

defects of tonsils, adenoids, and anemia. Only those cases which were seriously in need of medical care were included in this 27 percent.

The picture that we found of these children as we went into the schools was that of palor, of poor nutrition, poor posture, flabby muscles, and general lack of alertness, which is just the opposite from what we should expect of children of this age. Therefore, I will repeat that in the States there is an urgent need for Federal aid, that the need is great, the people are calling for it, and that we are unable to give it at the present time.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Doctor, would you mind telling the committee which Michigan county that was you referred to?

Dr. SMITH. Macomb County.

Mr. DINGELL. What was the reduction in the budget in your Department for Michigan?

Dr. SMITH. Fifty and seven-tenths percent.

Mr. DINGELL. In the last legislature?

Dr. SMITH. Yes, sir; in the last legislature; for 1934 as compared with 1929.

Mr. DINGELL. Oh, as compared with 1929?

Dr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Was not your budget gradually cut down until it reached 50.7 percent, reduction as you say?

Dr. SMITH. It has been reduced gradually; yes.

Mr. DINGELL. It was not cut in 1 year?

Dr. SMITH. Not in 1 year; no.

Mr. DINGELL. So the tendency is to cut down constantly—

Dr. SMITH. That seems to be the tendency.

Mr. DINGELL. The appropriation for the care of this service?

Dr. SMITH. For this service.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Dr. Smith, for your appearance before the committee and the information you have given us.

STATEMENT OF J. PRENTICE MURPHY, PHILADELPHIA, PA., THE CHILDREN'S BUREAU OF PHILADELPHIA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee:

It is a very high honor to be permitted to discuss briefly so important a bill, because it is very evident that although this is not a perfect bill and cannot because of human frailty result if enacted in perfect legislation, it certainly is destined to be looked back upon as an historic and classic legislative document. Its inclusiveness represents a note in the Federal approach to human welfare which is timely and effective and very far-reaching.

Running very hurriedly, I would like to be recorded as expressing the opinion that in regard to the old-age assistance the administration of that section should be properly left with the Department of Labor, because all signs point to a fairly rapid—whether wise or unwise is another question—diminution of some of the major activities of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. Others will discuss the adequacy of the total appropriation and of the individual grants under this heading.

Also, in regard to the administration of the proposed mothers' assistance Federal-State program, that might very properly be left to the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, and members of the committee: In the States we are facing a very urgent need for Federal aid in developing maternal and child health services. I speak not only from my knowledge of conditions in Michigan but also from what I know of the situation in other States. The need is much greater than in previous years because of problems arising out of the depression, but even in the years of prosperity we were unable to meet the demand for help. It is encouraging to note that people are beginning to recognize the need and are asking for help, but we are unable to give the help needed because of reduced appropriations and reduced personnel. State funds have been greatly reduced within the last few years. In 1934 in Michigan our funds available for maternal and child health programs through the State Health Department were practically 50 percent less than in 1929. In the States as a whole, in nine States there were no funds for a maternal and child health program. In 34 States the funds were reduced as much as 96 percent in one State.

The special needs for mothers include adequate medical and nursing care during pregnancy and at childbirth. Such care is not available at the present time. The recent study of maternal deaths in 15 States, including Michigan, brought out the fact that this care was lacking for the following reasons:

First, lack of funds to obtain it.

Second. Lack of knowledge as to the need for such care.

Third. Inaccessibility of nurses and doctors in rural areas.

Fourth. Lack of physicians and nurses in rural areas, qualified to give such care.

The study also brought out the fact that many mothers are dying from abortions—from abortions which they have induced themselves or had induced by others, because of the fact that they had not the funds to go through with the pregnancy. There are many deaths of married women who have had abortions just because they have not the sufficient funds. We feel that the assistance of public-health nurses going into the homes, helping these mothers, securing the needed financial help for them, and teaching them to care for themselves, would markedly reduce these deaths. In Michigan, in 2½ years, out of 1,627 maternal deaths, 28 percent followed abortions. We feel that that is a very definite indication for more attention along these lines and help for these mothers.

Special needs of children include, among others, the following:

Adequate diets, which are pitifully inadequate at present. I would like to quote Dr. Thomas B. Cooley, president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, who said, in a group of doctors, that he had seen more scurvy in the last year than he had expected to see in his entire lifetime. He said that it not only indicates the need of the protective foods to prevent scurvy, but also indicates the need of education of the mothers as to the need for these foods.

There is also need of nursing and medical supervision of infants under 1 year, during which time so many children die. We need correction of physical defects in growing children. The need for this care of children was brought out in a study that was made by the State health department in one county in Michigan and included 3,000 children. Physical examination was given to these children, and it brought out the fact that 27 percent of these children were suffering from serious physical defects, such as malnutrition, dental defects,

One of the very best known lines of the poet Francis Thompson is applicable to this whole picture of child welfare:

Thou canst not touch a flower without troubling of a star.

A mine accident in Pottsville, near my home, results in a crop of widows and a crop of orphans. We are faced with interlocking and interrelated social and economic forces which reach into all of our lives. The bill now before you, I believe, has elements of great value because it provides many ways for the further protection of children, first in their own homes and then elsewhere.

If more States had the service which has been permitted to the State of Michigan as a result of the very beneficent use of the wealth of Senator Couzens, there would be in the national picture a smaller group of orphans, lessened infant mortality, and greater security in families.

When mothers' pension legislation was first enacted in 1911 largely as the result of a great conference here in 1909, it was very fondly hoped that a great volume of child care out of their own families would be terminated. In part this has been accomplished. I have been in social work for 25 years. I say that one of the tragedies of social work is the fact that far too many children are cared for away from their own people. It is an observation that not enough of us realize that we have effectively but one mother and one father, and substitutes at best are substitutes.

In this bill there is built a broad program of service for mothers with dependent children, which, per dollar expended, will yield results quite in line with what we have where mothers' aid has been wisely administered in various States. If we had not had mothers' aid legislation during these years, the number of children away from home would be very much larger than it is.

Gentlemen, we are thinking in terms of huge totals with vast consequences for good or ill to those who are affected. At this present time there are 250,000 to 300,000 children away from their homes. We do not have accurate statistics. As a result of the activities growing out of this legislation if enacted we will have accurate statistics as to our child dependency population.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it be possible under this legislation to reassemble the families that are now scattered?

Mr. MURPHY. Very definitely, sir, because it is the experience of those who do a good social work job that along with material relief, after all, the most effective thing is an intelligent and high-grade advisory service to families. Families need guidance. They need advice. That which is permitted through the health services restores mothers to families, and lacking that they would not be restored. Where you have good public welfare administration coupled with good private administration in States, you have a falling off, and wisely so, in the population of children away from home; because, Mr. Knutson, the basic keynote of good welfare, the heart of this security program, is not to build more people in agencies away from families, but to build them in their own families.

It is also this—this is an observation backed by a vast amount of factual material—that while material relief is essential, and in the great tragedy which is upon us, most essential—just that and nothing more leaves lots of families still cold and out on a limb. Because

unless we do have the quality of the service such as the Children's Bureau under some of the provisions of the bill may express through public departments to private agencies, we are still going to have families breaking up, while vast sums of relief are being expended.

May I say this: One of the characteristics of private social work in this country has been the receipt of huge sums from private resources. The habit of giving along that line, while checked momentarily, it is not ended. That which Senator Couzens has done in Michigan might well and properly be done in many States.

Under the example as set by the Children's Bureau, under a leadership which is recognized throughout the world for its quality of service, an enormous impetus has been given to the liberalizing of the use of private funds.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, Mr. Murphy, for your appearance before the committee and the information you have given. You may extend your statement in the record, if you wish.

Mr. MURPHY. May I do that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; you have that permission.

(Mr. Murphy submitted the following extension of his remarks:)

[Reprinted from the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Philadelphia, November 1934]

CHILDREN IN THE NEW DEAL

(By J. PRENTICE MURPHY)

There are approximately 50 million children in the United States, more than half of whom live in rural areas. In October 1933 there were approximately 5,184,272 children under 16 years of age in 3,134,678 families on relief. In June 1934 this number had grown to 7,000,000 in 3,835,000 families. Since then there have been further increases. The figures bespeak the size of at least one child-caring job which the Federal Government has on its hands. If to this picture we add the number of unemployed children between 16 and 21 years living at home, we further broaden the scope of Federal responsibility for the care of children. The "new deal" has done a great deal for children, but it must do more for many children who will continue to live with their own families. It may be forced, among other things, to take on new burdens for certain children separated from their own people, who happen to be living in States with little or no financial or social resources, or where such are becoming exhausted.

During the last year of President Hoover's administration, Congress appropriated \$300,000,000 for unemployment relief. It was administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation through a separate division. It became very evident by March 1933 that the Federal relief funds thus expended were gradually spreading out into fields beyond unemployment relief under a very narrow interpretation of the term. In some States, private agencies were being subsidized out of Federal funds, including family, child-caring, hospital and health, and other types of agencies. In some States, public mothers' aid services were being so financed. These developments were natural. The demands in the face of mounting need and a limited administrative staff in Washington were complicated by the authority and power left with the Governors of the several States in the expenditure of Federal funds to meet relief problems unprecedented both in variety and in extent. Often there was no previous local or State experience, nor trained personnel to draw upon. Often there was lack of adequate State welfare machinery and of private organizations and resources. The Nation began to pour out on the national table all its distress, including much that had nothing to do with unemployment, and which it had long ignored or neglected.

THE NEW RELIEF ACT AND CHILDREN

The present Federal Emergency Relief Administration Act was enacted shortly after President Roosevelt entered office. The act indicates a clear recognition on the part of those who participated in its preparation and passage, of the need

of an entirely new and much more authoritative Federal relief set-up. The final draft of the bill which later became the act was the subject of a number of discussions on the part of social workers who had kept very close to the thinking of leaders in Congress on the necessity for Federal relief. In attendance at Washington were persons such as William Hodson, now Commissioner of Welfare of New York City, Stanley F. Davies, now General Secretary of the Charity Organization Society of New York City, Linton Swift, Executive Director of the Family Welfare Association of America, Walter West, Director of the American Association of Social Workers, Harry Hopkins, Federal Relief Administrator, and others. The prevailing thought of this group was that the new act should be concerned solely with the relief of families or individuals in need due to unemployment. It was felt that the support of specialized child care and hospital and health services, for example, should not be loaded upon the Federal Government.

The writer detailed a number of serious conditions affecting dependent and neglected children in need of removal from their own homes or already receiving separate care. It was his recommendation that the way be left open so that, under careful safeguards, extraordinary need in certain areas among children of the types referred to might be provided for through Federal funds in the absence of local or State, public or private resources. The enormity of the demands then being made on the Federal Government because of unemployment was discussed in detail. It did not appear that the proposed appropriation of \$500,000,000 would last many months. But there was no prophecy that huge additional Federal relief appropriations were to be needed before the year was out.

Senators Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Edward P. Costigan, Robert F. Wagner, and others among Senate leaders were of the opinion that, at the time, first consideration had to be given to the care and protection of children in their own families. If conditions did not improve, further legislation could be introduced. It was Senator La Follette who said that, if necessary, a children's bill providing for the protection of the health, educational, and other unmet needs of children could be introduced. These gentlemen were among the first to visualize the necessity for Federal unemployment relief and the extent to which such help would have to go. They saw the difficulties besetting private and public social work throughout the country.

SCOPE OF RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. Hopkins, who at the time of these conferences was chairman of the Temporary Emergency Relief Administration of New York, was also meeting the President as a preliminary to his acceptance of his present position as Federal Relief Administrator. In the course of some of the discussions he remarked quite humorously that some of his friends back in New York had said to him as he was leaving for Washington that he would have to be mighty careful lest children's workers and others unloaded all their burdens on his shoulders.

It is a fact that Secretary Perkins and Miss Grace Abbott, then Chief of the Federal Children's Bureau, in conference with certain congressional leaders, gave the final polishing off to the bill which became the Federal Emergency Relief Administration Act. They recommended the addition of certain phrases making possible Federal relief on a broader basis than strictly interpreted unemployment relief. Their advice was accepted. Developments since the act went into effect have justified the wisdom of their advice. It might otherwise have been impossible to carry out certain greatly needed relief activities, especially in agricultural areas. Contrary to the belief of some, the present Federal Emergency Relief Administration Act does not prohibit or preclude appropriations for the care of dependent and neglected children and other groups outside those receiving relief in their own homes or in shelters.

Mr. Hopkins, in entering upon his duties as Administrator of Federal Relief, was beset by countless pressing demands. His reaction to the increasing subsidizing of private agencies out of Federal funds, among other matters, can be measured in rules and regulations which he issued formally from his office under date of June 23, 1933. He saw that a relief program which had been developed prior to March 1933 could not in its entirety be accepted as the basis for any sound temporary or long-time Federal relief program. In his rules and regulations, he said in part:

"(a) Grants of Federal Emergency Relief funds are to be administered by public agencies after August 1, 1933.

"Just as all State commissions responsible for the distribution of Federal and State funds to local communities are public bodies, so in turn should those local units be public agencies responsible for the expenditure of public funds in the same manner as any other municipal or county department.

"This ruling prohibits the turning over of Federal Emergency Relief funds to a private agency. The unemployed must apply to a public agency for relief, and this relief must be furnished direct to the applicant by a public agent.

"(b) Grants made to the States from Federal funds * * * may be used for the payment of medical attendance and medical supplies for those families that are receiving relief.

"(c) These funds may also be used to pay the cost of shelter for the needy unemployed.

"(d) These funds may not be used for the payment of hospital bills or for the boarding out of children, either in institutions or in private homes, or for providing general institutional care. These necessary services to the destitute should be made available through State or local funds."

These instructions are clear. They state fundamental social philosophy. It is within the powers of the Administrator to broaden these rules if he so desires. While it came as a shock to some whose first interests were in the child-caring and health fields to learn that they were eliminated from specific Federal assistance, there was a very general recognition of the soundness and necessity of the rules and regulations. Neither the Federal Relief Administration nor the specialized private fields as named were prepared for the immediate handling of the complicated issues involved in any assumption of Federal responsibility for child care and health support on an institutional or agency basis. As had been stated so many times by social workers and others, the first line of defense for children is in their own homes. It is beyond question that a program of family relief or for responsible detached older adolescents and adults can be carried out more easily than where one assumes the care of persons, especially children, uprooted or detached from the families.

WARNINGS OF 1930

The Federal Relief Administration from the start has fully understood the meaning of family life to children. It has not been necessary to remind it of one of the pronouncements of the first White House conference in 1909: "Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. It is the great molding force of mind and character * * * except in unusual circumstances, the home should not be broken up for reasons of poverty." Nor was it necessary to get approval of some of the findings of the 1930 White House conference, to wit:

"Large numbers of children still suffer unrelieved in their own homes or are separated from their homes because of poverty.

"The social care and treatment of dependent and neglected children either in their own homes or in a foster family or institution is a most serious matter and should only be undertaken by persons qualified by special training, experience, and skill.

"Large numbers of needy children, additionally handicapped by considerations of color, national origin, or mass migration, do not share in the provisions made by public and private agencies for dependent children.

"Large bequests are tied to outworn methods of child care while modern progressive methods lack adequate support.

"Extraordinary opportunities for the prevention of the causes which deprive children of parental care are availed of to only a slight degree.

"Invalidism, accidents, irregular employment, unemployment, and insufficient wages leave hundreds of thousands of family homes without that adequate income which is essential to the maintenance of a home suitably equipped for the rearing of the citizens of the future.

"The volume of dependency may be considerably reduced by some application of the insurance principle to distribute over larger numbers and much longer periods of time the present loss in family income from these causes."

By the spring of 1933, which marked the close of the fourth winter of the depression, these findings had taken on added significance. In some instances certain social conditions in the country were clearly getting out of control. It was, therefore, essential that prevention, as well as alleviation, through a more adequate family relief program be given first consideration. However, it was quite clear that the restrictions imposed by Mr. Hopkins created very serious problems for many agencies and people in certain States and localities which had been receiving Federal funds for health and child care, or were planning to request such help. Mothers' assistance resources in some States were likewise affected. It was felt by some that conditions would arise affecting children outside the relief field which could not be dealt with satisfactorily through local or State resources, making it necessary to turn to Washington for help.

In spite of an improvement in industrial conditions, and contrary to the hopes of every one, and in spite of the new and extraordinary steps taken to provide employment, such as the Civil Works Administration, the Local Works Division, Emergency Conservation Work, and other brilliantly conceived projects, the number of families on relief continued to increase. Hence it has been more and more difficult for the Federal Relief Administrator to take on further specialized responsibilities outside of his relief job.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE FEDERAL PICTURE

It is essential that we look again at some of the elements in the Federal picture of relief. It spreads over the whole country. It operates in States which have highly organized systems of public and private social work served by highly skilled executives and staff members, and again in States lacking such resources, with enormous resistance due to ignorance, and with small funds. In many States there were no reservoirs of experienced social workers to be called into action in developing and protecting the involved and far-reaching elements which are essential to a sound family relief program. The political obstacles which had to be overcome in some of the States were monumental. In others, difficulties of this sort are still very much in the picture. There have been prejudices due to class relationships and to the differences which separate urban and rural groups and the different geographical areas into which the country is divided.

For great numbers of families, relief still falls below adequate dietary standards. Great numbers of families continue to face the horrors of eviction. The authority granted to include rent as an item in the budgets of families on relief has been offset by lack of sufficient funds in all but a few States and localities.

Superimposed upon all these considerations, it has been necessary for the Federal Relief Administration to develop understanding, a point of view, and a certain minimum amount of training for an army of new workers who, aside from certain academic and character backgrounds, were not equipped for a highly technical and expert service.

SPECIAL GROUPS OF CHILDREN

However, as we see before us the millions of children in families on relief, we are likewise confronted by others who face the necessity for removal from their own homes or are now being cared for in foster institutions and families. What is the situation confronting approximately 400,000 children in the care of 1,900 public and private children's agencies and institutions? What is happening to the 300,000 children living with their own mothers who are dependent in whole or in part on that special type of public relief which we call "mothers' aid?" What concern should we express for the 200,000 children who annually pass through the juvenile courts, and for the average annual population of 65,000 boys and girls and young men and young women who are in our industrial schools and reformatories? To a very large extent they come out of and return to families on relief. Therefore, what is happening to these families in the quality of social work as expressed to them, its imagination and its vision, becomes of vital importance. Since the depression began 5 years ago, a total of probably 2,000,000 children have passed through or are now in the care of mothers' aid and specialized child-caring agencies. They present a children's army of which we must not lose sight, nor are their problems such as can be ignored.

Humanity, in its family life, resolves itself into a series of rising and falling tides of activity. Children are born and, like adults, die. Hopes are realized and defeated. Parents achieve different results for themselves and their children; they are loving and wise, they are neglectful and ignorant, they desert, and they shelter and guard. Adequate specialized services for children are essential to well-rounded social programs, whether these programs be local, State, or National. These services are nonexistent in many of the 3,000 counties in the United States. Whole States are indifferent. There is thus presented a challenge which would seem to call for an answer in the next steps to be taken in our work of recovery.

DEPENDENT AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN

There are about 400,000 dependent and neglected children in the care of almost 2,000 public and private child-welfare agencies. In the face of the great disaster of unemployment, the needs of these children have, to a certain degree, been in the shadow. They offer part of the basis for the statement that in this country where we have so much wealth there has been much neglect where children were concerned, and much indifference about it all.

Progress in this field has rested on the basis of slowly developing standards of care under the direction of experienced and competent workers. The latter, in many parts of the country, have had to witness the lowering of standards, and where private agencies were involved, a reduced ability to care for children. The average citizen has little understanding of all that is involved in a sound foster care program. The "new deal" in this regard has faced an increase in the number of children separated from their parents, the stream going into public rather than into private agencies, with much lessened emphasis on the essentials as to health, shelter, and supervision. As has been said, but for Federal aid in large part, the volume of child care for dependent and neglected groups would have been much greater.

It has been easier for the well-organized urban areas to withstand the strain. It is in the rural areas, which are so unorganized from the standpoint of social welfare, that we find the most serious conditions. It has been easier to ignore their needs, notwithstanding the fact that the care of neglected and dependent children is an essential part of any relief program.

Much remains to be done from the standpoint of social education through a consultation and advice service to make clear what lies ahead of us. There are many children in families receiving relief who would be much better off in foster institutions or families. More children have gone into foster families in the face of grave questionings as to the kind of care they are receiving. Much that has been gained in care of this type may easily be lost, with results which will affect the work of whole States and localities. The answer in part is more Federal leadership and guidance.

CONFERENCES ON CHILD WELFARE

On December 15, 1933, as a result of a call to the President from the Child Welfare League of America, Miss Grace Abbott, then chief of the Federal Children's Bureau, brought a group of more than 100 representative children's workers together in Washington in a Conference on Emergencies in the Care of Dependent and Neglected Children.

It was reported that State and local appropriations for the support of such children by public and private agencies were being greatly reduced in many localities. Likewise, private contributions had fallen off; there was less income from endowment, and parents and relatives were less able to meet the costs of care. Thousands of older children who would normally have left these agencies to go to work were unable to find employment.

Notwithstanding the huge expenditures for unemployment relief, such relief was, in a large number of cases, insufficient to protect the health and welfare of children or to prevent their ultimate removal from their own homes. The general nonpayment of rents was leading to evictions, with tragic consequences to morale. In some localities children were being sent to almshouses or were being returned to their own homes with conditions of neglect or cruelty unchanged.

In some States, appropriations for mothers' aid had been seriously decreased, allowances were much less than adequate, and mothers were kept for long periods on lists before receiving aid. It was made clear that without Federal and State financial support to meet unemployment needs, almost countless numbers of children would have faced ill-considered removal from their own homes. The consequent volume of care for children's agencies, under existing circumstances, could not have been met. It was recommended that all standards of emergency relief be raised so as to insure to children a continuance of their rightful relations with their own families, and that where mothers' aid could not be financed out of local funds, State aid should be provided; and lacking such, Federal relief funds would become necessary. When given, such aid should be administered by the public agency now responsible for administration and supervision.

It was felt that plans should be developed to provide vocational training for homeless boys and girls over 16 years of age, and that employment should be provided for such children at public expense for the period of the emergency. State public child welfare machinery should be inaugurated or strengthened in part through consultation services under the auspices of a special unit of the Federal Government experienced in this field.

No recommendation was made for the granting of Federal funds for the care of children with institutions and agencies apart from their own relatives, this burden being left to public and private agencies in the different localities and States.

At a well-attended conference in March 1934 in Chicago, members of the Mid-West Child Welfare League considered further the action taken at the

Washington Conference of December 1933. It was emphasized that the problem of care and treatment of dependent and neglected children at this time could not be satisfactorily met without a competent child welfare set-up within the Federal Relief Administration to secure accurate information as to needs among children, and a trained personnel. The dangers in mass consideration and care of children away from home, and the appraisal of all remedial measures on the basis of their accord with sound principles of child care, regardless of social stress and emergency, were also emphasized. Since this conference, thinking has been away from having this special child welfare program developed by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, because of the size and extent of its work and the necessity for more specialization in the Federal welfare picture.

CHILDREN AND THEIR SCHOOLS

"Of all the areas in which a nation can choose, and of all the means by which it can determine its future, there is none that matters more, or indeed as much, as education. It touches the mind and the mind is the life of man."¹

This ideal must be viewed in the light of realities. The depression has exacted a heavy toll for our children through reduction in the number of teachers, shorter terms, closed schools, and a discarding of special services such as visiting teachers and classes for the mentally backward. All this is in the face of an increase of school population by reason of normal population growth, and increased social work burdens of the older adolescents unsuited for industry or unable to find jobs.

The teacher has played a heroic part during this period. Salaries have been reduced generally throughout the country, and in many cases have been unpaid for long periods. It was reported in June 1934 that at that time, in 46 States, there was owing to teachers \$57,000,000 with no evidence of debt, and a total of \$50,000,000 for which warrants or certificates had been issued but with no hope of early payment. Since this time the Federal Government has done an extensive refinancing work for many school communities reporting these conditions. In many places, teachers' salaries have been paid. Out of the deep gloom of a few months back, a new and more optimistic note is being sounded. Unquestionably the National Administration has been concerned about this whole situation, and has been active in more ways than are generally understood.

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration, through its special work projects, has rebuilt a large number of dilapidated country schools. Moreover, it used the services of more than 4,000 unemployed teachers for approximately 61,000 children attending nursery schools from unemployed needy families in 35 States. A total of 11,000 teachers were employed on all projects. It is still problematical whether the next Congress will see serious attempts to get specific Federal aid to bear part of the cost of education in at least the most impoverished States. We must not fail to refer to the approximately 75,000 college students who were aided through special grants.

CHILDREN IN MOTHERS' AID FAMILIES

Mothers' aid legislation, first enacted as a law in this country in 1911, was one of the primary recommendations of the 1909 White House Conference. It has been one of the greatest factors in checking the sweep of children into the care of foster families and institutions. It was the hope that such legislation would end the separation of mothers from children where poverty was the sole or chief factor. It has exerted a powerful influence on the whole field of public relief. In 45 States we have mothers' pension laws; they all provide for widows.

The ideal was to have this legislation also safeguard children whose fathers were divorced, had deserted, were in prison, suffered from physical or mental disease, or, in certain cases, were not married to the mothers. This broader mothers' aid program is included in the legislation of 20 States.

It is estimated that at the present time 300,000 dependent children are in the care of their mothers receiving mothers' aid support at an annual cost in excess of \$30,000,000. It is likewise estimated that for the country as a whole an even larger number of children of widows and other types of mothers eligible for such aid are being supported through unemployment relief grants.

There are wide differences between the States and between localities in given States as to the monthly grants made to mothers. They range, for example, from \$52.89 for Massachusetts (1933) to \$4.33 in Arkansas (1931). In Cleve-

¹ Barker, Ernest, *National Character*, Harper Bros.

land, Ohio, the 1933 monthly average was \$45.34; in Jackson County of the same State for the same year, the monthly average was \$2.63.

Practically all of this legislation rests on the basis of local or county support. In a few States the burden is shared by the States and the localities. It is becoming increasingly clear that here is a field of social welfare into which Federal aid should go on the basis of a separate category of relief, with the Federal Government and the States bearing the burden of support. It is important that the particular gains made in more than 20 years through this type of legislation be not lost or swallowed up in the greater mass of unemployment relief now being distributed throughout the country. It is unfortunate for the sake of the social welfare principles involved, that up to the present time States have been unable to secure a "matching" of mothers' aid appropriations by the Federal Emergency Relief appropriations. Those States and localities which have not accepted legislation of this type or have given it up have used emergency relief funds for such cases, with a very definite easing of burdens for their own taxpayers.

Any retrogression from the values contributed by this legislation for mothers and children will have a costly reaction on the whole child-care program of the Nation. Federal legislation permitting an application of relief of this type on a broad basis in all the States will stand out as an event of the first magnitude. It is gratifying to note that throughout the country during the past 5 years the principle of mothers' aid legislation has continued to be defended and supported with vigor and courage in the face of serious tax situations. The situation is nevertheless very serious, and will be hopeless for large numbers of children unless Federal aid comes into the picture.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

The emphasis on men as against women in industry is in the face of the large number of families with female heads. We are told that in some communities they represent from 15 to 20 percent of the families on relief. Illegitimacy has increased, for reasons which are obvious. The decline of the marriage rate plus overcrowding are important influencing factors. The essentials of protective work where cruelty, gross neglect, improper guardianship, and other conditions are present leave much to be desired. Courts and other public officials are more reluctant to correct abuses. One large State society for the prevention of cruelty to children reports an increase in cases of cruelty and abuse, especially sex cases involving young girls. It also reports a large increase of incest cases, due in the main to overcrowding and the presence of unemployed men and older boys at home.

The inability of child-caring agencies to discharge at a normal rate has made necessary on the part of the better financed agencies the care of many older boys and girls. With agencies less equipped, these children have become part of the transient army. The total number of transients, especially children, is much less than was estimated. For boys 18 years and over, the Civilian Conservation Corps camps have been a godsend; but the problem still remains a critical one, especially in view of the block to regular employment. We have also transient families moving from place to place, with their old permanent rootings entirely gone.

The infant-welfare problem in unemployed and partly employed families is a very real one. We are told that in these families the birth rate is higher than for families which have not suffered from the depression. This increase in birth rate holds alike for all types of unemployed workers. There is also the problem of child care in families handicapped by physical disability, chronic illness, and mental ill health.

If there had been no cessation of the work formerly done under the Federal maternity and infancy law, it would have been possible to give better health protection to children, especially those in unemployed families. One of the next steps in the recovery program should be a revival of this service. Notwithstanding many handicaps, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration has, along with the Federal Children's Bureau, done much to safeguard the health of children.

The Child Health Recovery program, under the direction of the Children's Bureau, during the current year has achieved real results, especially in a quickening of understanding of the need of medical care for children, and the ways whereby this and undernutrition may be overcome. All authorities make it clear that large numbers of children have taken "quite a beating" in terms of their health since the depression began. It is heartening to register the constant concern of the Relief Administration to do its part in this broad attack on the evils of ill health and sickness among children.

THE NEXT STEPS

The indications are that the Federal Government is to announce very shortly a broad program of social and economic security. It should advance the principle of social insurance along many lines, so as to divide the risks in terms of sickness, unemployment, and industrial handicaps for those affected by these adverse drives. Such measures will be of enormous benefit to children. The principle may well be applied to mothers with dependent children, thus removing one group of families now erroneously counted among the unemployed. We should like to see an enlarged Federal Children's Bureau, possibly within a Federal Department of Welfare, equipped so as to work effectively in its own well-chosen field. The responsibility on government, especially the Federal Government, for leadership in measures affecting children's welfare is unescapable.

(J. Prentice Murphy is executive secretary of the Seybert Institution and the Children's Bureau of Philadelphia, and member of the Pennsylvania State Welfare Commission and of boards of directors of various national welfare agencies. He has long been identified with children's work and connected with national activities affecting children. He is author and editor of a number of articles and publications dealing with social work for children.)

STATEMENT OF R. J. KNOEPEL, VICE PRESIDENT INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

Dr. GEORGE E. BENNETT. I am Dr. Bennett, supposed to appear on the program for the same cause as to which Mr. Knoepfel is speaking, together with Miss Church, both of us representing the Maryland League for Crippled Children. I would like to find out if it would be possible for us to give our time to Mr. Knoepfel, who is talking on the same subject, so that he may be able to go into the details of the care of crippled children?

Mr. COOPER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. You may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOEPEL. My name is R. J. Knoepfel. I am vice president of the International Society for Crippled Children, chairman of the legislative committee of the International Society for Crippled Children, New York City. I represent a constituency of about 35 State organizations devoted to crippled children, and organizations in 10 other States by correspondence and information.

In these States there are about 19 States having very well developed programs for crippled children, covering the whole field of discovery or finding of academic education, orthopedic care, after-care, convalescent home care, leading up into vocational education, vocational guidance, placement, and then continuing from that point, according to the laws of the various States, into the rehabilitation program of the rehabilitation department.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Will you include a list of those States in the record, please?

Mr. KNOEPEL. I will be very glad to submit it. As a matter of fact, if you would like, I would include in the record this directory which shows all the State organizations and a brief statement of the law of each State and the officers, if you desire it. I will be glad to give you one. I will give it to you, or it can go in the record, just as you prefer; or I will be glad to mail copies of them down to you for the use of the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The only objection to putting it into the record is that the record is already very long.

Mr. KNOEPEL. I do not ask that; I just offer it as a service.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will send a number of copies to the chairman of the committee, they will be distributed.

Mr. KNOEPEL. I will be very happy to do that.

Mr. REED. In the course of your remarks, Doctor, will you include a definition of crippled children as involved within the purview of your work?

Mr. KNOEPEL. Yes, sir; that is what I would like to do, that is why I wanted more than 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If it develops during the course of your statement that you need more time, we will extend your time.

Mr. VINSON. Some of the committee thought that the Dr. Bennett and Miss Church who wanted to yield time were not here.

Mr. KNOEPEL. They are here.

Mr. VINSON. They are here and they have the time. I cannot see that we lose any time by granting the request.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, the doctor will proceed.

Mr. KNOEPEL. I think that we need not go into the point that this is needed, because there are a number of States economically unable to undertake these programs.

As I stated, only about 19 States have well-developed programs, and that is a matter of degree. This problem is a complete problem, starting with the education of the crippled child and education of the public about crippled children. It really starts and centers in the public schools. The academic education runs along with the rehabilitation, with the operation of the surgeon, with the teaching of a child at a later date something which his particular handicap permits him to do, so that economically he may take his place in society.

In regard to the bill, I have a few suggestions to make, the first of which is that there was not a definition. I offer the definition which we used for the past few years in the Hatfield and the Copeland bills, which I think, with the substitution of the words "crippled children" for "physically handicapped children" would make a good definition.

For the purpose of this act the term "crippled children" shall be construed to mean any persons below the age of 21 years who by reason of physical defects or infirmities, whether congenital or acquired by accident, injury or disease, are or may be expected to be totally or partially incapacitated for participation in the educational and vocational activities expected of normal persons.

I think that is a pretty good definition. There are other definitions which I could submit to you.

Mr. VINSON. Is that definition in any State law?

Mr. KNOEPEL. That definition is something like the definition which is in the State law of the State of New York, only that definition is wider and includes "physically handicapped."

Mr. VINSON. Most of them, however, have a lesser age, do they not?

Mr. KNOEPEL. The age varies, sir. In some States the age is 18. I think in most of the States the age is 18. In a good many States the age is the age which is prescribed by children's courts, because in some of the States the children's courts are tied into this picture, and the child of the poor is brought into the children's court and the children's judge commits the child either for special attention or treatment. In those States the age is usually that age.