

production to be paid by the employer alone. I would not object were S. 1130 and H. R. 4142 attended to provide a 3-percent tax from the very beginning in 1936, because I believe that it is urgent to begin as soon as possible to build up the necessary reserves. In my judgment, however, it would be a serious mistake in policy for the Federal legislation to require the pooling of contributions and thus prevent any State from providing the fullest possible incentive to better management and employment stabilization.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 9, 1935.

Hon. PAT HARRISON,
Chairman Senate Finance Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRISON: I would like to place the central office of this organization on record with your committee as favoring the measures in Senate 1130 for greater security for children, mothers' aid, maternal and child health, crippled children, aid to dependent children, and other welfare services, and participation by the Children's Bureau.

I do not believe it is beyond the competence of the Federal Government to take such steps as are embodied in this bill for the equalization of opportunity among children in the United States. In fact, I think our governmental structure would be open to severe criticism were it not to seize this opportunity for bringing to disadvantaged children throughout the country as even a measure of opportunity as possible. After all these children have nothing to do with where they are born or happen to live and should not be penalized therefor.

Consequently the assistance of the Federal Government in securing effective operation of mothers' pension laws, of insuring that children in rural areas shall be born as safely and successfully as others, that cripples shall not remain hidden away from treatment, and that children in poorer communities will not be deprived of modern social service opportunities, seems to me entirely worthy of support.

I should like to have the committee consider seriously specifying the Children's Bureau as the agent of the Government to administer the mothers' pension sections of the bill, because the Children's Bureau has had more contact with this matter than any governmental department and a permanent measure of this kind ought to be allied with a permanent department. Of course, the creation of a Federal welfare department would be the logical place for such service. The Emergency Relief Administration, admirable as it is, seems to me not quite logical as an administrator of a permanent service. I am enclosing copies of statements on these matters from several of our member organizations: (1) Mrs. Blanche La Du, chairman of the Minnesota State Board of Control; (2) Mrs. Virginia Kletzer, chairman of the Child Welfare Commission of Oregon; and (3) one of my own based on statistics which I think may be of special interest to you.

Very truly yours,

C. W. ARESON,
Assistant Executive Director.

**MINNESOTA'S STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC SECURITY ON
CHILD WELFARE IN A GENERAL PROGRAM OF SOCIAL SECURITY**

In the State of Minnesota the various provisions for services to children proposed in S. 1130 have been dependent on and promoted by a State-wide program under the direction of the State board of control.

This program, established in 1917 by act of the legislature, placed on the State board of control the responsibility of promoting enforcement of every law for the protection of illegitimate, dependent, neglected, delinquent, and defective children. The board was authorized to organize county child-welfare boards and coordinate the activities of juvenile courts and reputable child-helping agencies. The experience of the State board of control since January 1, 1918, in promoting the program for the protection of children proves the value of the provisions proposed in S. 1130, title VII, section 703.

In Minnesota the State board of control may appoint county child-welfare boards on request of the county boards but the State makes no financial contribution for the administering of the child-welfare services in the county. Support of programs for such services depends on local interest and action of county boards. Because of this generally in only 20 percent of the counties has there been

In conclusion, on behalf of the welfare of the dependent and handicapped children of Minnesota and of these United States, we wish to respectfully urge that adequate Federal appropriations be made at this time for a program of general security for child health and protection. It is appropriate that the Federal Government come to the aid of the States and local communities in this time of extreme financial distress in order that the welfare of our children may be so protected as to insure the health and happiness not only of the present but of future generations.

MINNESOTA STATE BOARD OF CONTROL,
By BLANCHE L. LADU, *Chairman*.

STATEMENT BY C. W. ARESON, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, 130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND STREET, NEW YORK CITY, ON CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE SECURITY BILL S. 1130

I should like to comment briefly on title VII, sections 703 and 704 in favor of participation by the Children's Bureau in organization of child welfare services to redress glaring inequalities suffered by children in certain sections of the country. It is our opinion that such inequalities arise far more often from lack of proper organization of services to use available resources than from lack of money. It is rather common experience for the Child Welfare League to find in communities an expenditure of money that is adequate but applied ineffectively so that the available funds do not reach the largest number of children who need service. A striking example of results that may be secured even where funds are limited is presented by the Child Welfare Department of the State of Alabama, whose per capita wealth is one of the lowest but whose services to these children are more evenly spread and in many ways more effective than in numerous States far more able financially.

In assembling statistics for the White House Conference of 1930 the Child Welfare League of America found certain very striking contrasts which I wish to present briefly to the committee. Unfortunately these appear to be as between certain Northern and certain Southern States but this should not invalidate their meaning since in the compilation of the statistics from the Southern States Negro children are not included, and three, at least, of the Northern States are newer in population development and not above the average in per capita resources. The Northern States are: Massachusetts, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

The Southern States are: Virginia, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama.

The statistics reflect the number of children per 10,000 of population (1) both of whose parents are dead; (2) whose fathers are dead; (3) whose mothers are dead; and who, in their respective States are in the care of agencies and institutions and not being cared for either in their own remaining homes or the homes of relatives.

Full orphans, that is, children with both parents dead, average $5\frac{1}{4}$ in the first group and $17\frac{2}{3}$ in the second group.

Children whose fathers are dead, that is, the type of families commonly aided by mothers' pensions or mothers' aid, average 12 in the first group and $30\frac{1}{2}$ in the second group.

By contrast, children whose mothers are dead, the type most obviously in need of other home or institution care, average $20\frac{1}{2}$ in the first group and $15\frac{1}{2}$ in the second group.

From the figures quoted it appears that a quite abnormal number of full orphans are occupying space in the institutions and agencies of the second group and are not being permanently provided for with new homes as their orphanage requires. Analyses of a large number of institution populations indicate that the numbers of orphans in the second group are at least 50 percent too high for this class. This seems to us to reflect the lack of sufficient service of the right sort to get these children into new and permanent homes.

With respect to children whose fathers are dead it is very obvious that in the second group an abnormal number are in institutions and agencies. This is the group ordinarily cared for at home by their mothers who receive support from mothers' aid or mothers' pensions and their abnormal number reflects the lack of development of this type of aid. This comment, of course, would reinforce our approval of title II, sections 202 to 211. It is now recognized, without the necessity of comment, that maintaining children from families of this type in institutions or agencies is a much more expensive process than assisting their

mothers to maintain them in their own homes, as well as less satisfactory for the maintenance of the family unit.

I presume that in consequence of the overloading of institutions and agencies by orphans and by children whose fathers are dead, there is less room available for children whose mothers are dead. In the first group these were 20½ and in the second group 15½, a reversal of the order of preceding statistics. Ordinarily children of this group should outnumber both the others in the care of agencies and institutions for the obvious reason that when the mother dies the chances of a father maintaining a suitable home for the children are much less than when the mother remains with the family. One can only conclude that there are numbers of motherless children left with relatives and others who would be afforded definite assistance were the resources of their States organized for this purpose. It should not be overlooked that the abnormal loads from certain groups, ordinarily cared for otherwise, prevent these institutions and agencies from accepting neglected and abused children out of families that are not suitable for their upbringing.

Those who know the rapid development which certain of the States in the second group have been accomplishing in recent years will correctly see in the above figures and discussion only the fact that the States in the second group have not progressed as far as certain other States. In fact, the admirable development in certain of those States constitutes the strongest ground for approving sections 703 and 704, title VII, which will enable the Children's Bureau to assist States that are actually endeavoring to assist themselves, though they may be somewhat handicapped in doing so. North Carolina is an excellent illustration of service conceived in broad lines but needing assistance to make it entirely effective.

There seems to us no reason in fairness why children should not receive approximately the same opportunities in various parts of the United States and we believe the sections of this bill will tend to accomplish this and we therefore favor it.

STATE OF OREGON CHILD WELFARE COMMISSION,
Portland, Oreg., January 31, 1935.

Mr. C. W. ARESON,
Assistant Executive Director, Child Welfare League of America, Inc.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ARESON: After a careful reading of the child-welfare measures provided by the Wagner bill, I hasten to express my hearty endorsement, with one exception. The question arises why the Federal authority for aid to dependent children and the Federal authority for service to dependent and neglected children do not both rest in the United States Children's Bureau, instead of splitting the authority in the children's field, as is done in the Wagner bill by placing administration of aid to dependent children in the I. E. R. A. and that for child-welfare services in the Children's Bureau. To me it seems that the Children's Bureau is the logical Federal authority for both of these functions. This division of authority will, in our opinion, make for confusion and complications in administration because some of the neglected children will be members of families without more than one adult in the home and families who need and secure relief. Such a family should not be subject to two sources of supervision when one will serve more efficiently.

The Oregon law provides for dependent mothers of dependent minor children, but it fails to provide for either State supervision of administration or any equalization fund. Accordingly, there are 36 varieties of administration in the 36 counties of Oregon. A mother living on one side of a county line may suffer for necessities, while a mother in identical circumstances across the county line may receive adequate assistance. The State supervision which the Wagner bill requires will reduce these inequalities of treatment of mothers in need of help. Through its provision for an equalization fund it will place the State in a position to respond with greatest aid where greatest need exists. This is an important provision.

The latest figures assembled on a State-wide basis list five Oregon counties that have made no appropriation for mothers' pensions. Three of these are in the drought area, where the most acute need exists. These are Jefferson, Malheur, and Wheeler. Naturally in counties where special reasons exist for inability of residents to pay taxes, credit is more difficult to secure, and poor people have a more difficult time of it than in the other counties. The State should assist such