

LEVEL 4 - 25 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 The Atlanta Constitution
The Atlanta Journal and Constitution

March 19, 1993

SECTION: LOCAL NEWS; Section A; Page 6

LENGTH: 424 words

HEADLINE: Clinton will hear all about Downtown child care center

BYLINE: By Shirley L. Smith STAFF WRITER

BODY:

Some metro Atlantans believe they've found a child-care program that works. They intend to tell President Clinton all about it today as he visits the Downtown Child Development Center.

A small group of parents, as well as representatives of the consortium that operates the center, will meet with the president to discuss child-care issues.

Hailed as a national model for public-private partnership, the center has been cited for providing quality child care in an urban setting. And it is the oldest ongoing child-care consortium in the country. "It is also one of the finest child-care centers anywhere," said Mayor Maynard H. Jackson, who was instrumental in arranging the president's visit.

The facility, located in the 80-year-old Healey Building, serves 120 children from 8 weeks to 6 years old, whose parents work Downtown. It has come a long way since it first opened in 1985 with nine children in the old Rich's building Downtown.

Although there were concerns about its future after the store closed in 1991, the community and corporate sector raised about \$ 350,000 to relocate the facility to the Healey Building. The rent is paid by the federal government.

NationsBank foreclosed on the building earlier this month, but there is no reason for alarm. "The new owner has reaffirmed that the building will remain open," said Lloyd T. Whitaker, president of Newleaf Corp., which manages the building.

Mayor Jackson said he is hoping that the center will help revitalize the district, which has been abandoned by businesses over the years.

Parents said the center's Downtown location, its diversity, the experience of its child-care workers and the low teacher-to-child ratio make it an attractive facility.

Center Director Cheryl G. Smith said the center tries to provide a homelike environment and encourages children to think for themselves.

"Autonomy is a real important part of our program, because those are the



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

1993 The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, March 19, 1993

skills that children are going to take into life with them," she said. "They are going to need to be autonomous and self-sufficient and make decisions for themselves. Self-sufficiency builds self-esteem."

The weekly cost of enrollment ranges from \$ 95 to \$ 120. But, Ms. Smith contends that the cost is below market value for a child-care facility of its quality. The corporate contribution helps keep down the cost to parents, she said.

Consortium members include The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, Wachovia Bank of Georgia, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta and seven federal government agencies.

GRAPHIC: photo: Mayor Maynard H. Jackson, who got together with kids at the Downtown Child Development Center in February, calls it "one of the finest . . . anywhere." / JUDY ONDREY / Special

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: March 23, 1993



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 26 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 Information Access Company, a Thomson Corporation
Company

ASAP

Copyright 1993 Scholastic Inc.

Scholastic Update

March 12, 1993

SECTION: Vol. 125 ; No. 11 ; Pg. 8; ISSN: 0745-7065

LENGTH: 2156 words

HEADLINE: Women at work; opinions of five working women, Marjorie L. Kimbrough, Brenda Berkman, Laura Maldonado, Gertrude Michaelson and Marilyn Benner

BYLINE: Peart, Karen N.

BODY:

Despite discrimination, lack of child care, and other barriers, women are entering the work force in record numbers. But how much progress have working women really made? What battles remain to be won? Five working women give UPDATE their opinions.

The recent controversy over President Bill Clinton's effort to appoint a woman as U.S. Attorney General shows how far American women have come in recent years - and how far they still have to go. Twenty years ago, a President would not have even considered naming a woman to such a powerful post. And if he had, he wouldn't have found many women with the credentials to fill the job. But the fact that the President's first two choices were forced to withdraw because they had employed illegal immigrants as child-care workers illustrates the difficulties still facing even the most successful working women.

Clearly, working women have come a long way. In 1960, only 34 percent of women worked at jobs outside the home; today the figure is nearly 60 percent. And more and more women are breaking down barriers and entering traditionally male-dominated professions such as medicine, law, business, and government.

The flood of women into the workplace has forced government and employers to confront a number of complicated new issues, from the growing incidence of sexual harassment in the workplace to the need for adequate child care. In January, for example, President Clinton signed the Family Leave Act into law after years of debate. The law entitles working mothers or their spouses to take time off from work to care for newborn children or sick relatives. But experts say the law will only slightly reduce the crushing child-care burdens of working mothers.

While many working women have made steady gains in pay and prestige, many others have not. The majority of women still work in traditional low-paying "female jobs," such as nursing or child care. And while the paychecks of working women have steadily risen, on average women still earn only 70 cents for every dollar that a man earns.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

In an effort to educate the public - especially young women and girls - about the problems confronting working women, a number of women's groups have declared this April 28 "Take Our Daughters to Work Day." The idea is for parents, relatives, or friends to bring young girls to their jobs and expose them to the realities of work, says Nell Merlino of the Ms. Foundation for Women, which is organizing the event. "Girls have not been encouraged to go into fields like engineering, computer programming, or other male-dominated fields," Merlino says. "We hope this experience opens their eyes to occupations they might have never considered, and show that they are attainable."

To get a sense of how some women are faring in the workplace, UPDATE recently spoke with five women about their experiences on the job. Collectively, their stories tell the history of American working women - from the trail-blazing efforts of women 30 years ago to break into male dominated fields, to the achievements of young professional women today.

Marjorie L. Kimbrough 55 years old College instructor, former corporate executive Atlanta, Georgia

I graduated from the University of California at Berkeley in 1959, and became the first African-American to work as a mathematical analyst at the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation. Later, I worked as a computer systems representative for Burroughs Corporation. I was the first African-American woman there as well. In fact, I've been the first African-American woman in all the positions I held during 28 years in corporate America. From the start I've felt that I needed to open eyes to the fact that women, and black women in particular, are competent and able to perform. I guess it comes from my upbringing. My parents taught me to believe in myself and to strive to be the best, because white people would not expect it of me.

I've had to deal with sexism and discrimination. I was sexually harassed by a Burroughs manager who let me know that if I would be "kind to him," he could be "helpful" in my career. I refused his offer. And I let him know that I resented the fact that he thought I needed him to advance.

When I would go on business trips in the 1960s with white colleagues, hotels would refuse to give me a room. Or they thought that I had to be some celebrity to be traveling with a white man on official business.

After I left Burroughs, I became an independent consultant. I taught computer programming. My students were almost always white men, and they were always surprised that I was the teacher. Later, I watched white men that I trained get promoted over me.

When I moved back to Atlanta with my family, I worked for a computer company for 14 years. I finally quit when my manager wanted to go to Europe to train some employees. He stuck a tape recorder in my face, and said, "now tell me everything that I should say when I get there." I decided not to waste my time if he was going to get the recognition for my work.

I've seen little change over the years in the corporate world. There are more black women in business today, but most of them are experiencing the same things I lived through 30 years ago.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Scholastic Update, March 12, 1993

Brenda Berkman 41 years old President, National Organization of Women Firefighters New York, New York

My mother didn't have a job outside the home when I was growing up, but I always wanted to have a job. I can't remember a time when I thought that I was just going to stay at home. I was always interested in an active job, one where I could help other people. There's really no job that compares to being a firefighter for that. People appreciate what you're doing.

In the 1970s New York City did not allow women to take the firefighter's exam. I was the first to challenge that. I brought the lawsuit that got women hired. When we first came on, the firehouse was a very unwelcoming place. There was quite a bit of harassment. My protective gear was tampered with, they let the air out of my tank, there would be pornography up with my name on it. And lots of comments about how women could not do the job. People refused to work and eat with me. The whole object was to get me to quit. But I had support from family and friends, and from other women firefighters.

I do consider myself a feminist. That means I believe women have the potential to perform as well as men. I don't try to prove that I'm as good as every man that I encounter. I just try and show that I can do what I'm supposed to be doing.

The firehouse that I'm in now regards the job as a profession, not a club. I'm the highest-ranking firefighter they have, and I'm hoping that in the next couple of years I can get promoted to lieutenant. The attitudes are very much improved; it's not a constant barrage of nonsense. I'm happier now. I still get tremendous satisfaction out of going to fires.

This is my career. I'm planning on doing this until I retire, and then I'll do something else. I encourage more girls to think about being a firefighter. I'm not saying it's a piece of cake for any minority on this job, because the tradition has always been white men. But we're very hopeful the fire service will learn it can benefit from diversity. Overall, things are getting better for women. My mother would rather I were a lawyer, because it's safer. But somebody has to be the first person to do these types of things.

Laura Maldonado 34 years old Secretary Avon Cosmetic Co. New York, New York

I started working when I was 17. I've worked in a department store, as a bank teller, in a public-relations firm, and now I'm at Avon. I think for what I do, I should be getting paid more. But I knew when I accepted the job what the salary was. But I like the job, and the environment, so that makes up for it.

I started a family when I was 22, a lot earlier than my parents did. My mother was 40 when she had me. So when I was growing up, they were much older than I was. I wanted to grow up with my kids.

When my two daughters were small, I felt that work interfered with the time I could spend with them. With my first daughter, I had to go back to work three months after she was born, and it was very hard. But now it's much easier because they're older and have their own school activities.

The most difficult thing is finding good child care. I've gone through about



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Scholastic Update, March 12, 1993

seven baby-sitters. Either I find out that they aren't qualified or they quit after a while. My husband tries to help, but his work hours are very different than mine. Basically, my children take care of themselves. I have a neighbor who watches them, but she's not there constantly, so they're pretty much on their own. I don't have any regrets about working, though. It's taught my kids to be independent.

If it wasn't for the women's movement, we'd still be at home taking care of babies. I don't really consider myself a feminist. I'm for equal rights, but I don't go to the extreme. I still believe in men opening doors; I think things like that are nice. But I do think conditions for women in the workplace have gotten better. More women are getting higher-paid positions. I think we've come a long way.

Gertrude G. Michaelson 67 years old Senior adviser R.H. Macy & Co. New York, New York

I've had a satisfying and rewarding 45 years at Macy's. I was one of the first women to join their management training program in 1947. I was fresh out of law school and that in itself was unusual. I think I fit in because I never felt self-conscious about being one of the few women. I had an interest in sports and politics that I could comfortably share with the men.

After I finished the six-month training program, I became an assistant in the labor relations department. I moved up to higher levels of responsibility in human resources and consumer relations until I became senior vice president. I retired in 1992, but I'm still a senior adviser and a member of the board of directors.

My first bosses had never worked with a woman at my level before. But they were both true humanists; they only wanted competence. They gave me a lot of responsibility and recognition.

I know that there were other people who were less enthusiastic about my success. But I made up my mind not to pay attention to that, but only to deal with matters of substance. In that way I gained respect.

I consider myself a trailblazer only in the sense that there weren't many women in those days who balanced family and career, and stayed the course. I was fortunate to have a very supportive husband and two supportive children.

There's little doubt that the women's movement has done a lot to raise consciousness. Young women today are much more purposeful and have specific career directions. I hope that along the way I've done my part to make it easier for the young women who came after me.

Marilyn Benner 42 years old Emergency room nurse St. Vincent's Hospital New, York, New York

I've been a nurse for 17 years. Before becoming a nurse, I was a homemaker. I was raised in a traditional family and my husband strongly believed that a wife's place was in the home. But a friend inspired me to try nursing. Against my husband's wishes, I went to the nearest college and signed up. My husband wouldn't support me, so I went to the local hospital and signed a contract stating that if they financed my education, I would work for them when I



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

graduated.

When I got my degree, I started to work and loved it. I worked in the intensive-care unit, the operating room, the recovery and emergency rooms, and virtually every area there was. I spent a year there and then accepted a job as head nurse on the night shift at a small hospital in Darlington, South Carolina. I delivered 15 babies there.

When I started in 1976 , I made \$ 3.12 per hour. I thought that was good money. I'm paid well now, but I think that nurses should be paid more - especially someone who works in the emergency room; it can be a war zone at times. If it was primarily a man's profession, we'd be paid more.

Since moving to New York, with the skills I've learned being a nurse, I've built two businesses on the side: Benner Medical Products, and Benner Medical Props. People often ask why I continue in nursing, but I would never give up working in the emergency room. It's in my blood.

Conditions are getting better for nurses. There's a lot more respect for the profession now than there was when I started.

I can remember when nurses got out of seats so doctors could sit down. The majority of doctors now have great respect for nurses, but you still have your old-school mentalities who like to think that nurses are their handmaids. But most of the nurses that I've worked with don't tolerate it. I don't allow anyone to speak to me with disrespect and if they do, I'll call them on it.

GRAPHIC: Photograph

IAC-NUMBER: IAC 13599739

IAC-CLASS: Magazine

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 23, 1995



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 27 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 The National Journal, Inc.
The National Journal

February 27, 1993

SECTION: EDUCATION; Vol. 25, No. 9; Pg. 512

LENGTH: 3778 words

HEADLINE: Child Care Quagmire

BYLINE: BY ROCHELLE L. STANFIELD

HIGHLIGHT:

In the wake of the Zoe Baird saga, many experts are asking why government is so reluctant to look at child care as a legitimate need of families across the economic spectrum.

BODY:

Denied the opportunity to go down in history as the nation's first female Attorney General, maybe Zoe E. Baird and Judge Kimba M. Wood will make the books as the working mothers who finally forced society to confront the issue of child care head-on.

"The silver lining in the Zoe Baird story is that for weeks I've been on the phone with the press," Marcy Whitebook, the director of the Oakland-based Child Care Employee Project, said in an interview. "I think that story is helping to break the silence about how bad the child care problem is and raise the awareness of the general public, the policy makers and the media."

Several opportunities to deal with parts of the problem hover on the horizon. For starters, two priorities of the Clinton Administration -- welfare reform and expansion of the \$ 2.8 billion Head Start preschool program for poor children -- could provide a forum for discussing the child care needs of low-income families.

As part of the economic plan that he unveiled to the nation on Feb. 17, President Clinton pledged to plow an additional \$ 9.3 billion into Head Start by fiscal 1998. "Head Start is a success story," he said. "It saves money, but today it reaches only one-third of all eligible children. Under our plan we will cover every eligible child."

And a new round of tax reform this year could put on the agenda bigger tax subsidies for families that pay for child care. But that's just picking at pieces of the problem, say child care experts, who yearn for a wide-open national debate on the issue.

The nation's reluctance to look at child care as a legitimate need of families across the economic spectrum has stymied the development of a comprehensive and articulated menu of child care options, a step that many European countries have already taken.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

"We have to come to see children who are under 5 years old in the same way we see children over 5, as part of societal responsibility," Carla B. Howerly, a child care specialist who is the deputy executive officer of the American Sociological Association in Washington, said in an interview.

For the poor, child care is frequently a prerequisite to getting off welfare and obtaining a decent job with full-time benefits. But child care subsidies come from more than a dozen programs with conflicting and confusing federal regulations that often drive recipients off the job and back onto welfare.

For middle-class parents, finding good, affordable child care is mostly a matter of luck and sufficient income, although the federal government helps a bit on the financial side. Parents can take a tax credit for child care if they meet certain requirements. Quality is an iffier proposition. State and local regulations, which are intended to control the quality of child care, often are lax and in some cases only drive the system underground.

Ultimately, the adequacy of the nation's child care system rests on the availability of qualified child care workers. But because the average pay is so low (it hovers around the poverty line), many experienced child care workers have been driven from the field.

Day care centers average about 40 per cent turnover a year, in fact, even though young children do much better in stable environments. Whitebook's most recent study, which followed day care workers over four years, found that at the end of the period, more than two-thirds had left their jobs.

Child care expert Deborah Phillips, a psychology professor at the University of Virginia who lives in Washington, summed up the issue from personal and professional perspectives. She and her husband, a congressional aide, send their 2-year-old son, Samuel, to the Senate Child Care Center, a highly regarded facility that's open to children of congressional and other government employees.

"I'm just very lucky to be able to afford [good child care] and to live somewhere that offers it," Phillips said in a recent interview. "That's the kind of care that should be universally available. People know that what we have in this country is a mess. And they are beginning to ask, 'How on earth do you begin to fix it?' What we really need to do is to step back and think very carefully about the needs of children and families, and then design a system around that."

A SENSITIVE SUBJECT

Child care remains a surprisingly touchy subject, a holdover of the 1950s-era notion that only mothers can properly care for their children.

Perhaps that's why child care emerged slowly and cautiously as a central theme of the Baird-Wood saga. Even Hillary Rodham Clinton, who made child care a high priority when she chaired the Washington-based Children's Defense Fund (CDF) in the 1980s, passed up a recent opportunity to highlight the issue. In an early-February interview, Newsweek asked Clinton whether the Administration's problems in finding an Attorney General "says anything about the day care situation in this country." She answered, "Probably, but I haven't analyzed



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

that."

But why is the issue of child care such a sensitive subject? "Perhaps our [public] dialogue is very convoluted because of feelings we have about whether [child care] is appropriate," Helen Blank, CDF's director of child care, said in an interview. "It's important that we start to be honest about what the situation is and what we need to make the system work for families. The economy has changed and women have to work. That's not going to go away."

More than half the mothers of children less than a year old work outside the home, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as do nearly two-thirds of mothers of children age 3-5 and threefourths of mothers of children age 6-13. Mothers of infants constitute the most rapidly growing segment of the nation's work force.

In the past, many working mothers could leave their children with relatives or neighbors. But now, many of those handy substitute mothers are out working themselves. In 1977, only 13 per cent of children under 5 whose mothers worked outside the home went to group day care, according to a Census Bureau survey. By 1988, the proportion had doubled.

In the wake of the disclosures by Baird and Wood that they had employed illegal aliens as nannies, the nation's news media rushed out stories about the availability of legal nannies and the hassles of complying with federal tax and immigration laws. It looked like a universal problem. But only 3 per cent of all working mothers (about 900,000 families) rely on inhome child care, and only as small fraction of the care givers are live-in nannies, the federally sponsored 1990 National Child Care Survey reported.

No one knows for sure how many of those nannies are illegal aliens. But Jeffrey S. Passel, who researches immigration policy at the Washington-based Urban Institute, figures that fewer than 100,000 undocumented workers are engaged in child care. "It's just not a huge number," he said.

The overwhelming majority of families use some form of group day care, according to the 1990 survey, including about 80,000 licensed preschools, 118,000 regulated family day care centers (in the home of the provide) and as many as 1.1 million nonregulated day care centers.

But change seems inevitable. Through a combination of demographic and economic factors, mothers of young children have finally made it to the top runs of government, professional and corporate ladders. They have money and more clout than ever before. They demand high-quality child care but have a hard time finding it. And finally, for the first time, they're in a position to do something about the problem.

CARE FOR THE POOR

Despite society's general reluctance to intervene in the lives of children under 5, the federal government has had few qualms about butting in when they are on welfare of merely poor.

"As a society, we're still ambivalent about the idea that women with young children should be at work," said Catherine W. Berheide, a sociology professor



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

at Skidmore College in Saratoga Springs, N.Y. "Yet we feel that mothers who do not have other sources of income should be employed."

The government takes one approach in helping poor children and a radically different tack in supporting their parents. Not surprisingly, conflict and confusion result.

Head Start, the biggest and oldest child care program (it was launched in 1965), is aimed at the children. Although the goal is mainly education, the program also aims to provide a comprehensive package of services -- nutrition, health and social services. The idea is to give disadvantaged 3 and 4-year-olds a "head start" in kindergarten by providing a rich preschool experience. And so Head Start is modeled after preschools and, like typically private nursery schools, meets only during the school year and only in half-day sessions.

"The positive benefits of Head Start are targeted toward the educational needs of the child and are not meant to help provide child care for low-income women," Berheide said.

Several proposals now circulating on Capitol Hill would allow Head Start to provide full-day, full-year sessions and also to take in toddlers. But to do so wouldn't be cheap: One proposed plan would cost \$ 13 billion when fully implemented after five years.

A crazy quilt of programs addresses the mother's needs, but with little attention to the children's. The 1988 Family Support Act provided child care support to welfare parents in school or job training programs and, once they got a job, for a year's transition into the economic mainstream. Two 1990 laws, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act and the At-Risk Child Care Act, together provide about \$ 1 billion a year to subsidize child care for poor families whether they're on welfare or not.

The subsidies "are seen like transportation -- a supportive service to get the mother to work, rather than a co-equal service in order to make sure that the child succeeds in this world," said Judith M. Rosen, who directs the Fairfax County (Va.) Office for Children.

Consequently, the government's priority is keeping down costs. Welfare regulations pay mothers only up to 75 per cent of the local median cost for child care. The regulations for child care block grants, while somewhat less severe, don't emphasize quality.

"We give parents this impossible dilemma of deciding between putting their child in a part-time day program [Head Start] and then patching together something in the afternoon in order to get fulltime employment, or going the route of the Family Support Act and potentially subjecting their children to poor quality care," child care expert Phillips said.

And that's only the beginning of the problem. The plethora of subsidy programs amounts to an obstacle course for beneficiaries. In 1988, the General Accounting Office (GAO) counted 46 federal programs for specific aspects of child care -- subsidizing milk for children in some day care centers, for example, or providing child care at military installations.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Marcia K. Meyers, a researcher at the University of California (Berkeley), studied the impact of child care subsidies on participants in California's education and training program for welfare recipients.

The red tape, she found, was cumbersome and utterly confusing. "Only a small fraction [of people] hung on to the child care subsidies," she said in an interview. "Sometimes they'd never heard of the program. Or somebody had told them, 'Don't bother, the waiting lists are too long.' Or it was just too much trouble on top of everything else to get themselves down to yet another welfare office to apply for benefits."

The bottom line, Meyers concluded, was that those who had difficulty obtaining child care and those who were concerned about the quality of the care they did get or worried about the safety of their children were much likelier to drop out of the program and go back on welfare.

In Fairfax County, Rosen has managed to untangle the federal bureaucratic knots and to weave the various subsidies into a seamless program. "It's nearly impossible for us logistically," she said, "but we can do it because we have the authority over all those funding streams."

Getting welfare mothers into the work force is the central theme of Clinton's welfare reform plan. But child care experts warn this won't happen unless his plan helps to provide quality child care. They also urge that barriers between the different child care subsidies be removed and that Head Start be linked to other low-income child care programs.

"Flawed as they may be, these [federal] programs uncapped the demand," CDF's Blank said. "Families realized, 'Hey, there's a program out there that can help me.' So we're back with waiting lists that are as long as, if not longer than, when we started."

Low-income families spend up to 25 per cent of their incomes on child care, according to the Census Bureau. A 1991 study by the GAO looked at the potential for poor single mothers to work themselves above the poverty line. The GAO figured that 65 per cent could do so if they could find full-time, year-round jobs and didn't have to pay for child care. But if they had to pay for child care, the proportion slipped to only 45 per cent.

No matter how anyone slices it, however, there isn't enough subsidy money to go around. Welfare is an entitlement: Anyone who's eligible can participate. But the states have to come up with matching funds to get federal child care subsidies, and many have been too fiscally strapped to do so. Meanwhile, the Head Start and child care block grant programs can distribute only as much money as Congress makes available each year. So, in Fairfax County, for example, while the number of subsidized child care slots has soared 70 per cent in the past three years, the waiting lists are also longer than ever before.

HEADACHES AND HASSLES

For the poor, money is probably the biggest child care headache. For the middle class, availability may be a bigger problem than affordability.

Middle-class families, in fact, get the lion's share of federal child care



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

subsidies. Sandra L. Hofferth, who researches child care issues at the Urban Institute, calculated that 60 per cent of the \$ 7 billion in federal child care subsidies in 1991 went out through the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit.

Although the working poor can apply for the tax credit, Hofferth found that only 22 per cent of families with annual incomes of less than \$ 15,000 do so (compared with 37 per cent of families with annual incomes of more than \$ 50,000). Because the credit is nonrefundable, only families that earn enough to pay taxes can use it. And because the care giver's social security number must be reported on federal tax forms, those who deal in the day care underground can't take advantage of the credit, either.

There is considerable political support for increasing and broadening this form of child care subsidy by making the tax credit refundable, raising the earned-income tax credit for working-poor families with children and perhaps issuing child care vouchers that could be used anywhere on the open market.

"If you put more money in the pockets, of working parents, obviously there's more money available to pay child care providers and to pay for higher-quality child care," said Elaine Ciulla Kamarck, a senior fellow at the Progressive Policy Institute, a Washington think tank that has the President's ear on a range of economic issues. "Rich people don't have a child care crisis. Markets do, at some level, work."

Indeed, at his televised town meeting in Southfield, Mich., on Feb. 10, Clinton responded to a question about child care with a plug for expanding the tax credits. He also called for a federal-state partnership to improve the quality of child care nationwide.

Most child care experts agree that tax credits or vouchers, however, won't solve the problem. There's no evidence that families who save money by claiming the tax credit, for example, use it to buy higher-quality child care.

"We've got to do both [subsidize parents and support quality programs] because [a high-quality child care] system just doesn't exist," said Barbara A. Willer, the public affairs director of the Washington-based National Association for the Education of Young Children. "We need to ensure that families have a range of child care options. But those choices are false choices unless there are strong systems and programs. So we need to target money in sufficient quantity to operate good programs."

The child care problem isn't a lack of providers. "We've pretty much shown that there are sufficient places out there-- you can find child care," Hofferth said, referring to the 1990 survey that she conducted with Willer and others. "The key issue is, is it good?"

Rich or poor, families in need of child care say that the first, and sometimes the steepest, hurdle is finding out what kind of care is available in their communities. See box, p. 514.)

In the business, this is called resource and referral. Although most states and communities have a resource and referral system, information about child care options doesn't reach most of the parents who need it.



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Peg Smith, the deputy director of Indiana's bureau of child development, said that one of the first things she discovered on the job was a pervasive information gap -- a gap that the state aims to fill through a comprehensive planning effort. "The state of Indiana invests a great deal of money into resource and referral," she said. "So we have to face the fact that something still isn't working. We may have to change some things."

Once parents find a day care provider, how can they judge quality? One way is to ascertain whether the provider is trained and whether the facility is licensed. Indiana's planning effort, for example, is also looking into upgrading licensing procedures for day care centers and training programs for providers.

Indiana's program is partially financed by the 1990 child care block grant program, which directed states to set aside a small portion of their funds for such quality improvements. Although similar activities are under way in other states, the Indiana initiative is considered more comprehensive than most. But even enthusiasts admit that these campaigns have a very long way to go.

Regulating day care is a state and local responsibility. But when the GAO surveyed state regulations and enforcement last year, it came up with a dismal picture. All states require commercial and workbased day care facilities to be licensed, but 32 states exempt at least some schoolbased centers and 12 exempt church-based centers. Although 28 states say that they license at least some home-based day care centers, as many as 92 per cent are actually unregulated. Monitoring and enforcement of standards at regulated facilities in many states is minimal, the GAO found.

"So they have these standards, but are they able to enforce them in a complete way?" said Janet L. Masica, an author of the GAO study, "If you think of all the providers in a state as a pie, the states are really only looking at a very small slice of that pie."

As part of the larger child care study, Phillips and several colleagues visited day care centers in Georgia, Massachusetts and Virginia to check on whether they complied with state-mandated ratios of staff to children. The ratios are strictest for infants and, not surprisingly, compliance was worst in this category. In Georgia, which has the most-lenient ratios, 72 per cent of the center were in compliance. In Massachusetts, which has the most-stringent standards, only 55 per cent of the centers were in compliance. Virginia was in the middle, at 63 per cent.

On the other hand, local ordinances and other regulations can sometimes be so intrusive and unnecessary as to drive providers out of the business or into the underground. "Our child care system is characterized by both regulatory neglect and regulatory overkill," said William Gormley, a public policy professor at Georgetown University who studies child care regulations. "It's a curious combination of overly strict and overly lenient regulations."

In Milwaukee county, Wis., a middleclass suburban area, Gormley figured that family day care providers had to make an average of \$ 936 in home improvements to pass the licensing requirements -- replacing kitchen fixtures and bathtubs and adding an exit door, for example. DeKalb County, Ga., requires them to run "a gauntlet of inspections, including building, electrical and plumbing



inspections," Gormley said. "Eight out of 10 providers simply ignore these requirements."

While the experts agree that reasonable standards are vital and credible enforcement is crucial, they say that regulations are sometimes misdirected.

"It's not like inspecting meat," Phillips said. "The best for of regulation accomplishes two things: It is provider education and support and it reduces the isolation of child care providers."

Indiana, for example, commissioned a series of training videos for day care providers that were broadcast on cable television during the children's nap time.

The quality question pretty much boils down to money: how much the providers of child care are paid. Whitebook's surveys show that college graduates in the child care field earn \$ 11,000- \$ 12,000 a year. To make \$ 20,000 or more a year, a child care provider has to get out of the playroom and run a school.

Borrowing an idea from Head Start, where salaries are higher, the California welfare-to-jobs program looked at a scheme to train welfare mothers to become child care workers. "Then they realized the women couldn't make enough money doing [child care] to get off welfare," Whitebook said.

Laurie Meltzer Klinovsky, a teacher who directs the Greenwood School in Hyattsville, Md., a private preschool that provides day care for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and several other federal agencies that have offices in the same complex. "If you're doing it to make money, you might as well get out of the business right now," Klinovsky said. "I do it because I like to do what I'm doing."

"We've really only put our toe in the water on the child care issue," CDF's Blank said. "Eventually, we're going to have to figure out how to finance this. And it can't be on the back of the child care workers. It won't happen without some funding mechanism. And it's going to be complicated."

GRAPHIC: Picture 1, Child care expert Deborah Phillips and her 2-year-old son, Samuel, at the Senate Child Care Center on Capitol Hill; Picture 2, Barbara A. Willer of the National Association for the Education of Young Children; Pictures 1 and 2 by John Eisele; Picture 3, Helen Blank of the Children's Defense Fund, Richard A. Bloom

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 28 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 Newsday, Inc.
Newsday

February 26, 1993, Friday, ALL EDITIONS

SECTION: BUSINESS; Pg. 45

LENGTH: 351 words

HEADLINE: Child-Care Experts Send SOS to Clinton

BYLINE: By Pamela Mendels. STAFF WRITER

BODY:

Saying that "Nannygate" has highlighted working parents' frustration with the failures of child care in the United States, 93 experts yesterday urged President Bill Clinton to establish a task force to come up with solutions to America's child-care crisis.

In a letter to Clinton, they called for a "Task Force on the Economics of Child Care," modeled on the health-care task force headed by his wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton, to look into three issues: how to create an ample and diverse supply of high-quality child-care settings; how to make that care affordable for working parents and how to make child care a well-enough paying career that it is more likely to operate on the books.

Nancy Kolben, one of the signers of the letter and president of the National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies, said the problems that scuttled Zoe Baird and Kimba Wood as attorney general candidates proved that the child-care system works poorly for people of all incomes. The lesson was underscored last week when two children of working parents died in a fire in an unlicensed family day care home in Queens.

"This is an issue that cuts across class lines," Kolben said. "What we now know is that whether you are rich, poor or middle class, child care is a problem."

Richard Stolley, senior editorial adviser of Time Inc. and president of the Child Care Action Campaign, a New York-based advocacy group, said he signed the letter realizing Clinton has many other pressing issues before him. But Stolley said he was dismayed that Clinton mentioned child care only once during his State of the Union message.

"Maybe child care is not first on the menu, but some attention should be paid to this crisis," Stolley said. "We are trying to create momentum, expectation, perhaps even pressure that this administration will see the child-care crisis as a serious situation that should be addressed."

Other signers of the letter ranged from academics such as Edward Zigler, a Yale University professor, to businesspeople overseeing work-and-family programs at major corporations.



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS[®]
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Newsday, February 26, 1993

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 29 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 The Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles Times

February 25, 1993, Thursday, Home Edition

SECTION: Metro; Part B; Page 7; Column 1; Metro Desk

LENGTH: 754 words

HEADLINE: COLUMN LEFT / CASEY S. MCKEEVER;
WILSON CUTS DON'T EQUAL CLINTON REFORM;
THE GOVERNOR'S REVIVED WELFARE PROPOSAL BEARS LITTLE RESEMBLANCE TO THE
PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM.

BYLINE: By CASEY S. MCKEEVER, Casey S. McKeever is directing attorney of the
Northern California office of the Western Center on Law and Poverty in
Sacramento.

BODY:

Gov. Wilson, badly in need of a boost, thinks he has found an ally in President Clinton. Wilson apparently believes that Clinton's Feb. 2 speech on welfare reform at the Governors' Conference "might help disarm critics" of his welfare program, decisively trounced by voters in November but reintroduced in Wilson's '93-'94 budget.

But Clinton's program hardly resembles Wilson's. The President proposes to spend \$6 billion to give families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children, typically headed by a 30-year-old mother of two children, more help in becoming employable. He also would assist working-poor families with health care, child care and added income support. Clinton would require that after completing a training program, an AFDC parent work, but guarantees a job would be offered.

In contrast, Wilson proposes to slash aid to these families by \$1 billion and calls this a "work incentive." If despite her best efforts a parent can't find a job, or finds one that barely covers her child-care expenses, too bad.

Wilson argues that the main reason poor families rely on aid is that AFDC is too generous. Yet cuts made over the past three years have reduced the value of AFDC by 20%, leaving the typical family with \$624 per month that, combined with food stamps, is 19% below the poverty line.

At the Governor's Conference, Clinton discounted the notion that welfare itself is the problem: "(M)any people stay on welfare not because of the checks . . . They do it because they do not want to put their children at risk of losing health care, or because they do not have the money to pay for child care out of the meager wages they can earn coming from a low-education base."

The centerpiece of Wilson's program is another 19% cut in benefits for poor families. It applies to those who can't find work even if they complete or are in the midst of job-training programs, and to many who supplement part-time, low-wage work with AFDC. Wilson hardly rewards those who, in Clinton's words,



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Los Angeles Times, February 25, 1993

"work hard and play by the rules."

The President promises to give AFDC recipients "the education, training and child care they need." Wilson proposes to "re-focus on employment-related services to help clients find jobs quickly" Instead of preparing them for jobs that would support a family, Wilson would rather that single mothers look for unstable part-time jobs that will guarantee their continued reliance on aid.

Clinton's total reform package also includes measures that would help the working poor: universal health care, a larger earned income tax credit, better child-support enforcement and more affordable child care.

Wilson offers a few "work-support features" and added child-support enforcement. But he mostly proposes to implement existing laws. The added child-care money he touts would still leave low-income parents facing long waiting lists for affordable care.

Wilson assumes that Clinton's encouragement of state experimentation means that his proposals would meet with automatic federal approval, even though they violate current laws.

But Wilson's "experiment" is a thinly veiled budget cut hurting large numbers of families on whom the impact won't even be studied. It does not serve the purpose for which "demonstration projects" were designed, and may not fit Clinton's demand that such experiments be "honestly measured."

Comparing Clinton's strategy favorably with Wilson's, however, does not mean that the President's approach confronts all the problems of low-income families.

Giving families with full-time workers the chance to escape poverty doesn't solve the strains on single mothers for whom parenting duties prevent full-time work from being a realistic option. As Harvard poverty expert David Ellwood said, policies must address the "dual role (of single parents) as both nurturer and provider." This could include a government-guaranteed child-support payment that does not decline with earnings, helping many women avoid poverty if they work part-time.

A set time limit on aid proposed by Clinton fails to account for the variety of situations and needs of poor families. It is also crucial that the public-service jobs offered after training are real and not dead-end make-work assignments.

Despite these questions, it should be clear that the President's reform strategy is fundamentally different from, and superior to, Wilson's. The governor should not be able to resuscitate discredited policies by hanging on the coattails of Bill Clinton.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXISTM
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 30 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 The Time Inc. Magazine Company
People

February 15, 1993

SECTION: IN HER WORDS; Pg. 103

LENGTH: 1174 words

HEADLINE: For richer, like Zoe Baird, or poorer, undocumented workers are often the best available child-care choice;

INFANT MORALITY

BYLINE: Ellen Galinsky, Rochelle Jones

BODY:

Zoe Baird's withdrawal as President Clinton's first nominee for Attorney General hasn't extinguished the debate over child care that her confirmation hearings ignited. While few parents could identify with the \$507,000 salary Baird earns as general counsel for the Aetna Life & Casualty Co. in Hartford, Conn., many could understand her decision to employ two undocumented workers, if not her failure to pay the couple's taxes. For most parents, finding safe and reliable child care is a worrisome task. And to those needing in-home care, undocumented workers are often the best available care givers. "Qualified workers are in short supply and difficult to find," says Ellen Galinsky, copresident of the Families and Work Institute, a research group in New York City. The author of three books on parenting -- and the mother of two grown children -- Galinsky, 50, talked to reporter Rochelle Jones about the "piecemeal nonsystem" of which undocumented workers have become a part.

Zoe Baird's failed nomination exposed the dirty little secret of child care -- the hiring of undocumented workers. How widespread is this?

What she did is quite common. While the majority of working parents with children under 5 are able to use relatives for child care, 3 percent hire in-home workers. It's difficult to say accurately what percentage of in-home child-care workers are undocumented, but we know that half or more of all referrals by nanny agencies are undocumented workers.

Why do so many ordinarily law-abiding people flout this particular law?

When Zoe Baird said she was thinking as a mother, not as a lawyer, that rang very true to me. Looking for child care can be very stressful and brings up every anxiety you've ever had as a parent. Will my child be safe? Will he come to value the person who cares for him more than me? People do, in fact, find it agonizing. When a parent finds someone she feels is suited to her child, she may overlook the legal issues in favor of what she feels is the best situation for the child -- although it is not necessarily the right thing to do.

The underground economy of undocumented workers seems to be flourishing. Why?

Hiring workers who are undocumented has a lot of advantages for some parents.



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

People, February 15, 1993

It can be less expensive. It can be reliable. If you're helping a worker to obtain legal status, you're just about guaranteed stability in child care during that time. Although there has been a lot of debate over whether these workers are taking jobs away from Americans, we've found that because of the low salaries and low status, few American workers are willing to take these jobs. You can work at a fast-food restaurant for what you could earn as a child-care giver.

Is this just a middle-class issue or does it cross economic lines?

There is no question that it's easier to find good child care if you have the money to pay for it. But even people with good incomes will tell you that they have trouble finding reliable care -- in-home or otherwise. The average price for child care in this country is \$3,150 per child a year. The cost of good child care can range from \$6,000 to \$12,000 a year. The parents who are really being squeezed are employed parents who fall just above the poverty line [\$13,950 for a family of four] and who don't qualify for such low-income benefits as child-care vouchers or Head Start.

How do parents find undocumented workers?

They're not difficult to find. Some parents find them through word of mouth. I've had friends place classified advertisements for child care, and every single person who responded was an undocumented worker. I've had friends who have contacted three or four different nanny agencies, and three-fourths of the referrals were undocumented workers. Since this is a low-paid profession, there's a real shortage in the number of people who are willing to do it. Moreover, some undocumented workers are better-suited than other applicants.

In what ways?

Culture plays a role. Many of these care givers may be from countries where child care is valued highly. In Haiti, for instance, child care is considered crucially important work -- as it should be. Many undocumented workers are above average in terms of education; some have even attended college. They tend to be people who love working with children.

The other issue the Baird case exposed was the paying of workers off the books. Is this common?

The IRS estimates that of the 2 million households that employ domestic help, only one quarter pay Social Security taxes for them. Many employers prefer to pay off the books because it's a hassle to fill out all the government forms that make the arrangement legal.

Don't the workers themselves prefer to be paid off the books?

That's another reason employers do it. The wages are so low -- the average in-home child-care worker makes \$2.30 an hour -- that a lot of workers, undocumented or not, don't want taxes and other withholdings taken out. Seventy percent of child-care workers earn below the poverty level. If you're earning that little to begin with, it seems particularly onerous to take home even less.

Are the undocumented workers being exploited?



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

People, February 15, 1993

Some are. We've found illegal Mexican workers in Texas, for example, who are being paid \$10 a week. In addition, many in-home workers receive no benefits, no paid holidays and no paid sick leave.

Why do law-enforcement agencies ignore this underground economy?

The laws are very hard to enforce. In my experience, if you claim a deduction for a child-care worker and then stop, the IRS starts writing letters asking you why. But if you've never filed a claim, there's no practical way to know that an illegal child-care worker exists. What can the agencies do -- pay surprise visits to people's homes?

What can be done to improve the state of child care?

We know how to provide quality child care. We fail not because of a lack of knowledge but because of a lack of will. When I attended President Clinton's postelection summit conference, I recommended that he form a commission that would bring together economists and early-childhood specialists to find creative ways to put more money into the child-care system.

Has any good come of the Baird hearings?

Good can come of it if we use this case as a call to action to do something about the child-care crisis. Studies consistently show that the care received by infants and toddlers, the youngest and most vulnerable individuals, is poorer than for any other age group. Child-care workers are underpaid, undertrained and underappreciated. It's not surprising, then, that they are in short supply.

We finance higher education, so we should be able to figure out similar financing for child care. We also need to change the immigration laws to make it easier for aliens to gain legal status as child-care workers. The problem is not undocumented workers; it's that the job is not valued for the significant role it plays in a child's development.

GRAPHIC: Picture 1, "There's a shortage of good child-care workers," says Ellen Galinsky (in a classroom at Manhattan's Bank Street School). descBlack and white: Ellen Galinsky sitting on the floor while a boy stands nearby., Photograph by Kimberly Butler; Picture 2, Baird (with President Clinton) reportedly told Clinton aides, before her nomination as Attorney General on Christmas Eve, that she had hired undocumented workers. She withdrew on Jan. 21. descBlack and white: Bill Clinton and Zoe Baird., BOB STRONG/SIPA; Picture 3, In 1990, Victor Cordero and his wife, Lillian, 32, together earned \$500 a week caring for Julian, now 3, the son of Baird and her husband, Yale law professor Paul Gewirtz. Victor, 26, also served as Baird's driver. Now separated, Victor reportedly returned to Peru last month; Lillian will soon follow. descBlack and white: Victor Cordero., PETER CASOLINO/NEW HAVEN REGISTER

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 31 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 Newsday, Inc.
Newsday

February 14, 1993, Sunday, NASSAU EDITION

SECTION: CURRENTS; Pg. 49

Other Edition: Suffolk Pg. 47, City Pg. 45

LENGTH: 603 words

HEADLINE: Let In More Child-Care Workers

BODY:

PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON'S decision to nominate Miami prosecutor Janet Reno for U.S. attorney general may put a lid on his administration's Nannygate woes. Let's hope so. Some of what emerged during that nearly eight-week national psychodrama pinched some very raw nerves. A lot of middleand working-class families would love to have the means of Zoe Baird - Clinton's first nominee - to pay for reliable day care.

Anxiety levels peaked again when Clinton dumped his next top choice - Kimba Wood, a Manhattan federal judge. Wood had hired an undocumented worker when it was still legal to do so. She paid the required taxes and broke no laws. But her nomination disintegrated, in part because the White House thought her use of an illegal alien might be tough to explain. What an absurd standard.

Nannygate I and Nannygate II have forced Americans to think about the shortage of child-care options for families of all incomes. It should also force Congress to rethink out-of-touch sections of the immigration laws and how they affect the availability of child-care workers.

Why have child-care workers been so hard for Baird and millions of other less affluent families to find? One primary reason: Not many Americans want these jobs. They don't pay well. The median income of full-time private household workers - including those who provide care to children or the elderly - is a measly \$ 179 a week, according to the Department of Labor. And the number of those workers is expected to plummet.

There's also a supply-side problem in day-care centers. The average annual staff turnover rate is 41 percent, according to a recent study. Raising day-care worker salaries would help, but that would place day care beyond the reach of many Americans. And millions need it. The National Child-Care Survey estimates there are some 27 million households with kids under age 13, about 16 million with working mothers.

One piece of the solution involves revising immigration laws to let more foreign child-care workers enter the country. Legal in-home child care is scarce because the Immigration Act of 1990 mistakenly assumed that plenty of Americans were eager to work with kids. The number of "unskilled workers" - the category that includes household help - who can legally enter the country each year and



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS®

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Newsday, February 14, 1993

seek permanent residence is only 10,000. It now takes 10 or more years for an unskilled worker - sponsored by an American - to get into the country.

A national consortium of immigration lawyers, IMMLAW, has a proposal worth mulling. Instead of lumping child-care workers with all unskilled workers seeking permanent residence, they'd like Congress to create a special category of temporary work visa for home-care workers. Work visas are now routinely issued to professionals and migrant farm laborers.

The "Nanny Visa," says IMMLAW, would be a five-year work permit that would enable U.S. sponsors to legally hire a nanny. Sponsors would be required to pay the going wage, comply with tax and Social Security rules and pay their workers' return airfare. During those five years, the workers could stay with the sponsoring family or switch to another, so long as they continued to provide home care. Applications for permanent immigrant status could be made during that time. Legalizing illegal aliens already working as nannies here should be considered as well.

If future Nannygates are to be avoided, Clinton and Congress must revise immigration laws. Millions of Americans, generally women, shouldn't be treated like pariahs because legal, affordable day care and nannies are in short supply.

GRAPHIC: AP Photo- Zoe Baird testifying on Capitol Hill.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 32 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 Newsday, Inc.
Newsday

February 9, 1993, Tuesday, NASSAU AND SUFFOLK EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 5
Other Edition: City Pg. 7

LENGTH: 1129 words

HEADLINE: Clinton on Defensive;
Under attack on cabinet jobs

BYLINE: By Susan Page. WASHINGTON BUREAU

DATELINE: Washington

BODY:

Scrambling to contain the latest in a series of political firestorms, the White House yesterday denied accusations that it was applying a double standard on the issue of child care and household help that hurts women being considered for top jobs.

But even some allies questioned President Bill Clinton's decision to drop two female candidates for attorney general from consideration because of their child-care arrangements, although the White House declined even to rebuke a male cabinet member, Commerce Secretary Ron Brown, for having failed to pay Social Security taxes for a household worker.

"It's a double standard that holds women responsible not just for our underpaid jobs in the work force but, on top of that, for our unpaid jobs at home," Patricia Ireland, president of the National Organization for Women, said in an interview. "We carry that double burden, and we're penalized for it."

The issue of who takes care of the kids and cleans the house probably wouldn't even have been raised for male candidates, said Harriett Woods, president of the National Women's Political Caucus. "If it had been a man," she asked in an interview, "wouldn't it have been assumed it was his wife's responsibility?"

White House communications director George Stephanopoulos denied any double standard, saying that in the future all prospects for senior jobs will be asked about any domestic workers. Those who have illegally employed undocumented workers probably won't be nominated, he said.

This latest controversy - distracting attention yet again from Clinton's preferred message on the economy - put fierce new pressures on the president as he sought to move quickly to fill the sole remaining cabinet slot. White House aides said the announcement could be made as early as tomorrow, with speculation centering on contenders of both genders.

"He's got good intentions," Ireland said. "What I don't want to see is my



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Newsday, February 9, 1993

grandmother's observation that the road to hell is paved with good intentions."

NOW yesterday urged its 600 chapters nationwide to launch a telephone, fax and mailgram campaign aimed at the White House and Congress urging Clinton to appoint a woman and asking male policymakers to explain their child-care arrangements. If Clinton doesn't name a woman as attorney general, Ireland noted, the number of women heading cabinet-level agencies in his administration will be no greater than during the Carter, Reagan and Bush administrations.

Rep. Patricia Schroeder (D-Colo.), one of Congress' leading feminists, expressed disappointment that a president in whom many women voters had put great store may fail to appoint a woman to any of the four top cabinet jobs - at the State Department, the Pentagon, the Treasury Department and the Justice Department. No one but white men have headed any of them.

"Of the four jobs, they decided this is the one they'd put a woman in," Schroeder said in a telephone interview from her Denver district. "For the other ones, they had buddies and moved them right in, and now they've got themselves in a little bit of a box. The tragedy will be that we won't have broken through any glass ceilings."

The drama began Christmas Eve, when Clinton announced he would name corporate lawyer Zoe Baird to head the Justice Department. But she volunteered that she had illegally employed an undocumented Peruvian couple and had failed to pay Social Security taxes for them. An explosion of public protest prompted the White House to withdraw her name.

Then, on Thursday, Clinton was on the verge of naming U.S. District Judge Kimba Wood of New York to the job when the White House learned she had employed an undocumented Trinidadian as a babysitter. It was not illegal to do so at the time, and Wood paid Social Security taxes for the worker; nonetheless, the White House told her she wasn't going to get the job for fear of another damaging dustup.

But when the commerce secretary admitted Sunday that he had failed for four or five years to pay Social Security taxes for his part-time household help, Stephanopoulos offered a series of justifications - that the law set an unrealistically low threshold for paying Social Security, for instance, and that many people were unaware they were required to pay it.

And Labor Secretary Robert Reich seemed irritated even to have the question broached in his appearance on CBS' "Face the Nation" Sunday. "I'm not here to talk about baby sitters," he scoffed. "I'm here to talk about the economy."

In response to media queries, some cabinet members have said they have not employed illegal aliens - including the secretaries of Agriculture, Education, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Labor and Veterans Affairs and the budget director. But the White House declined to offer accounting for the full cabinet or the senior White House staff.

"I don't know about all of their past histories," Stephanopoulos said. "You can check with them."

He said the Baird case had "sensitized" the administration to the issue and complained that Wood had been less than candid in explaining her situation to



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Newsday, February 9, 1993

the White House. He also said Clinton had been angered by the disclosure by an unnamed White House official that Wood as a student had briefly trained to work in a Playboy Club, calling the leak "irrelevant."

Sen. Alfonse D'Amato (R-N.Y.), who had nominated Wood for the bench, issued a press release criticizing Clinton's decision to drop Wood from consideration. "Judge Wood did not violate the law and is being held to a new and unfair standard," he said. "Obviously, this whole nomination process raises serious questions about what standards are being adopted and to whom they are being applied."

The controversy upended White House attempts to control news coverage. A hastily arranged announcement of a new environmental coordinating body and Clinton's declaration that he will seek another extension of jobless benefits were overwhelmed by the issue now dubbed Nannygate. In apparent recognition of the perception problems facing the White House, campaign strategist Paul Begala has resurfaced as a "volunteer" to coordinate Clinton's message when his economic package is released next week.

Meanwhile, some leading female lawyers at a meeting of the American Bar Association told Reuters that the Clinton administration had asked for additional names for consideration for attorney general. Lynn Hecht Schafran, who heads a program to promote women and minorities in the court, said the names they submitted were Mary Jo White, acting U.S. attorney in the Eastern District of New York in Brooklyn; Lindsey Miller-Lerman, a judge on the Nebraska Court of Appeals; Andrea Ordín, a Los Angeles lawyer; and Susan Gertzendanner, a former federal judge.

GRAPHIC: 1) AP Photo-Clinton, flanked by Labor Secretary Reich on his left and Treasury Secretary Lloyd Bentsen on his right, meets with his economic team at the White House, where he said he wanted to extend jobless benefits. 2) AP Cover Color Photo-Clinton in Oval Office

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

**LEXIS·NEXIS™**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS™**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS™**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 33 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.
St. Louis Post-Dispatch

February 9, 1993, TUESDAY, FIVE STAR Edition

SECTION: WAR PAGE; Pg. 1B

LENGTH: 817 words

HEADLINE: WHY NO NATIONAL CHILD-CARE DEBATE?; IT'S TOO COMPLEX

BYLINE: Kathleen Best and Bill Lambrecht Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau This article includes information from Post-Dispatch wire services.

DATELINE: WASHINGTON -

BODY:

AS PRESIDENT Bill Clinton moved closer Monday to naming a third candidate for attorney general, women's groups and others sifted the wreckage of his previous attempts, trying to frame a realistic debate over child care in America.

"We are hoping that Kimba Wood will do for day care what Anita Hill did for sexual harassment," said Rosemary Dempsey, vice president of the National Organization for Women.

But that might be tough. Whereas Hill's testimony in the Clarence Thomas hearings presented a stark, visual choice, the pictures are fuzzier in the cases of would-be attorneys general Zoe Baird and Kimba Wood.

Child-care questions raised by their hiring of illegal aliens are being seen through lenses of class, generational change, political strategy and legislative equity.

The complex issues are reflected in the responses of interest groups and those they hope to influence.

While the National Organization for Women began a phone and fax campaign Monday to protest a "double standard" in the White House selection process, other women's groups were laying back.

The National Women's Political Caucus and Women's Legal Defense Fund said women nominees should be treated the way men are, but they kept the volume turned low.

"I don't sit in judgment of what any group does," said Harriett Woods, president of the caucus. "We think President Clinton feels that the best person he can appoint is a well-qualified woman. We think that's true, too."

Clinton himself rejected claims of a double standard. He said Monday that White House officials interviewed applicants "in a totally evenhanded fashion."

Clinton said Cabinet candidates had not been asked questions about household



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 9, 1993

employees until Baird told White House officials that she and her husband had hired two illegal immigrants from Peru. Her nomination was subsequently withdrawn.

"This issue was never an issue - and it never occurred to anyone to make it an issue - until Zoe Baird voluntarily disclosed it," Clinton said. "So no one was subjected to a double standard."

Since then "all of our interviews, for men and women alike, have been conducted in a totally evenhanded fashion," Clinton said. He added, however, that he believed candidates for attorney general "should be held to a higher standard than other Cabinet members on matters of this kind."

Mixed signals on the two women were being received in congressional offices. The confirmation hearings on Baird, who admitted breaking the law by hiring illegal aliens to care for her children and not paying Social Security taxes on their earnings, generated 4,000 phone calls over three days to Sen. Paul Simon, D-Ill.

His office logged a dozen calls Monday on Wood, who complied with federal immigration and tax laws in hiring an illegal alien to baby-sit her children. And other congressional offices reported getting no calls on Wood at all. Wood was never formally nominated to the Senate.

Syndicated radio talk show host Rush Limbaugh used his show Monday to accuse Clinton of having "thrown two women to the wolves" in search of an attorney general. He berated the president for allowing his wife to interview Wood.

But the show - aired on 600 stations - did not appear to be stirring a grass-roots uprising.

Child care is too complex to make good grist for radio talk show, said Celinda Lake, a Democratic pollster whose company had ties with the Clinton administration. She said her research indicated that issues of class and wealth raised in the attorney general search had weakened its potential to trigger a national debate over child care.

"Most people would conclude that you don't use these vehicles" to advance the child-care debate, she said. "They're too complicated."

By some accounts, the fate of Baird and Wood was yet another growing pain that the "baby boom" generation must endure as it takes the reins.

William Strauss, co-author of the book "Generations," said that no other new administration has had to deal heavily with the problems that come when both parents have careers.

Strauss also observed that baby boomers - those born in the generation after World War II - may have conflicting values: expanding the role of women in public life while paying close attention to children.

"This is not something that George Bush's generation had to deal with," Strauss said.

Ruth A. Wallace, a sociology professor at George Washington University, said



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

that the controversy had "underlined an inequity" in society.

"It's always assumed that child care is a responsibility . . . that is the burden of the mother," Wallace said. "The question is, why aren't some of the younger men asked some of these questions?"

The White House called in political adviser Paul Begala to help Clinton avoid more blunders and signaled that a new nominee could be announced as early as today.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: September 29, 1993



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 34 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Inc.
St. Louis Post-Dispatch

February 9, 1993, TUESDAY, THREE STAR Edition

SECTION: WAR PAGE; Pg. 1B

LENGTH: 775 words

HEADLINE: WHY NO NATIONAL CHILD-CARE DEBATE? IT'S TOO COMPLEX

BYLINE: Kathleen Best and Bill Lambrecht Post-Dispatch Washington Bureau This article includes information from The Associated Press.

DATELINE: WASHINGTON -

BODY:

AS PRESIDENT Bill Clinton moved closer Monday to naming a third candidate for attorney general, women's groups and others sifted the wreckage of his previous attempts, trying to frame a realistic debate over child care in America.

"We are hoping that Kimba Wood will do for day care what Anita Hill did for sexual harassment," said Rosemary Dempsey, vice president of the National Organization for Women.

But that might be tough. Whereas Hill's testimony in the Clarence Thomas hearings presented a stark, visual choice, the pictures are fuzzier in the cases of would-be attorneys general Zoe Baird and Kimba Wood.

Child-care questions raised by their hiring of illegal aliens are being seen through lenses of class, generational change, political strategy and legislative equity.

The complex issues are reflected in the responses of interest groups and those they hope to influence.

While the National Organization for Women began a phone and fax campaign Monday to protest a "double standard" in the White House selection process, other women's groups were laying back.

The National Women's Political Caucus and Women's Legal Defense Fund said women nominees should be treated the way men are, but they kept the volume turned low.

"I don't sit in judgment of what any group does," said Harriett Woods, president of the caucus. "We think President Clinton feels that the best person he can appoint is a well-qualified woman. We think that's true, too."

Other mixed signals were being received in congressional offices. The confirmation hearings on Baird, who admitted breaking the law by hiring illegal aliens to care for her children and not paying Social Security taxes on their earnings, generated 4,000 phone calls over three days to Sen. Paul Simon, D-Ill.



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 9, 1993

His office logged a dozen calls Monday on Wood, who complied with federal immigration and tax laws in hiring an illegal alien to baby-sit her children. And other congressional offices reported getting no calls on Wood at all. Wood was never formally nominated to the Senate.

Syndicated radio talk show host Rush Limbaugh used his show Monday to accuse Clinton of having "thrown two women to the wolves" in search of an attorney general. He berated the president for allowing his wife to interview Wood.

But the show - aired on 600 stations - did not appear to be stirring a grass-roots uprising.

Child care is too complex to make good grist for radio talk show, said Celinda Lake, a Democratic pollster whose company had ties with the Clinton administration. She said her research indicated that issues of class and wealth raised in the attorney general search had weakened its potential to trigger a national debate over child care.

"Most people would conclude that you don't use these vehicles" to advance the child-care debate, she said. "They're too complicated."

By some accounts, the fate of Baird and Wood was yet another growing pain that the "baby boom" generation must endure as it takes the reins.

William Strauss, co-author of the book "Generations," said that no other new administration has had to deal heavily with the problems that come when both parents have careers.

Strauss also observed that baby boomers - those born in the generation after World War II - may have conflicting values: expanding the role of women in public life while paying close attention to children.

"This is not something that George Bush's generation had to deal with," Strauss said.

Ruth A. Wallace, a sociology professor at George Washington University, said that the controversy had "underlined an inequity" in society.

"It's always assumed that child care is a responsibility . . . that is the burden of the mother," Wallace said. "The question is, why aren't some of the younger men asked some of these questions?"

The White House called in political adviser Paul Begala to help Clinton avoid more blunders and signaled that a new nominee could be announced as early as today.

Begala, appearing on NBC's "Today" show, suggested that Clinton could have faced even more heat if he had supported Wood.

"We would be sitting here today and you'd be asking me how many times does Bill Clinton have to be hit on the head with a baseball bat before he learns to get out of the way," said Begala.



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, February 9, 1993

Democratic strategists said that Clinton needed to take his message straight to people and avoid the political hothouse of Washington. Clinton planned to do just that with a campaign-style town meeting in Michigan on Wednesday. Later in the evening, Vice President Al Gore planned to hold a similar meeting in California.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: September 29, 1993

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

**LEXIS·NEXIS®**

A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

LEVEL 4 - 35 OF 35 STORIES

Copyright 1993 U.S. News & World Report
U.S. News & World Report

February 1, 1993

SECTION: U.S. NEWS; ON THE AGENDA; ON THE ECONOMY; Vol. 114,, No. 4; Pg. 51

LENGTH: 847 words

HEADLINE: Zoe Baird's hard child-care lesson

BYLINE: By Susan Dentzer

BODY:

Zoe Baird confessed that she was acting as a mother, not a future attorney general, when she hired undocumented immigrants to look after her child. Her appointment to run the Justice Department is now history -- but the issues raised by her experience in the grim child-care market live on. Among them are tough questions about the role of public policy in fostering better child care. That's a concern dear to the heart of President Clinton and his activist wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton. And any drive by the Clintons to get the government more deeply involved in such family matters -- vital as it could be to the economy and society -- might make the uproar over Zoe Baird look like child's play.

At first glance, Baird's child-care choices seem mystifying. Her employer, the Aetna insurance company, provides workers with extensive help in finding child care and is consistently rated among the most "family friendly" companies in America. Moreover, with an annual family income that topped \$ 600,000, Baird could even have gone so far as to hire a \$ 50,000-a-year child psychologist to care for her son, rather than the \$ 250-a-week Peruvian woman she eventually chose. Yet experts in child-care economics say Baird was actually typical of millions of American parents in several key respects. Shopping for a care giver is in some ways like picking an auto mechanic; without much hard information on the quality of services that will be provided, parents must make instinctive judgments about whom to pick for the job. They also resort to simpler yardsticks like convenience -- such as having a caretaker at home, rather than at a center, to accommodate a hectic work schedule -- as well as price, a criterion evident in Baird's apparent desire to get a good deal.

Imperfect market? These attitudes may sound more calculating than maternal, but they point up a fact of life in the marketplace for child care that has important implications for public policy. The average family with working parents and young children pays a stiff 10 percent of its income for child care; if the price of care rises too high, many mothers or fathers will quit working and tend their children full time. University of Wisconsin economist James Walker argues that this is one critical reason that the real price of child care has barely risen over the past 15 years, despite the enormous rise in demand for care among working mothers with preschool children. At the same time, a growing and mostly female corps of workers has sought employment as care givers, often drawn by the ability to mind their own children while they work. The result has been to depress the wages of child-care workers, who earn about 40 percent less than other employed women with comparable levels of education.



LEXIS·NEXIS™

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS™

Ⓜ A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group

Low earnings have encouraged massive turnover among these workers -- frustrating parents and hurting kids, who thrive on stable care.

To some economists and child-care advocates, this is a clear-cut case of a "market imperfection" that produces a poor outcome for families and society. But what to do about it? Economist Ann Witte of Wellesley College and of the National Bureau of Economic Research argues that giving parents more information about child-care quality could help. Federal funding could be increased for state services that refer parents to qualified care providers, spurring demand for better-trained and higher-paid care givers. And paternalistic as it sounds, the government could expand public-service campaigns to teach parents about the importance of early child development, so they could make better-informed choices about child care for their children.

But what about families that, unlike Baird's, can't really afford to pay more? During his election campaign, Clinton proposed several strategies, such as broadening tax breaks for families with children. Yet such tax relief or other subsidies to low-income families will be tough to enact without widening the federal budget deficit or hiking taxes on somebody else. Another Clinton notion -- raising licensing standards for child-care facilities, which vary widely from state to state -- is also problematic. For instance, requiring child-care centers to increase the ratio of care givers to kids sounds like a great idea. But such measures could also raise costs so much that they might have the perverse effect of driving more child care underground, into private homes and other unregulated settings.

In a nation with millions of working parents, the government can't duck these thorny issues. But this is politically dangerous territory -- and the key question may be whether federal moves to improve the quality of child care will conflict with parents' own preferences, warns economist David Blau of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. At last December's economic summit in Little Rock, Ellen Galinsky, copresident of the New York-based Families and Work Institute, proposed convening a special conference on the economics of child care. Baird's bombshell might turn out to be Lesson No. 1.

GRAPHIC: Drawing, No caption (Illustration by Maris Bishofs for USN&WR)

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group



LEXIS·NEXIS
A member of the Reed Elsevier plc group