a result of it there was a program called child care centers for mentally retarded and physically handicapped. We have retitled that now, and I have a responsibility to this program also, which is the development center for handicapped minors.

These essentially are children who were originally in the center not necessarily because the mother was working, but in many instances she was working so it was a long day program. But it went further than that. It provided some experiences for very young children who could not accomplish an educational program in a regular school.

Now, in 1965 we also amended in the Children Center Act a provision that rather recently also there was authorization by the legislature to provide supervision and instruction for children of some of AFDC families—these are aid to families with dependent children—who either the parent was receiving instruction or training or she might have had such a limited budget that she needed an augmentation of that, and this was granted through a county welfare budget. We have today some 2,340 of these children out of about 17,000 enrollment in the centers.

Then, if we were going to go to the other end of the spectrum, we also—this program does not quite do all the things I believe you are proposing in yours; in other words, without any means test. We do have a financial means-test program, and the majority of the children and families, about 95 percent, come within a financial means test, which was indicated earlier.

There are also some exceptions for exemptions to these means tests, and these were because of a recruitment problem; in other words, a societal need. There were not enough teachers in California, and many times they could come with the teacher but she had no place to put her child. There was no day care or nursery school, private care, or anything else, so they were exempted from the means test. Likewise, public school registered nurses.

And at the time of the Korean war they said anyone in an essential industry necessary for the mobilization of defense. So there are about 5 percent of the total population of the centers who do come from these exempt categories.

The legislature expanded or amended the program to make it possible for certain mothers who could not supervise the child in the home to be able to use the centers. This is an example of maybe it is a two-parent family, the mother is working but the father is going to school. His training was interrupted by his service commitment. And so this family was eligible. Or the single parent or the sole parent mother is eligible to receive instruction or training so she can

come with work skills to get into employment. And then there were certain others that, where the parent was either physically or mentally incapacitated, or perhaps both parents, that they could make use of the centers.

The two problems which have been indicated which still need serving: One is housing, which I am not going to touch on too much except that there is dearth of public school housing in California, there are very few empty classrooms; even with the Public Law 874, Federal support in impacted areas, there is very little housing. There are no classroom facilities. I think I can say period to that.

Then the other major problem is a continuing upgrading of professional preparation for the people who teach in these children centers, and for that matter, any and all of the preschool programs, private day care and otherwise programs throughout the State.

I think it has been mentioned that we do have some 17,000 children to program. We operate around the clock. I should say we operate 10 to 12 hours a day in the centers, 52 weeks a year with the exception of national holidays. The children are provided a very good nutritional intake. About 75 percent of all the nutritional intake comes for these children in the centers, which consists of a hot noon meal, a mid-morning snack, a midafternoon snack and even in some instances the children are served breakfast. Now, the breakfast is not part of the standard service for which the parent faces a fee, but the others are included as part of the service, plus some health components and the instructional and supervision programs.

I think I could say a great deal about the staff requirements—

Mr. DANIELS. Before you go to that, sir, what hours of the day are the centers open?

Mr. WEBER. Normally from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Mr. DANIELS. How many days a week?

Mr. WEBER. All, with the exception of one district, operate 5 days a week. We have had some requests lately to consider, and this again is at the option of the administering agency; that is, the public school district. The reason that they went from the 6-day to 5-day program, in most instances they were only having about a third of the normal number of children in the centers, and from an economic standpoint it was impossible to provide this service for the sixth day on the basis of so few children needing it.

Mr. DANIELS. Now, in spite of the summer vacation period you still operate the centers during the summer?

Mr. WEBER. This is right. And the children who are of school age who normally come before school and after school during the school year, these children are usually there all day.

Mr. DANIELS. You say your center population amounts to 17,000 now in the San Francisco School District?

Mr. WEBER. This is statewide.

Mr. DANIELS. The entire State of California?

Mr. WEBER. Right. Over the past 25 years about three-quarters of a million children have had experiences or exposure in these centers.

Mr. DANIELS. Some experts believe that the primary focus or attention on child day care centers or nurseries should be the health and welfare protection of the child rather than directing such focus or

attention to their education, recreation, culture. I would like to have your comments on that question because of your involvement in the educational program in this State.

Mr. WEBER. Well, I was one that felt very strongly, and voiced my thoughts, that this is not an either/or program, nor is any long day program just that.

I think one of the welcome things that came out of the Social Security Agency on Education at the national level was a statement in which they concurred that this program was not either one of education or of care, that it was all of the integral parts that had to fit in together to make a well-rounded child, or even for that matter, the family. So there is a better overall adjustment to the family of its needs in society. And coming from the field of education I feel very strongly that these other integral parts must be woven into a good program, a good parent educational program, a strong parent involvement. There also must be health protection, not only physical, but mental as well, and there also must be some social services involved.

Very few districts actually have had as much of this as we would like to see it happen in California, because the State guaranteed income per child-hour-of-attendance is not large enough to accommodate this. And even with some—a few districts have put in an override tax—there is still not enough funds to do this. I feel very strongly that this is, as one of the prior speakers mentioned, placed logically and correctly in education. I would think if there were a commission that someone from the Department of Education should have a very strong role in this.

I concur that some of the things you have commented on, that if we are going to really achieve better coordination and this whole cooperative enterprise of State agencies, we are going to have to go at it perhaps in the way of a commission. And I have seen two or three commissions in California that are staffed at some sort of intermediate level, and I find that really instead of this person or this commission perhaps being a head knocker and saying "Let's get together and join the team and let's work together collectively" it just hasn't worked out that way. So I think somewhere at the State hierarchy that there would have to be a commission that would have some enforcement powers and things I think you have commented on.

Mr. DANIELS. I didn't want to interrupt the manner in which you intended to proceed with your testimony, but do you anywhere comment upon the administration of a nursery or day care center, or had you contemplated doing so?

Mr. WEBER. Well, you mean the overall administration?

Mr. DANIELS. The overall administration. How should it be operated, what should be the qualifications of a person in charge, if it deals with education what the qualifications will be of the instructors and those assisting the instructors such as trainees in this program, and what should be the minimum number of personnel in such a center?

Mr. WEBER. You have given me quite a bit to try to get back to the committee. I think first off I have, and I will just cite the page—

Mr. DANIELS. Suppose you proceed in the way you intended to.

Mr. WEBER. I was just going to say that we have in our administrative code, we have our curriculum or the program objectives in which they list most of the objectives. In fact, I suspect, and I know for a fact,

that most of the program objectives that came out of the other preschool programs came from the objectives that we have in our curriculum in children centers.

As far as the staff certification, on the very back page of our testimony here I have a document, or a piece of paper, which it isn't too simply written. But it attempts to explain the present staffing, that is the professional requirements of staff people, and it starts out with a bachelor's degree—first off with a credential merely in kindergarten primary or general elementary may be used in lieu of a permit. Then we go from a regular permit that has an A.B. degree requirement and 12-semester hours in the field of early childhood education, child development, or any of the behavioral sciences. In other words, this parent must have completed a bachelor's degree and have had these 12-semester hours in the field of early childhood education to receive a clear permit.

Now, because of the recruitment problems here in the State we have moved down to a lower type of permit, which is called a provisional permit. This provisional permit—there are three tracks in which you can secure a provisional permit. One is that you have 2 years of college work. The second is that you have had 1 year of college work and 1 year of experience in a licensed facility, licensed by an appropriate State agency from any State. The third track is the one who has had 4 years of experience in nursery schools, preschool programs, again which have been licensed by an appropriate State agency.

So these are basically the professional requirements for staff. I think we would be the first to say that they are probably low. We would like to see a major in childhood education.

Now, I would like to go then to the other part of the question which you asked me: What about aides and assistants?

Again, here we have provision in the education code which permits the use of an aide or assistant under a qualified permit or credential holder in the center. And our ratios would be pretty much the same as you would find in a headstart program or one of the Unruh preschool acts.

We staff a little differently. We weight it a little more since we have 2-year-olds as well as 3-year-olds, usually in groups, and the other preschool programs do start at 3 years of age. So the 2's and 3's have a heavier staffing. Probably where there is a single teacher, no aide or assistant, there would be about one adult to six to eight children.

Our whole concept is a small group operation, and we found from our experiences in kindergarten in California, we are moving from the 30—even in the primary grades—we are moving down to the bonuses in a district, if they have a lower staffing ratio.

Now, the 4- and 5-year-olds we probably would staff—the district would staff with about one adult to 10 children.

Now, with the school age children, which would include the kindergarten children on up to the primary, and even the upper years, in other words to the elementary grades, probably about one adult to 20 children.

Now, some of the districts where they are having a second pair of hands, which is, namely, an assistant or an aide, in other words, the aide or the assistant requires no professional preparation. They are

required to have a physical examination, fingerprinted, TB test so that they are not carriers of contagious diseases. But we think, and I personally think, that we are coming to the point not only in preschool programs but in public education where we are making a much greater use of the terra professional or the one who will be learning on the job who is under good supervision. And again, I think this is extremely important. I think I would say, too, and this at the fear of stepping on some people's toes, that the children center program has—well, the other preschool programs that are operated by public agencies have adopted the same professional requirements.

The privately licensed ones, not to say that many of them have just as high qualified personnel, they do not have in writing anything that requires any professional preparation, although it is my understanding at the present time that they are working toward some minimum standards for staff teachers who will be in private programs. And I think this is coming about as a result of the 1967 social security amendment, in which I understand—in fact, there are two people from education and, I think, a group of 10 from California that are going to be testifying or working with a small work committee in Los Angeles next week as a result of the social security amendments under the WIN program.

Mrs. MINK. May I ask a few questions following this presentation on the staff?

We visited a center yesterday in Los Angeles where the State was involved in a training program of primarily mothers in the low-income group, giving them training and experience hopefully to qualify them for employment in a preschool setting.

Now, supposing a mother from a low-income family does complete one of these training sessions. Would she qualify in any of your programs as an instructor?

Mr. WEBER. If she had no college background preparation—

Mrs. MINK. Let's assume she does not.

Mr. WEBER. I think the answer would be no, not as a teacher. I use the word "teacher" in quotes. These are people who are deemed to be certificated by the State Department of Education or by the legislature. She could, however, in a period of not too long a period of time, she could qualify to become a teacher and secure a provisional type permit. It would take her some time to work on the job, some apprenticeship training, I guess you might say, and eventually she would. And this is one of the strengths of the way we have structured the permits, in that it does provide for employment under people who have expertise in working with young children, and eventually after she has—and hopefully she is going to take some junior college or college units—she will move up the ladder in the sense of qualification. So, if she had no college preparation, she would have to serve 4 years as an assistant teacher.

Mrs. MINK. Is this 4 years as an assistant in order to become a teacher in your children centers or in any nursery day care program in the State of California?

Mr. WEBER. Only those programs where public funds are in the picture. In other words, the Unruh Preschool Act, which is strictly a 3 to 4 hour day program requires the same permit qualifications. If it is a Headstart program and it is not operated by a school district,

the answer is "No." They have made their own rules on that and there are no necessary requirements professionalwise for staff personnel.

Mrs. MINK. What about, say, a church nursery?

Mr. WEBER. Well, when we get into the whole field of private licensing, unless public funds move into this church to establish a program or operate the program, the answer is: No, there are no requirements other than they say the director and the teacher should be mature. This is about the extent of it.

Mr. DANIELS. Do you think certain private day care centers should have greater supervision?

Mr. WEBER. I think if we are talking about young children and we are talking about group care and supervision, the answer is: There should be some kind of inservice education for all adults who work with young children. I don't think it is just enough that you are warm and love little kids and you had a boy scout troop or something like that.

Mr. DANIELS. I think health and safety requirements should also be imposed, because some places may not employ the strict standards.

Mr. WEBER. I think the State of California has very adequate and high standards for all of the physical characteristics, the housing safety and all of these kinds of things.

Mr. DANIELS. Even supervising those that are operated by churches and private agencies?

Mr. WEBER. They are required to be licensed by the State department of social welfare. Any program which has six or more children in it is required to have a State license to operate that facility. The only ones that are not required to go through this procedure are those authorized, administered, and operated by public schools here in California.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Weber, it seems very inconsistent to me that a nursery center licensed by the department of social welfare has no specific licensing requirements for its staff or teachers or instructors, and yet under your standard in which you would employ a teacher one of the ways in which you may be authorized to become a teacher is to merely have taught 4 years in a nursery center which was licensed by the department of social welfare which had no standard.

Mr. WEBER. Well, I certainly did not mean to imply that most private nursery schools are not good ones. I think the exception is very small, because I think the State department of social welfare does a good job of supervision. A lot of it is in inservice training. Most of them are very competitive with other private nurseries, because the parent is paying a fee for service and she demands good service. And I think the people that are running the program—I'm not talking about the fly by night; there are a few of those—but I think the average private nursery school is doing a good job. They have access to funds because most of these families are in the higher income categories and they can afford to pay for service and they demand it. So I think this pitch was made—this last way of getting a provisional permit was put in after we had about four rather heated meetings with the State board of education, and there were those that were coming up through some of the poverty programs and said, "Look, you have left us out entirely."

So we felt it was a ladder, we felt there was protection there if they served under another qualified adult. In other words, you would have maybe a group of 4-or 5-year olds, and maybe there would be 12 children in the group but there will be this second person who is never there with the children by herself, or technically she is not supposed to be, and always works under the direction of the qualified person.

Mrs. MINK. Don't misunderstand me. I think that this provision of yours of allowing certification, or at least instructional permit because of 4 years' experience in a private nursery or in a noneducational licensed nursery, is an excellent one. Supposing we admit that 90 percent of these nursery day care centers licensed under social welfare are staffed adequately and do meet the general requirements which you have set forth for your own staff, why has it not been possible to have the department of social welfare under the department of education get together and establish uniform staff requirements for licensing purposes so that at least in this one very critical area there can be a meeting of minds? The reason for my making this inquiry is that one of the sections of the bill calls for standards. And if it is not possible within the local situation here such as the State of California for agencies that are working together to establish standards when they are really close together, how can we hope in a national program that we can get a meeting of minds as to what the standards ought to be?

Mr. WEBER. Well, I think to very briefly put it in a few words, there has been an advisory committee by the State Department of Social Welfare on day care, the licensing standards—I mean, the staffing standards, and this started some 8 or 10 years ago, and I sat, and a couple of other members in the audience sat on that committee and the total committee along with the person from Social Welfare agreed that this was good. Then it got higher upstairs and somebody said, "Well, we really can't enforce these standards because maybe there is a nursery over in Alpine County and there is no way they can get to a junior college or any training institution." So we said, "Well, this isn't a problem. Let's say that anybody that is 50 miles away from a university, a higher education institution, we will exclude that." But I think now the thing has come clear around, and along with the advent of the WIN program, that they are now—and I think this is what this meeting next week will be about—they are talking about setting up acceptable national standards, and I think California is going to have to come up and have something in black and white to do the same things. This is why I say I still think too that California has not done a good job in bringing together agencies who are intensely interested period. People in social welfare are just as interested in education about children, and we have not come together. Therefore, we have a crazy set of standards here, or no standards. And yet everyone we talk to says, "Well, this is the basic minimum standard we should have in any program administered or supervised by any department in the State." And hopefully, we are moving in that direction.

Mr. DANIELS. If I may interrupt, I would like to say: yesterday we were in Los Angeles, and we visited several day-care centers, some under the jurisdiction of the Department of Welfare and some

under the Department of Education, and there is a vast difference between the two. So hopefully, we would like to see standards established, that we have them on a high plain and everybody working together.

Mr. WEBER. I think it is absolutely a must that we have to have some sort of a minimum standard in any State, and I think at the national level there certainly can be this kind of arrangement worked out too.

I have two questions and concerns in the proposed legislation.

I don't think I noticed anything in the bill that sets up any kind of a means test eligibility. In other words, this would be wide open. I think we would like to go that way in California and simply have a parent pay a larger cost of the service. As it is now, it is not available to all families in California. I think the idea is an excellent one. I think it has some problems maybe to get people to go with the using of public funds.

And I don't think I noted anywhere about any payment for service by the recipient. I don't know whether you contemplated that or not. I would just remark this: as far as the California program, I think we feel the whole strength in the program, the philosophy of it, is that this is a taxpayer's program and not a taxpayer program. In other words, each parent does make a contribution.

I would like to say the way the fees work, which is a little different than Mrs. Mahler indicated, that we have a statewide fee schedule which is required for participation, and those incomes which are very low and very large families pay as little as 2 or 3 cents an hour for a child. The family that is able to afford more, just like our Federal income tax, pays a higher hourly fee until it gets up to, essentially, 56 cents an hour. So we have a sliding scale of fees based on the family's ability. And we also engineered a thing for larger families that have more than one child in the center. We permit the second child to come in on a payment of half the hourly fee of the first child. We feel very strongly, or I do personally, that there should be some individual family initiative to make some of the cost of the program, because this is over and above the public education program.

Mr. DANIELS. Would you care to comment as to having this wide open to the general public or limiting the program?

Mr. WEBER. I have been involved too legislatively for sometime here in California preparing legislation, and we always get the hangup that well, you know, this is public money. Why should we be supporting people who can buy a service from private enterprise? Of course, the concept of this program is in general to provide services for low income families and not—with a couple of exceptions that I made because of society's needs for teachers and nurses—not to subsidize them. But actually what happens as far as our exempt categories, the family may use the service, the only difference being they pay the total cost. So that there is no cost to the taxpayer in California. And I think this maybe is not a bad principle.

I would like to see services for all families who need it, but I just think you may come into a financial hangup in getting a bill through.

Mr. DANIELS. Putting aside the question of space and financial limitations, what would you consider the advantages and disadvan-

tages of upgrading day-care centers through the following: (1) public schools, (2) private schools, (3) nonprofit agencies, (4) industry, (5) through joint management and labor organizations. Would you care to comment on that?

Mr. WEBER. I would say that the need will be so great and the resources will be so little in terms of facilities which are available, and money to buy additional facilities or build facilities, that I think all of these agencies will share a very major role in providing this service. And I think the only thing we have to do is to have some standard so that regardless of whether it is a labor-management thing or private nursery or a church, that they have to meet some minimum professional requirements for staff.

Mr. DANIELS. I take it then from your answer that you would have a total involvement of all these groups?

Mr. WEBER. I think so.

Mr. DANIELS. With the standards being established?

Mr. WEBER. Right.

Mr. DANIELS. Please continue.

Mr. WEBER. Schools aren't large enough to cope with all the problems, and they are screaming already they have too many. I think we are just beginning to see the possibility of private enterprise going in.

I might give you just an interesting example of this. I was up in South Tahoe where they do some gambling just across the border in Nevada, and their concern up there is for the young children of the mothers who work at the gaming tables. I said, "This isn't a bad idea, to have Harrah and some of the clubs take a look at this and build you facilities." These people all live in California but work in Nevada. This may be one answer to it.

I think this is true in other parts of the State, to get involved with private enterprise to at least come in on a share of the expense on building facilities, providing facilities.

I just want to say I have been very appreciative, being invited here. It has been a wonderful experience. I think it is something that is needed. I am sure if more of it is needed in California than we can serve now, that it is probably needed in other areas that don't have very much to offer.

We are right now trying to get another \$4 million out of the legislature, \$2 million for capital construction and then \$1,800,000 to be able to operate these newly constructed centers if the bill goes through.

I think California has shown an interest in continuing concern about this program, and I think this is why it has been around for 25 years, because it has been a pretty solid program.

Mr. DANIELS. That is why this committee is here, because of your experience with this program.

I want to say to you that I enjoyed listening to you. You have been very, very helpful in the ideas that you have expressed here this morning, so on behalf of the committee I would like to commend you for your very constructive testimony.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much.

Mr. DANIELS. Our next witness is Mrs. Dorothy K. Snyder, director of the Los Angeles Children's Centers, Los Angeles.

**TESTIMONY OF DOROTHY K. SNYDER, DIRECTOR, LOS ANGELES
CHILDREN'S CENTERS, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.**

Mrs. SNYDER. Chairman Daniels and the members of the committee, I am Dorothy Snyder, director of Children's Centers, Los Angeles City Schools.

I would like to begin by saying we are living in the space age. We won't find that on your comments; but, listening and being the last person to speak, I believe gives me an opportunity to rebuttal on several items.

I have written, and would like to comment, mainly about Los Angeles, because that is what I know.

You mentioned you visited centers in Los Angeles. I am quite familiar with the Second Baptist Church facility and the other three under that program. And you mentioned you had been able to visit some under the department of education. I wondered if Los Angeles might have been fortunate enough to have a visit from you yesterday or was it another program in the county, another school district?

Mr. DANIELS. I will furnish you with a list of the places we were.

Mrs. SNYDER. Thank you. I would like that.

Interprise does not have a children's center. They have the same program as the Second Baptist Church, same State training program. I am very familiar with the Interprise program. I think it is a good one. I am glad you got to visit that one.

Before I comment on these statements here, I would like to say something regarding these four training programs. We hire aides from these four centers where they have had training. We are fortunate enough that the psychologist who has done much of the training for these four centers also is a part-time psychologist for Los Angeles city. So the philosophy that we would like to have expounded for the children in Los Angeles sort of gets to us two ways, and we feel fortunate that this is so.

We hire their aide trainees. We have 95 aides in Los Angeles at the moment, and about a third of them come from this training program.

We reserve the right to do our own training on top of that, but we pay them during the time they do this.

I am very pleased that you were able to visit the two, especially the Second Baptist and the other school district.

In Los Angeles we have 79 children centers, and they provide early childhood education for 4,200 prekindergarten children and an augmented instructional program for 2,100 kindergarten through sixth-grade children. Twenty-eight centers are in the designated poverty areas of Los Angeles. The remainder are located at other elementary sites which have real need of a program for sole parents who are working and other eligible families. All of the centers have fantastic waiting lists. A 2-year delay before being enrolled is not at all unusual. Facilities run the gauntlet. We have some old World War II bungalows, temporary buildings, and we have been using them for 25 years; and some new modern buildings especially planned for children's centers with district tax money over and above the State apportionment and family fees. About 4,700 families are represented by the 6,300 children enrolled, 4,500 being sole parents.

Requests for enrollment in the centers come from all areas: Ethnic, economic, and geographical.

Eligibility is prescribed by State law, keeping within a framework of moderate to low incomes.

Last week 625 children enrolled were "aid to dependent children" recipients; 183 parents of these children were in training for employment programs.

The statistics show excellent results for the parents in the training programs that we have. I have taken information directly from the records of a sole parent, with her knowledge and permission, whose children have been enrolled in a central Los Angeles center.

The mother has enrolled two boys, twins, 5 years of age in January of this year. She also has a 9-month-old baby. Her earnings at that time were \$280 and she worked in a bank. She was attending school on a part-time basis at night. In May of this year, after finishing her training, she had progressed to \$608 a month as a caseworker in Los Angeles County. This experience is not unique; 25 years of success stories can be told regarding families using services of children centers.

State law has also provided for certain types of employee shortages such as public school teachers and nurses, which has been mentioned. This not only makes for better disbursement in our labor field, but it also allows for greater intergrouping of children and parents on varied economic levels so that each is able to have a beginning experience of living and learning successfully together in our small world.

The curriculum or program in Los Angeles children centers is involved in ego development. How can curriculum be planned without taking into account the nature of the consumer of knowledge? A third criteria here is teacher effectiveness. In order to make an impact all three areas must be attended to: Curriculum modification, child development, and teacher strategy.

An ongoing inservice education and staff development for all employees of children centers is being implemented. In order to prevent the discrimination and poverty of past generations being perpetuated, people who know and understand how learning takes place must be responsible for developing and carrying out programs for young children.

Community people play an important part in the centers. Some positions require only eighth grade education or equivalent, while education aides require high school or equivalent. The education aide is an exciting innovation position in Los Angeles. Much enthusiasm has developed regarding their contribution to our program and to the community. We view it as a necessary position today and the opportunity or progression for tomorrow.

The long day, 11 to 12 hours, which is unique to day-care programs because of supervision of children while parents are out of the home, extends tremendous opportunity for working with children. Along with ego development come health needs. To emphasize, you cannot separate the child. On a part-time basis we are able to provide in Los Angeles clinical psychologist and psychiatrist, pediatrician, school nurse, and dentist for assessment purposes only. It is desirable to provide followup services for repair and prevention. This is one of our goals for the future.

Because recognizing psychological needs is difficult to impossible for the lay public, and the trained personnel in this field are expensive

and not readily available, well-prepared teachers able to recognize and work with all children's needs is vital.

I would like also to comment regarding the previous testimony. I feel that 2 years is not too young for many children. Four years may be too young for some. Six years is too young for some to be in school without an opportunity for earlier education.

The Pediatrics Society in Los Angeles County is stressing and requesting constantly of us as to why we are not having longer hours of day care, while we are not taking younger children. If the Pediatrics Society is asking these questions, then those of us in the field of day care programs and educational emphasis, as well as all other parts of the child, emotional, social, and so forth, we need to take a long look also.

Thank you.

Mr. DANIELS. I'm glad to hear you say that you felt 2 years is not too young to take a child in one of these centers.

Do you have any comment to make as to the maximum age a child should be enrolled?

Mrs. SNYDER. We have children in our centers up to 14 years. We would have many more if we had facilities and provision for this. We have done this to offset some of the requests, since we don't have the room and feel the younger child should have preference because of the age of the child.

We have cleared them through our voluntary agency in Los Angeles, given them chest X-rays, skin tests, depending on the age of the child, if they have not already cleared some in junior high school, and have used them as volunteers. Usually parents and other school agencies have worked with us to make this a possibility, which otherwise parents would like to have them in centers and enrolled as such. But we can give them both responsibility for learning and working with and also making a contribution; it is sort of taking care of two situations. So before and after school we have seventh and eighth graders on this basis, and until summertime we have them all day.

Mr. DANIELS. This idea of ego development is quite attractive, and I was wondering what comments you have to make with respect to programs that should be provided by day-care centers?

Mrs. SNYDER. So many times we think of day care as custodial—it must be custodial—but if we spend millions of dollars a year and we lean on the fence and watch children play, I think it is a very poor source of spending funds. The money is important, but the money is not nearly as important as what is happening to the child. A great deal of learning goes on whether it is directed or whether it is incidental. But if we can direct the learning so as to develop the ego in the broad sense of the term, giving them all the opportunity to take advantage of the intelligence that they do have—not the IQ as such—but the intelligence, meaning at every level, then we have not only very well spent the millions of dollars but we have very well spent the time on our real resource, which is the young people.

Mr. DANIELS. I take it from what you say, then, that the personnel at these centers should have trained help?

Mrs. SNYDER. Definitely so. They should have the gauntlet of service. There should be very competent people in planning programs and working and caring and seeing that it is carried out on sight,

people who truly understand how children learn, not today at 9 o'clock we are going to do this and at 10 o'clock we are going to do that, but in developing and watching the developing of each child and presenting materials and experiences and knowledge regarding how this is done for individuals. But also, along this, recognizing physical needs and emotional needs and certainly health needs.

This would be such an expensive operation and a waste of time and money to have every individual have this very high bit of knowledge, but to have sufficient people working with children and have the other community resources, have the aides, have the assistants, have the volunteers, and other agencies which are not only extra hands but are learning, are contributing, are going back into their community with better ways of operating of involving parents.

Mr. DANIELS. If this bill were to be enacted, do you think we have sufficient expert knowledge and trained help, to really initiate this plan on a nationwide basis?

Mrs. SNYDER. I am always optimistic. We live in a space age, and things change very quickly. Today we are having to hire in Los Angeles people with provisional permits instead of credentials. This is not because there aren't people knowledgeable and it is not because we do not have interested persons. It is because all of us have not pushed as hard as we could have pushed and should have pushed.

Yes and no. Yes, we must go ahead if we do have to train, because there are enough people who do know. Research is so plentiful that it fills my office with material from all over the United States. I think we have done enough research now. Let's put some of it in practice and train as we go along. I am constantly learning in this field, and hope to go on constantly learning.

I have to give an ambiguous answer to your question, because it is a yes and a no.

Mrs. MINK. Has the particular program childrens' centers, State of California, received any funding under title 1 or title 3 of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act?

Mrs. SNYDER. Not directly into children's centers. Some of the school districts have used funds under one of these provisions and had put them in facilities and along with childrens' centers. We do not do this in Los Angeles. There are the elementary prekindergarten classes in Los Angeles which are strictly under title 1 and 3, meeting the requirements only of low poverty level. It was considered, and also the Unruh preschool facility to the State has been considered. I do not feel, since each city school district—well, take our own—in Los Angeles, they are saying that this money and these titles must be only the credential person in charge of 15 children, and so forth. I would agree with that if we had money to pay salaries. We would be able to keep all of our people that we very well train. As soon as they reach the district requirement for the elementary teacher they leave our section. They do not resign from the board. We are all one big agency. But the elementary teacher is paid about \$100 more a month than the child care teacher. So, of course, what are they going to do? We have about 30 who stayed with us who had this trained personnel. They not only have the training for elementary teacher, but they also have the years of experience working with young children and

putting their emphasis and resources on studying this type of program but simply because of the dollar differences are going. But I think that it is working toward a combination of programs.

Mrs. MINK. How many children are now in an 8910 or title 1 or title 3 type program in the Los Angeles city schools who are of pre-school age?

Mrs. SNYDER. In their prekindergarten classes they have 69 classes, 15 each.

Mrs. MINK. Sixty-nine preschool classes, that is over and above your 79 children centers?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. And each of these has 15 children?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. How many Headstart classes exist in the same jurisdiction of the Los Angeles city schools that are operated under the OEO program?

Mrs. SNYDER. I do not know within the city. I know only the county Headstart, and they now have approximately 6,000 children.

Mrs. MINK. Is that the year around Headstart program?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes, it is.

Mrs. MINK. For the county of Los Angeles?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. You say for your centers you have a fantastic waiting list. Could you estimate what this waiting list would be?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes, we could fill another 160 centers if we had them. These are bona fide waiting lists. I must hasten to add a waiting list today may be of no value tomorrow, because a parent must, if they are alone with the child, find, or if there is illness in the family, find some way, some type of child care. But we check our waiting list every 4 weeks in every center, and they do not go down.

We have a far greater request for school-age children than for preschool. We have far greater requests at certain times of the year, this being one of them, for families, two parent families who are not eligible for our service because of their income being higher than the designated State requirement.

We have certainly no difficulty in keeping the maximum number of prekindergarten children in our centers, which average about 4,200 a year.

We are now in the process of building four new buildings which will give service to about 600 more children. This is out of local district funds.

Mrs. MINK. Now, of the 69 classes which are being conducted by the school department in Los Angeles for pre-school-age children that are not part of your children centers, would all of these children have qualified for your program?

Mrs. SNYDER. No. All of them would have qualified except for one situation. They have chosen children whose parents are at home and who can come to the school and pick the child up after the part day session. And, of course, our children are in need of an all day service.

Mrs. MINK. The 69 classes of preschool is just the regular school-hour program and not the full day?

Mrs. SNYDER. Right, just the 3-hour session.

Mrs. MINK. Just 3 hours?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes. Otherwise, they would be eligible as far as income, as far as need. But they have purposely worked out so there wouldn't be a conflict in the two programs, because we operate under the same division with the same department head.

Mrs. MINK. What happens to these children then after the 3 hours?

Mrs. SNYDER. They go home.

Mrs. MINK. And who is home?

Mrs. SNYDER. Hopefully, mother. I have to say hopefully because we very well know this may or may not be of great value, depending on many situations.

Mrs. MINK. How are these children selected as distinguished from those who are selected for your program?

Mrs. SNYDER. They are selected by the parents in the schools who have younger children where the principal or someone in the school has seen a need within the family and know there are younger children and older children in school, generally speaking. And also, they are sometimes referred from the State department of social welfare.

Mrs. MINK. Did I understand you correctly to say that these 69 classes that are run under 8910, the salaries of these teachers are different than teachers under the childrens' centers by \$100 a month?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. And yet it is a program that is administered by the same department?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes.

Mrs. MINK. How does this come about?

Mrs. SNYDER. I wish I knew. The district is able to keep this distinction simply because there is Federal money available for salaries and there are no Federal funds available to children centers. So we live within the framework of what the State can provide.

Mrs. MINK. One other question, which I think is very relevant.

What is the coordination between this children center program and the preschool program and the regular elementary education? Is there a carryover of the records of the children so that the teachers in, say, kindergarten, the first grade are given an opportunity to know about the youngsters prior to their enrollment in regular school program?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes. Under the elementary division, which we are all three part of, the research section has our health records beginning with our children when they come in at 2—they are given a complete physical—and this record then is kept through, we have some that have been kept through 14 years of school. Each child going to kindergarten has a résumé written regarding the things he has experienced, some of his activities.

Mrs. MINK. Is this required by your State department of education rule or is this just a procedure?

Mrs. SNYDER. No, this is just our own district requirement.

Mrs. MINK. Does the Department of Social Welfare have the same sort of requirement that follows each of its children in the nursery day programs that they administer, that they license, so that a youngster who has been in a nursery program under their licensing system would also be benefited by some sort of a critique being set to a regular school program that he might enter at kindergarten or first grade?

Mrs. SNYDER. The county OEO head start, which is a combination of preschool and head start funds are working on this, and some have been able to perfect it; others are in the process of doing so. It is their desire to do this.

Mrs. MINK. What about the private, the totally private church, nonprofit nursery center programs, are they doing this sort of a follow through?

Mrs. SNYDER. They are beginning to do this also. I think that the school district and private agency people are getting together.

Mrs. MINK. Would you consider that this would be one of the beneficial standards that should be set forth in any of the programs that are funded by Federal programs such as this?

Mrs. SNYDER. Definitely so.

Mrs. MINK. One last comment.

On your extended program, which takes care of older youngsters in elementary school after the regular school is over, in my own State this program is funded not only by OEO funds but also under 8910 money. Do you have, in addition to your children centers program for extended after school care, also parallel programs funded under the 8910 program or OEO to take care of these children after the regular schoolday until the parent returns?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes; we have the tutorial program on extended day basis for children who could not meet the eligibility of children centers but would be a similar eligibility as the morning preschool classes that I described. And our extended day teachers or our school-age teachers and these teachers work together on plans and programs.

Mrs. MINK. So how many of these elementary youngsters would you say are being benefited by tutorial program under the other two Federal acts currently in your city school system?

Mrs. SNYDER. School age; I expect there would be as many as 60,000 school-age children.

Mrs. MINK. Being benefited now by ESEA programs and OEO programs for afterschool activities?

Mrs. SNYDER. Yes. Along with the community services, which is the physical education emphasis, which is State fund for tax. That would be very hard to estimate, of course. This is more of recreation.

Mrs. MINK. Thank you very much.

Mr. DANIELS. Thank you, Mrs. Snyder, on behalf of the committee and myself personally.

Now, this concludes the testimony of the witnesses who are scheduled to testify today. I notice, however, a number of people in the audience who apparently have a great interest in this subject matter.

I wonder if anyone is present who desires to add to the testimony?

If not, the committee will stand adjourned.

(The following material was submitted for this record:)

TESTIMONY OF HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have this opportunity to submit a statement on behalf of H.R. 10572, the Pre-School Centers Supplementary Education Act, of which I have the privilege to be a co-sponsor.

At the outset I want to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this subcommittee for your decision to hold prompt hearings on this needed legislation.

At the same time, congratulations are due the distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. Mink, who as principal sponsor of the bill has exhibited deep understanding of the problems faced by many American mothers and fathers.

Mr. Chairman, the Pre-School Centers Supplementary Education Act was introduced before the Congress had given its approval to widespread changes in the nation's welfare laws.

At that time the need to increase federal assistance for day care facilities was evident. Nationally there were about two million working mothers and about 2.5 million children between three and five years old whose mothers were working.

The problem of finding a decent, wholesome environment for these children posed a real and pressing problem.

Today that problem has intensified with the passage of the "work incentive" amendments to the Social Security Act.

Those amendments will require mothers receiving Aid to Dependent Children funds to be trained and accept work. Their minor children will be cared for in day care facilities of one kind or another.

The new law provides that the Federal Government will pay 85%—of the costs of operating these day care centers for the first year, and 75%—of operating costs the second year. According to figures from the House Ways and Means Committee, by 1972 the Federal contribution to day care centers is required to be at least \$350 million annually.

I supported and voted for the "work incentive" amendments in the belief that more than three decades of the present system of Aid to Dependent Children had produced little more than a "dole" mentality among recipients.

To those who would object that a mother's place is in the home with her children, my reply would be: It depends on the circumstances. What kind of mother? What kind of home?

If a mother is locked in ignorance and lack of self-esteem, her home, her family, will reflect that damaging image. In such situations, perhaps a better solution is to encourage that mother and those children to emerge from the home into a more stimulating environment outside.

If this is to be accomplished, of course, there must be meaningful training and meaningful work for the mothers. They cannot simply be shunted off to do domestic day work.

Rather, they should be allowed to better their economic and social and psychological condition by engaging in occupations which will be rewarding both financially and in building self-pride.

At the same time, it is incumbent that the day care centers in which their children are lodged during the working day be more than mere baby-sitting "daytime depositories."

The children should be given the opportunity to attend day care facilities where trained workers can help compensate for a less than desirable home life. They must have adequate educational opportunities; they must have equipment which will aid their learning process.

Ideally, then, when a mother comes home from a meaningful and satisfying job and the children from truly productive day care centers their individual experiences should produce a measure of mutual mental and social stimulation.

This could, indeed, be a first, important step on the ladder out of poverty.

In that context, the Pre-School Center Supplementary Education Act takes on greatly increased importance.

Passage of this measure could mean the difference between spending millions of dollars just for baby sitting, or spending those same millions on a meaningful educational experience for the children involved.

The program of educational and cultural enrichment proposed by H.R. 10572 could provide part of the required federal contribution to day care centers in a form which would most benefit the children involved.

The dollars spent to enhance, expand and enrich educational programs in child care centers may be the most important which the government could spend.

More and more we are becoming aware of the importance of early guidance, early training, early education.

Future years are sure to bring an increase in the numbers of such day care centers, and a dramatic increase in the numbers of children who attend them.

There also is a need for adequate day care facilities for children whose parents must both work in order to adequately support the family.

Although such families can pay a modest amount for day care, they generally cannot afford to send their children to centers which provide more than simple "baby-sitting" services.

The Pre-School Centers Supplementary Education Act would assist those families as well. It would provide federal support for educational programs offered by public and private nonprofit day care centers attended by their children.

Today, therefore, we must begin to set the pattern for upgrading more of these centers from mere custodial facilities to meaningful places of training and instruction.

The effort will not be an easy one. Teachers and teacher aides must be trained. Equipment must be provided. Meaningful curricula must be developed. Educational techniques, suited to the age of the pre-school participants, must be improved.

The Pre-School Centers Supplementary Education Act will, I believe, provide the "seed money" to states from which can develop and grow an effective system of day care centers to assist pre-school children whose mothers must work because of their economic situation.

Right now across our land there are thousands of day care centers struggling to provide an adequate program. Many of them are handicapped by a lack of sufficient funding to do the kind of job which their sponsors know must be done. The bill before us today will provide them with badly needed assistance.

Two members of my personal staff are on the advisory board of just such a day care center at Our Lady Queen of Peace Church Family Activities Center in Arlington, Virginia. They have brought the work of this center to my attention and I believe it is a good example of the kind of effort which is being attempted in day care—and the constant financial obstacles which prevent its complete achievement.

Believing that the Family Activities Center program will be of interest to the subcommittee, I am appending at the end of my remarks today a memorandum explaining the day care activities being carried on there. It was prepared by the Rev. David T. Ray, who has spearheaded this effort.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge the subcommittee to take speedy and favorable action on H.R. 10572. By so doing you will help insure more useful and fulfilling lives for hundreds of thousands of less-privileged American children.

A MEMORANDUM ON THE FAMILY ACTIVITIES CENTER

The Family Activities Center is a facility sponsored by Our Lady Queen of Peace Church, Arlington, Virginia, to help meet the needs of the total family of the entire community which it serves regardless of denomination or race within the limits of its human and financial resources. It is an endeavor to place the church in its pristine role of service, to develop a corporate sense of compassion. It should in the words of the President, 2 March 1965, give "added dimensions to the possibilities of daily life."

Although our concern is for the unmet needs of the total family, our decision was that a day care facility was the primary way to support and buttress the family. So a day center was given priority: for children whose mothers must work to support their families, who are ill or who must momentarily concentrate on special care for other family members or who choose to spend part of their time outside their house, on family chores, civic duties, or a job.

We opened our new facility June 1966. At that time, we enrolled 80 children—28 of these children were children of poverty. From September until March 1967, when finally a day care center opened with Federal funds, we cared for these children. We received no recompense from any source.

From the very beginning we had a studied, structured concept of what we wanted to accomplish. We believe it is an innovative, long-range and developing type of program. We have the good fortune of having as our mentor Helena Miller, Ph. D., Associate to the Dean at Duquesne University.

However, because of the lack of financial resources and our dependence upon unpaid volunteers, we have been forced to accept sub-professional and unprofessional people to implement our program. For example, at present we have a certified Montessori teacher who has only two years of college background. We have a college graduate with two years experience in community organization and limited experience with Head Start. And, a teacher with no college background but with several years experience in day care work.

Although our primary concern has been the pre-school child, however, we have provided for the needs of children 5 to 12 years whose parents are concerned about their supervised care, before school in the morning and after school in the evening. During the school year, we have had up to eight children in this age bracket. We furnish transportation to the school and bring them back to the Activities Center after school.

During the summer, we provided learning and recreation opportunities for up to 160 children ages 5 to 12. This structured program was from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Half of these would have been unsupervised at home. We used 13 college men who are contemplating the ministry for this program. These men had previously received 30 hours orientation from the above-mentioned Dr. Miller.

At this point, we might make a fiscal note. Our total receipts for our pre-school operation—1 January 1967–31 December 1967—were \$17,050.18 as compared to our expenses \$35,093.31. The deficit was supplied by members of the Parish. This does not include repairs, utilities, etc. Our total expenditures for the Family Activities Center were \$45,422.71. When we consider that the Children's Bureau estimates the cost of day care at between \$1,000 to \$1,500 per child per year and we spend about \$500, it is evident we are sub-standard. William Raspberry in a recent column in the Washington Post, 22 January 1968, states that "most of the current day care centers are little more than babysitting centers—or storage bins." We have testimony that we are at least a little above this.

I believe it must be said that the inspiration for what we are doing and the confirmation that we need, has come from the liberal social legislation of the past few years. The poverty class has been adequately provided for. However, the people of marginal income in \$3,000 to \$7,000 receive no assistance from other than groups such as ourselves. With limited financial encouragement, we could up-grade the learning part of our programs and procure better and more equipment. The social legislation of the best years seems to be crying out a lesson in Christian teaching: "This is the way to love your neighbor."

TESTIMONY OF HON. JAMES M. HANLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman: The principal purpose of this legislation is to expand educational opportunity and early childhood development in the Nation's day care centers. It is not a day care center bill in the sense that funds are being provided for the construction and operation of institutions whose primary purpose is to look after preschool children while their mothers are at work. Day care centers already exist, and the purpose of this bill is to take advantage of such centers by greatly enhancing their ability to contribute to the educational and cultural development of the preschool children being cared for.

Congress has certainly given its enthusiastic endorsement to the principle of preschool education in the Headstart program, and I believe that enactment of H.R. 10572 will provide for a strong and continuing program of child development within day care centers.

The legislation places the administration of the program into the hands of the States, requires that the States and the political subdivisions enforce standards for safe and sanitary day care centers, and directs the States to concentrate the assistance where it will provide the greatest educational and cultural enrichment to children who need it most.

The bill will confine grants only to the provision of supplementary educational services and equipment; and it defines day care centers as public or private nonprofit institutions which provide care and supervision for at least eight hours for a majority of the children involved.

I believe that this program should be directed primarily into areas with concentrations of families of low and moderate income. One of the very promising aspects of the operations of the war on poverty in Syracuse has been the participation of residents in our low income neighborhoods in the development of a yet unrealized program for day care centers. There are day care centers in Syracuse, and those which are located in our inner-city neighborhoods could well be strengthened and enhanced into sound and effective early childhood development centers. The one thing all of our day care centers have in common is the great need for additional financial assistance.

In addition to the obvious benefits which accrue to children because of their participation in an educationally and culturally oriented day care center, the mere existence of such facilities will enable low income parents to take advantage of the various adult education and employment training programs which are at the heart of our national effort to control and abate poverty.

STATEMENT OF HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS
FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I thank you for this opportunity of appearing before you and expressing my views with respect to H.R. 10572, a bill of which I am cosponsor and which would provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers.

In recent years, the Congress has enacted a number of pieces of legislation dealing with education, in an effort to assist local schools in improving their programs, particularly those affecting children from low-income families. I continue to support these programs and hope to see them continued and expanded. H.R. 10572 is designed to supplement existing programs and to fill an existing gap in educational services. It would authorize grants to public and private nonprofit day care centers, to be used for supplementary educational services and education equipment. At the present time, local schools may receive Federal funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to operate preschool programs. Private and public groups may receive grants from the Office of Economic Opportunity for Head Start programs. But there is no Federal program which would assist day care centers in their educational programs.

A recent book entitled "Revolution in Learning" begins with these words:

"Millions of children are being irreparably damaged by our failure to stimulate them intellectually during their crucial years—from birth to six. Millions of others are being held back from their true potential."

The author, Maya Pines, goes on to discuss the status of preschool education and review many of the exciting and imaginative programs which attempt to provide effective educational experiences for children of preschool age.

This book is an example of the emphasis being given in recent years to the intellectual development of children before they enroll in the regular public school. Many experts say that by the age of 6, when a child normally starts school, two-thirds of his intelligence has been given its form which will shape its future development. Recent research has shown that the most rapid growth of intelligence takes place before the age of four and what a child learns during this crucial 4 year period largely determines the extent of his future achievements. If the child is born into a poverty-stricken family what happens during these critical years may decide whether or not he himself will escape from poverty.

If we agree that educational enrichment during the first years of a child's life is important to ensure his future academic success, we must then do whatever is necessary to establish such programs, particularly for children who would not have the opportunity to enroll in regular nursery school classes. The Head Start program is an example of a successful preschool program, assisted by Federal funds. It has made an impressive record, by providing educational, medical, nutritional, and social services to hundreds of thousands of children from low-income families. Hopefully, it will continue to expand so that it can enroll all of those children who could benefit from it.

The Head Start program, except in a few special cases, operates only for a few hours a day and therefore cannot serve children whose mothers are working, and who therefore are enrolled in day care centers. Federal assistance to day care centers has been minimal in past years. Passage of H.R. 10572 would mean that day care centers now in existence and those which may be established in future years could receive financial aid to improve their educational programs.

Another major reason for my support of this legislation is that a substantial increase in the number of day care centers across the country can be expected. There has been an understandable reluctance to encourage day care centers for children of preschool age, due to a feeling that such children are better cared for in the home with the mother present. We are, however, faced with the sad truth that in low income families, a second wage earner is needed in order to provide adequately for the children. In the absence of the father, the mother may prefer employment to welfare assistance. The problem is so vast and the need for its

resolution so important to our national well-being that it should be a public responsibility to provide good day care services for those who need it to become self-supporting.

Two pieces of legislation enacted during the first session of the 90th Congress show a recognition of the nationwide need for more and better day care programs. The Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 establish a new program of grants to public and private nonprofit organizations for the operation of day care programs for low-income children and children living in areas with large concentrations of low-income families. A total of \$25 million has been authorized for this program, with preference being given to programs designed to enable the parents to participate in education and training programs or seek gainful employment.

The second day care program is authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1967. This legislation specifies that all appropriate adult members of families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children are to be referred to work or training programs, and day care must be provided for children of all AFDC mothers who participate. It is estimated that during fiscal year 1969 a total of \$35 million will be needed to provide day care for 35,000 children. By 1972 it is expected that a total of \$350 million will be used for this purpose.

These two new programs will most certainly result in a great increase in the number of day care programs in operation. Passage of the Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act will help the existing and new day care centers to include educational activities as an integral part of their program.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I urge that favorable consideration be given to this legislation. We have an excellent opportunity to use those critical preschool years to ensure that all children have a chance for normal mental and physical development. The money spent on a program such as this may be considered a wise investment in American's future. Expenditures for the education of three, four, and five year olds may give to these children the tools with which they can obtain maximum benefit from their later years in school, thus enabling them to live a productive and satisfying life.

is essential to provide a good working environment for those who need it for a better living.

The first of these is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living. The second is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living. The third is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living.

The fourth is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living. The fifth is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living. The sixth is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living.

The seventh is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living. The eighth is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living. The ninth is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living. The tenth is the need for a better working environment for those who need it for a better living.



