

Policies for the Use of Federal Child Welfare Funds

by MILDRED ARNOLD*

THE 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act authorized the appropriation of increased Federal funds for child welfare services. To help guide the States in planning for the expanded services thus made possible, the Children's Bureau needed to develop new policies. As a first step, the Bureau held four regional conferences between October 2, 1950, and January 5, 1951, with representatives of State welfare departments, other public agencies, and voluntary agencies and also held a national conference with representatives of national voluntary organizations concerned with the child welfare programs.

The purpose of these conferences was to consider the needs of children for child welfare services, whether under public or voluntary auspices; the problems confronting public and voluntary agencies in meeting these needs; and the main points that ought to be covered in the policies to be adopted by the Children's Bureau for the guidance of the States and the Bureau's child welfare representatives in developing plans for the use of the increased funds.

On the basis of the discussions at the four regional conferences and the conference of national voluntary agencies, the Children's Bureau developed a policy manual¹ to guide the States in planning for the use of the additional Federal funds provided by the Congress.

The 1950 law made four revisions in the Federal child welfare provisions:

1. The total amount of Federal funds authorized annually for child welfare services was increased from \$3.5 million to \$10 million.

2. The flat amount available to each State was changed from \$20,000 to \$40,000 annually.

3. The basis for allotment of the balance of the Federal funds was changed from rural population to rural population under age 18.

4. Authorization was provided to use Federal child welfare services funds "for paying the cost of returning any runaway child who has not attained the age of sixteen to his own community in another State in cases in which such return is in the interest of the child and the cost thereof cannot otherwise be met."

The following proviso was also added: "Provided, that in developing such services for children the facilities and experience of voluntary agencies shall be utilized in accordance with child-care programs and arrangements in the States and local communities as may be authorized by the State."

To realize the intent of these amendments, the Children's Bureau wished to develop new policies concerning personnel, professional education, foster care of children, return of runaway children, and community organization and planning in rural areas and areas of special need.

In general, regulations and policies in force for the use of Federal child welfare services funds have been broad and allow the States wide latitude in developing plans. The act provides that such plans shall be developed jointly by the State agency and the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency. One specific requirement in the regulations, however, limited the use of Federal funds for maintenance of children in foster care; funds could be used only for temporary care in boarding homes or "projects for care in such homes for special groups of children to meet particular needs."

Now that the Bureau faced the necessity of revising old policies—and

issuing new ones—how could it go about the task of building the broad, sound base so essential to children's services, how could it be sure that these expanded services would meet the needs of children in communities in all parts of the Nation? The Bureau needed the help of many persons, particularly those who would carry the main responsibility for the expanded programs. The five conferences were planned to bring these workers together to help with the task.

Out of these discussions, the Bureau hoped, would come important guides to broad, sound policies on which the expanded programs could be built.

Regional Conferences

The plan for each of the four regional conferences included, for the first 2 days, meetings of the Children's Bureau personnel with representatives of the State welfare agencies—the agencies responsible for the development and administration of the child welfare programs under the Social Security Act. These meetings were conducted in an informal fashion. The agenda for the conferences were developed by the conferees themselves, each conference dividing itself into small groups to bring out the questions to be discussed. As a result, there were some variations in the discussions in each of the four conferences, though at the same time there was a striking similarity in the topics selected.

Certain significant trends were apparent in the discussion. There was general advocacy of the full use of all resources and interests under both public and voluntary auspices, and recognition of the need for more and better community planning to assure the expansion of child welfare programs on a sound and effective basis. It was recognized that such planning should be so organized that it would enlist the effective participation of representatives from voluntary agen-

* Director, Division of Social Services, Children's Bureau.

¹ *Policy Manual for the Use of Federal Child-Welfare Services Funds*, April 9, 1951.

cies, public agencies, and citizen's groups.

Priorities in the Child Welfare Program

All the regional conferences stressed the importance of community planning in the establishment of new services and in the extension and strengthening of existing services. All community resources and interests, under both public and voluntary auspices, should be utilized in programs of social services for children and youth.

A high priority was also placed on the development of a balanced program with a wide variety of social services and facilities to meet the needs of children and youth. In such programs, particular attention should be given to services for strengthening family life and helping children in their own homes. More adequate coverage of social services for children and youth is needed if these services are to be available in geographic areas now without such services and in areas with only limited services. Obviously, too, the development of personnel with the necessary skills and knowledge must have a high priority if these objectives are to be achieved.

Increased research in child welfare was also urged by the conferees, who realized the need for research as a tool in community planning and as an aid in evaluating the effectiveness of present methods, techniques, and organization.

A Comprehensive Program

Each of the regional conferences discussed briefly the proper scope and content of State child welfare programs and accepted as a basic premise that "children who need services are found in all economic, social and ethnic groups, and services should, therefore, be available to all children needing them regardless of their economic or social status."

The focus of a program should always be on the child and his needs. Children have a wide variety of problems that call for social services and for the resources and facilities that are essential to meet their needs.

The conferees emphasized the urgent need for certain aspects of services in child welfare programs, whether under public or private aus-

pices—early recognition of problems; strengthening home life for children; provision of skilled service; helping children individually or in groups to meet social problems through professional services and adequate resources to meet needs; and preventive work in eliminating hazards and causes of social problems through community planning.

Adequate legislation, sound organization, and adequate funds were considered necessary for effective services to children.

Community Planning

The conferees recognized the need for community planning to (1) bring about better understanding of programs and services and to obtain citizen support; (2) achieve inter-agency cooperation; (3) promote effective utilization of all existing resources, under both voluntary and public auspices, and encourage the expansion of such services when necessary; (4) promote a multidisciplinary approach in developing services and in meeting the problems of children; (5) gear social services for children into differing cultures and practices; and (6) help citizens fulfill their responsibilities in a democracy.

Community planning in child welfare programs is not new. It has always been an important part of these programs. But too often the planning has been piecemeal and sometimes after the fact.

The possible structure and organization for effective State and community planning was discussed at some length. Because of the differences in size, type, and stages of development among the States, as well as among the local communities, flexibility in structure was recognized as essential. Plans should be made for the training and utilization of personnel with special knowledge and skill in community planning to assist States and local communities.

The conferees felt that the experience and interest of groups that had participated in the Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth would be an important source of strength for community planning. To prepare for that Conference, State committees had been designated or

appointed in every State and Territory. They reviewed State-wide needs and submitted a report to the Conference. Community-planning groups had also been organized in at least a thousand counties. These planning groups represented widely different groups—professional and citizen—in the population, and both voluntary and public agencies.

Planning is now well under way for a follow-up program of the White House Conference. Planning committees in every State, and a national citizens' committee—all under voluntary and not governmental auspices—are being set up to stimulate and coordinate follow-up efforts. Provision is being made for an advisory council on State and local action and an advisory council of national voluntary organizations, for liaison with the Federal Government.

How can a general planning committee, such as that for the White House Conference, be used in planning for an expanded child welfare program?

The general consensus was that planning for children is everybody's concern. Not only do public and voluntary agencies share responsibility in community planning, but citizens too should participate. To be effective, community planning for child welfare services should be both continuous and comprehensive; it should be State-wide as well as local. It is not enough to develop some initial plan through a representative meeting and let it go at that. The planning must be a continuing process that is capable of adaptation to changing conditions.

Research

Two types of research were discussed at the four regional conferences—basic research, which relates to the study of child growth and development, and operational research, which relates to methods of doing the job.

The conferees held that research, including fact-finding, is an essential tool in effective community planning. Skill in evaluating the services provided, including processes and methods, and in discovering the unmet needs of children, should be improved. Cooperative research on a regional

basis might be possible, and national leadership in planning research is one of the great needs. Because of its special responsibility for assembling facts and information on child life, the groups advocated that the Children's Bureau give more leadership in this important field.

Use of Child Welfare Funds

For its child welfare program, each State receives a flat sum from the Federal Government; in addition, it shares in the balance appropriated for this purpose for the Nation according to the proportion of its rural population under age 18 to the total rural population under that age.

The groups recommended that the Children's Bureau consider changing the definition of rural areas. A rural area has been defined as a county in which more than 50 percent of the population live in nonurban places, as defined by the Bureau of the Census, or as a county that has less than 50 percent of its population living in nonurban places but that does not have a city of 10,000 or more population according to the 1940 census.

Several possible ways of defining a rural area were suggested, including (1) developing areas on a district basis rather than on a county basis; (2) defining the area on the basis of where children live who are receiving services; and (3) raising the limitations on the size of a city within a rural area from the present definition of 10,000 population to one of 20,000 or 50,000.

The conferences also wanted clarification of the definition of an area of special need, particularly with respect to the requirement that Federal funds be used in such areas for developing State services for the "encouragement and assistance of adequate methods of community child-welfare organization."

The conferees discussed at length how Federal funds might be used so that they would not lessen or supplant State or local funds already appropriated for the child welfare programs. There was general agreement that Federal funds should not be substituted for funds already available but that, in keeping with the purpose of the Social Security Act, they should be used for establishing new services

or for extending and improving existing services to children.

Personnel

The groups agreed that social services to children cannot be extended and strengthened unless skilled, professionally trained personnel are available. In staffing the programs, States are faced with a variety of problems, such as an insufficient supply of trained personnel; the inequality of salaries among States (States that pay low salaries lose competent personnel to States that are able to pay more); difficulties in providing for competent supervision; difficulties in securing and retaining staff for rural areas; and the inability of professional schools to supply enough workers.

Because of the importance and, at the same time, the serious shortage of qualified personnel, the conferences agreed that the development of a long-range plan for the employment, training, and improvement of essential personnel should be given a high priority in the expansion of child welfare programs. When trained persons are not available, only persons with general aptitude and ability who are qualified to obtain professional training should be employed. States have found it unwise to recruit persons who could not acquire the necessary skills or be eligible for professional training.

Skilled supervision was considered vital. How can such supervision be brought closer to local workers, particularly in rural areas? Some States have been developing plans for using a local supervisor for county workers in a district composed of two or three counties. Thus the geographical area and the supervisory load are kept small enough to permit staff meetings, group discussions, and other methods of supervision that give workers the stimulation they so often lack in isolated rural areas. Although State consultation is needed on various aspects of the program, it cannot take the place of local supervision. A plan for the training of supervisors should be part of the long-range training program; it might be set up in cooperation with schools of social work, or other methods of increasing skills in supervision might be used.

The importance of extending and strengthening staff development programs was emphasized in all the conferences. There is great need for broadening and strengthening the skills and techniques of the staff currently employed—especially the skills involved in community planning and organization, in work with children living in groups, and in research.

It was recommended that the Bureau consider the use of Federal funds to extend in-service training programs beyond the public welfare agencies—to training schools for delinquent youth, to probation departments, and to voluntary agencies.

Professional Education

Professional education was a major topic of discussion in all the regional conferences. There was general agreement that programs for professional education in social work for the child welfare staff should be expanded.

One of the basic questions considered was whether professional education should be provided, as at present, through payment of a stipend covering the cost of such education, or whether it should be provided through payment of salary to staff members granted leave for professional education. Young workers who have dependents have great difficulty in using leave for professional education when the stipend is based on the cost of education. For this reason, some provision should be made for the use of Federal funds under either plan. A State agency might then choose the plan it would follow, which should be used uniformly throughout the State. Federal funds, it was agreed, should be used for professional education in a graduate school, but not for undergraduate education.

One serious problem in planning professional education for a greater number of workers arises from the lack of opportunity for field-work placements of students in schools of social work. Policies should permit the use of Federal funds to extend opportunities for field-work placement in cooperation with schools of social work; in this area, State public welfare agencies have a responsibility to cooperate with the schools.

The greater use of field-work placements in juvenile courts, child-care

institutions, day nurseries, and departments of public welfare in rural areas was advocated. This arrangement would facilitate the extension of training opportunities and would benefit both public and voluntary agencies.

Training for specialists other than caseworkers, including staff with skill in group work, research, and community organization, is needed. Other personnel, such as cottage parents, should also receive in-service training—through institutes, workshops, and other methods—as part of the agency's total program of staff development.

Foster Care

All four regional conferences considered the use of the increased Federal funds for the provision of foster care for children through the further development of foster-care services within the public welfare agency and also the use of voluntary agencies for the care of those children who are the responsibility of the public welfare agency. Localities where there are child welfare workers but no funds available for foster care should receive first consideration. The second priority should be given to localities where funds are available but not sufficient to meet the need, and the third, to localities where additional funds would raise the standard or level of care—for example, by increasing boarding home rates, providing clothing, or meeting other needs.

The conferences brought out the need for expanding resources for specialized care, such as detention care, or temporary care preceding long-time placement. The development of foster-family homes for these purposes might meet the need for such resources in rural areas. Considerable interest was expressed in using Federal funds to establish group homes for children with special needs not now being met, such as emotionally disturbed children or children in need of detention. Group homes were thought of as homes caring for a comparatively small number of children—possibly 12 or 15—in contrast to institutions, which usually care for larger numbers of children.

The relationship between public and

voluntary agencies in providing foster-family care or group care on either a temporary or a long-time basis received much attention. A wide variety of arrangements now prevails. The basis for a good relationship between the two types of agency, it was felt, rests in cooperative planning, in relation to both community planning to provide needed services and the ways in which voluntary and public agencies should develop their programs.

The regional conferences recognized that casework service must be assured to every child receiving foster care and that, if the voluntary agency providing the care does not have casework service—most often true for institutions—a plan would have to be made for such service, either through the voluntary agency itself or through the public agency. If such service were provided by the voluntary agency, some kind of cooperative planning would need to be worked out as to the initial decision to place the child and periodic evaluation and review of the child's needs and progress. This area is one of the most difficult and complicated. Certain general guidance is clearly needed from the Federal Government with relation to the use of Federal funds, but, at the same time, there must be a wide variety in State and local patterns of service.

Use of Voluntary Agency for Foster Care

All four regional conferences discussed the use of voluntary agencies in caring for children who are the responsibility of the public welfare agency. Underlying this discussion were concern as to how the needs of individual children could best be met and recognition of the fact that public and voluntary agencies have a contribution to make.

The discussion brought out the wide variations in the arrangement under which voluntary agencies now provide care for children for whom the public agencies have responsibility. Some voluntary agencies do not receive, and do not wish to receive, any public funds for the care of children. Others have long had a pattern of providing care on a purchase basis.

That the public agency should have continuing responsibility for the chil-

dren for whom it purchases care and that it should not be merely a disbursing agency was generally recognized. What is meant by "continuing responsibility" was discussed at all four conferences. The following responsibilities of the public agency were then delineated:

- (1) Study and determination of the needs of the individual child;
- (2) decision as to how the child's needs can best be met; if through care offered by a voluntary agency, then selection of the voluntary agency best able to provide this care for the particular child;
- (3) determination as to whether public funds should be used to pay for such care and, if so, in what amount and to cover what part of the care and services;
- (4) planning for casework services to the child and his family to make sure that they are provided by the public or voluntary agency and that duplication or confusion of services is avoided;
- (5) periodic evaluation of the child's needs and progress, through reports from the voluntary agency and consultation between the two agencies; and
- (6) decision as to when care provided by the voluntary agency should be terminated and a different plan made for the child.

Runaway Children

One of the first questions raised in this area was whether the use of Federal funds for the return of runaway children is mandatory under the provisions of the Social Security Act. It was pointed out by the Bureau that these provisions are permissive rather than mandatory.

Do the provisions of the Act with respect to rural areas and areas of special need apply to the use of Federal funds for the return of runaways? Here the answer is "No." The provisions concerning runaways offer State public welfare agencies a real opportunity to base their plan for the child's return on his best interests.

How is a runaway defined? After reviewing the provisions of the Act, the groups accepted the following tentative definition proposed by the Children's Bureau: "A runaway child is defined as a child under the age of 16 who, without consent of his parents, guardian, or other person or agency

who has accepted responsibility for his care and protection through legal or voluntary action, shall leave his home or other place of abode in one State and go into another State." Can abandoned or deserted children be considered runaways? The law apparently does not cover this group of children.

A number of participants asked for further interpretation of the phrase "to his own community"; would this necessarily mean to the child's place of local residence? The problem of determining the child's own community, particularly when his parents, although they had legal residence in one State, have moved to another State, might often be difficult. Which State should pay for the child's care—the State in which the child was found or the State to which he was returned? Actually, the law does not specify which State should pay. But regardless of which State pays for the child's return, both States will be involved in working out plans that are to the best interests of the child. All four conferences emphasized the importance of an adequate social study in determining the plans of care for the child.

Who would be responsible for determining that the return of the child is to his best interest and that the cost cannot otherwise be met? Obviously this responsibility would rest with the agency that made the funds available.

Several participants asked what would be done with the child while the social study and plan were being completed. Can Federal funds for the return of runaways be used to cover the costs of care for the child during this period? The law does not permit the use of the funds for this purpose, but Federal funds for child welfare services in rural areas and, under certain conditions, in areas of special need may be used to provide emergency or detention care.

Are Federal funds to be used only for the transportation of the child being returned? Can these funds also be used for the fare and services of an escort for the child if needed? Although the reports of the congressional committee do not indicate the intent of Congress in this respect, the

Children's Bureau believes that Federal funds may be used for an escort as well as for the transportation and incidental expenses for the return of the child.

Some of the groups asked whether runaway children would need to be brought before the courts when Federal funds were used. The consensus was that runaway children can be referred directly to the public welfare agency without requiring referral to the court, though many States include running away in the statutory definition of delinquency.

Role of Voluntary Agencies

Throughout the discussions in the four regional conferences, the important role of the voluntary agencies in the total program of social services to children was recognized. Because of their long experience, these agencies can make a rich contribution in the total community planning for child welfare. Public agencies, in carrying out their responsibilities, can profitably use the voluntary agencies' knowledge of costs of services and care and their established media for interpretation. The cooperation of voluntary agencies in legislative programs for establishing and strengthening child welfare services has proved extremely valuable in many States.

Because of the importance of assuring the fullest possible consideration of the resources of voluntary agencies, especially in view of the proviso added by the 1950 amendments, each regional conference gave particular attention to the ways in which the two types of agency could reinforce each other. In addition, public and voluntary agencies share the responsibility for ensuring that adequate provisions are developed for meeting the needs of children.

There are many ways in which the experience and resources of voluntary agencies may be used in child welfare programs. The agencies can participate with public agency representatives and citizens in broad community planning and in working on particular problems in individual communities, through interagency committees; serve on advisory committees of State and local public welfare agencies; provide consultation to public welfare

agencies on matters affecting the welfare of children; participate in joint staff meetings of public and voluntary agencies to discuss common problems; and serve on official policy boards of public agencies.

Role of Other Public Agencies

The important role of public agencies, such as training schools for delinquent youth and the juvenile courts, in providing social services to children and youth was recognized at all four regional conferences. Safeguards as to the quality of service and coordination of the programs with other services for children and youth, however, were considered essential.

The use of Federal funds to provide professional education for staff of other public agencies was suggested as a means of improving the services of these agencies. In considering possible plans for the use of Federal funds for this purpose, it was proposed that the State public welfare agency employ staff for the period of professional training, or that it grant scholarships to persons employed by other public agencies.

Two possible plans for using Federal funds for the employment of staff for these agencies were considered—the loan of professional personnel employed by State welfare departments to such agencies; and the granting of funds by the State welfare agency to other public agencies. Since some State laws do not permit one agency to grant funds to another public agency, the consensus seemed to be that the most effective method would be the employment of professional staff by the State welfare agency with (1) joint planning between the agencies involved in meeting the need for additional professional services; (2) the assignment of staff by the State welfare agency; (3) continuing supervision by or consultation with the State welfare agency; and (4) periodic reevaluation of the plan for the use of staff assigned to other public agencies.

Meeting With National Voluntary Agencies

The meeting of the Children's Bureau representatives of the national voluntary agencies followed the re-

gional conferences. The meeting was held to review the discussions and the general suggestions made at the four regional conferences and to give the Children's Bureau an opportunity to secure the advice of the national agencies on the policy statements to be developed for the use of the increased Federal child welfare services funds.

State-Wide Planning

The group spent much time discussing whether consultation on a State-wide basis with broadly representative groups, including representatives of voluntary agencies, public officials, and citizen groups, should be mandatory in setting up the State plan.

Some of the conferees favored a mandatory requirement. The Children's Bureau, they pointed out, is required to have evidence of cooperative planning and must assure itself that there has been such planning and that Federal funds are not used for duplicate services. Since title V of the Social Security Act does not require the development of a comprehensive plan of child welfare services, and since the funds are limited, representative groups should be consulted. Title V is designed, moreover, to encourage experimentation and research, which involves cooperation and consultation, and the decision as to the development of the plan for the use of Federal funds should not be left solely to the States. A final reason that was advanced was the failure of public agencies to take as much leadership in cooperative planning with voluntary agencies as is desirable, and the need for steps to assure such planning.

Others believed that the provision should not be mandatory. They claimed that cooperation can best be achieved on a voluntary basis and that a mandatory requirement might result in routine, ineffective planning. Another reason was their belief that primary responsibility should rest with the States rather than with the Federal Government for cooperative planning within the States. Moreover, since it would be difficult, and in some States impossible, to select individuals on a State basis who were representative of voluntary agencies, it was held that the State plan may have to be

composed of the sum of local plans. A mandatory requirement is unnecessary, it was pointed out, because the Children's Bureau, through joint planning with the States, can review the programs and obtain information as to consultation and cooperative planning; and the Bureau, of necessity, must be assured that a State plan is developed on a sound community organization basis, with consideration of all parts of the program.

The conferees agreed as to the desirability of consultation and cooperative planning with broadly representative groups. The major question was "How can this goal be achieved?" The first alternative considered was continued reliance on joint planning between the Children's Bureau and State agencies, with more emphasis on consultation and cooperative planning. Under the second proposal, the Bureau's policy statement would carry a strong recommendation that there be consultation and cooperative planning. Under the third, consultation and cooperative planning would be made mandatory. The second and third alternatives would require the development of criteria.

The group finally recommended that the Bureau policy include a strong statement as to the desirability of consultation and cooperative planning on a State-wide basis with broadly representative groups. It also recommended that the instructions for submitting plan material contain an outline of information to be included in the plan concerning State and community planning and how the different groups are to be brought into this planning. These recommendations would also apply to local community planning.

How can the Bureau determine that cooperative planning has taken place? The group concluded that it would not be desirable for the Bureau to try to set up definite criteria, but that the States should be encouraged to use various methods of assessing needs and planning to meet needs.

Role of Voluntary Agencies

It was proposed that the Children's Bureau include, in the material prepared for use in developing joint plans with State agencies, suggestions

of areas—recruitment of staff, for example—in which public and voluntary agencies have common objectives and cooperation would be practical.

In considering the possibility of cooperative projects with voluntary agencies, the question was raised as to whether the use of the term "encourage" in relation to such projects might imply a kind of priority to the State departments of welfare. Problems might thus be created in some States where the amount of Federal funds and other funds is so limited that the States would feel that they could not afford to use their funds for cooperative projects. The needs of children and the ways of meeting these needs should be the determining factor in relation to such projects.

Role of Other Public Agencies

In the discussion of cooperative projects in relation to the courts in particular, and at some points to other public agencies within the States, several questions were raised. In view of the limited Federal funds and the great needs in these agencies, is it advisable to undertake such projects?

Because, under the present law, Federal funds must be administered under a merit system, it is necessary to find a way of relating appointments to other public agencies to the merit system and relating the State welfare agency to the services provided by other agencies, not in the sense of dictation of case decisions, but in the sense of providing consultation.

The question was also raised as to whether the Federal funds can go to more than one State agency. There is no State where Federal child welfare services funds have gone to more than one State agency; the Federal Security Agency has interpreted the law to mean that the agency to administer the funds is the State department of public welfare.

Other questions and problems were raised in relation to assignment of staff to other public agencies, such as the courts—whether funds would be spread too thin by trying to cover too many areas of service; whether the court should be built up as an administrative agency by developing expanded casework services; the

"fuzzy" administration that might result from lending workers from the department of welfare to the courts; and, a basic question, the direction in which to move in the building up of services to children.

The group stated that if the courts can establish conditions satisfactory to the administrative agency—the State department of welfare—they should have the service of qualified staff on assignment.

Staff Development

Questions were raised as to what is meant by "staff development." Greater attention to recruitment is needed, it was felt, particularly in the light of the increasing competition for personnel as the mobilization program expands. The need for creative imagination, particularly in the area of training, was noted. The group agreed that experimentation in methods of training on the job was an urgent need, and that such training projects, when feasible and advisable, should be open to staff members of both public and voluntary agencies.

For workers going into rural areas, training should be broadened to give them an understanding of the particular situation in which they will be working—for example, the understanding that is gained by training in rural sociology.

In the consideration of scholarships for professional education, the discussion started with a question as to whether Federal funds were available only to public welfare departments. There was a division of opinion on whether or not scholarships from Federal funds should be granted to workers from the voluntary agencies; a series of reasons was given for each point of view.

In the course of the discussion, it was suggested that, in any cooperative planning of training between public and voluntary agencies, and particularly between public and religious agencies, there should be no interference with the basic philosophy of church-sponsored agencies.

Foster Care

The group agreed that, in providing foster care, priority should be given to areas, primarily rural, where

there are neither public nor voluntary facilities for such care or where these facilities do not meet the need. Where voluntary facilities exist to provide the necessary service, the public department should work out cooperative arrangements with the voluntary agency for the care of children for whom the public department is responsible. Duplication of casework service should be avoided; if possible, the basic casework service should be provided by the voluntary agency on the basis of joint planning with the public welfare department. In working out such cooperative arrangements, some of the conferees believed that the public agency should make full payment for the cost of care, though it was noted that the actual cost of service was often difficult to determine.

Public and voluntary agencies should sit down together and determine, community by community, what is public and what is private responsibility. The point was also made that, in many instances, children would not need to be placed in foster homes if basic services were available.

Sometimes voluntary agencies were freer to do experimental work; such demonstration or experimentation should be in consultation with the public agencies.

Some of the serious unmet needs identified by the group in relation to group care included the need for services for after-care of children in training schools for delinquent youth and the need for facilities for Negro children.

In relation to group care, it was agreed that the development of strong basic services in the local community should be emphasized. Since there is such a variety of problems to be met on the basis of community planning, the Children's Bureau should encourage the development of a variety of services through the use of Federal funds.

Is it advisable to use Federal funds to develop group homes for emotionally disturbed children? Certain factors would seem to be against it, such as the limited experience in the use of such homes; the importance of providing highly qualified, specialized

staff; and the high cost of adequate service, which might deter States in using funds in this way.

The members of the group agreed that the policy of the Children's Bureau should be flexible enough to permit experimenting in various types of care, taking into account the problems in different communities and the importance of cooperative planning with other agencies and the necessity for developing basic child welfare services.

Mobilization and Defense

Considerable time was given at the meeting of the national voluntary agencies to the ways in which children would be affected by mobilization and defense activities, the services that ought to be developed to minimize as much as possible the impact of these conditions on child life, and how the opportunities for young people in the teen-age group could be safeguarded. All these questions were considered against a background of increasing urgency.

What are the personnel problems likely to be faced by the child welfare services during this emergency period? It was the sense of the group that child welfare services are essential services, and that, as far as possible, personnel for them should be considered essential. Steps should be taken immediately through appropriate channels to point out the importance of giving special consideration to institutions and other child welfare services in the matter of equipment of various kinds.

The reluctance of the Armed Forces to accept boys for induction who had been residents of training schools or who were on probation should be explored, it was agreed. The ability of these boys to take their place as citizens is of tremendous importance in their rehabilitation.

Standards

The discussion on standards was extremely brief because the time for the conference was running out. The consensus was that standards are primarily the responsibility of the States and local communities, and that they should be worked out cooperatively by

(Continued on page 20)

Table 2.—Contributions and taxes collected under selected social insurance and related programs, by specified period, 1948-51

[In thousands]

Period	Retirement, disability, and survivors insurance			Unemployment insurance		
	Federal insurance contributions ¹	Federal civil-service contributions ²	Taxes on carriers and their employes	State unemployment contributions ³	Federal unemployment taxes ⁴	Railroad unemployment insurance contributions ⁵
Fiscal year:						
1948-49	\$1,690,296	\$553,461	\$563,833	\$988,965	\$222,850	\$9,816
1949-50	2,106,388	662,262	550,172	1,094,406	226,306	18,855
10 months ended:						
April 1949	1,293,079	490,755	427,613	841,338	209,709	7,519
April 1950	1,609,596	597,134	419,120	876,392	210,308	13,384
April 1951	2,305,334	623,305	433,518	1,052,425	214,462	18,246
1950						
April	85,657	29,554	3,229	104,439	3,692	363
May	274,447	32,642	5,881	211,946	14,275	197
June	222,345	32,486	125,171	6,068	1,723	5,273
July	200,876	32,326	875	121,218	1,785	222
August	316,310	31,398	10,492	205,106	13,470	127
September	185,074	333,303	125,988	6,035	1,347	5,665
October	181,498	34,085	2,763	116,786	1,980	17
November	287,928	32,168	9,817	191,143	12,398	168
December	239,131	29,178	132,961	9,980	2,716	5,837
1951						
January	131,331	33,958	1,567	96,405	16,319	22
February	373,787	29,752	6,508	153,307	146,981	155
March	239,310	31,874	139,527	12,151	13,963	5,847
April	150,089	35,264	3,021	140,294	3,502	186

¹ Represents contributions of employees and employers in employments covered by old-age and survivors insurance.

² Represents employee and Government contributions to the civil-service retirement and disability fund (including Alaska Railroad, Canal Zone, and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency retirement and disability funds integrated since July 1949 with principal fund); Government contributions are made in 1 month for the entire fiscal year.

³ Represents deposits in State clearing accounts of contributions plus penalties and interest collected from employers and, in 2 States, contributions from employees; excludes contributions collected for deposit in State sickness insurance funds. Data reported by State agencies; corrected to May 21, 1951.

⁴ Represents taxes paid by employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

⁵ Beginning 1947, also covers temporary disability insurance.

⁶ Represents contributions of \$28.3 million from employees, and contributions for fiscal year 1950-51 of \$305.0 million from the Federal Government.

Source: *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury*, unless otherwise noted.

Table 3.—Total Federal cash income and outgo¹ and amounts for programs under the Social Security Act, 1950, by quarter, and January-March 1951

[In millions; corrected to May 14, 1951]

Classification	1950					1951, Jan.-Mar.
	Total	Jan.-Mar.	April-June	July-Sept.	Oct.-Dec.	
Cash income ¹	\$42,451	\$12,242	\$9,309	\$10,499	\$10,401	\$18,062
Social security	4,081	1,064	924	1,051	1,042	1,186
Federal insurance contributions	2,667	674	582	702	709	744
Federal unemployment taxes	224	170	20	17	17	177
Deposits in unemployment trust fund ²	1,191	220	322	332	316	264
Other	38,370	11,178	8,385	9,448	9,359	16,876
Cash outgo ¹	41,969	10,760	11,105	9,351	10,754	11,179
Social security	3,726	1,076	959	752	938	1,058
Administrative expenses, Social Security Administration ³	50	12	11	13	14	15
Administrative expenses, Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor	6	1	2	1	1	2
Grants to States ⁴	1,329	320	350	306	354	356
State withdrawals from unemployment trust fund	1,366	553	399	233	180	233
Old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments	961	186	194	196	385	448
Administrative expenses, Department of the Treasury ⁵	15	4	4	4	4	4
Other	38,243	9,684	10,146	8,599	9,816	10,122

¹ Cash income and outgo represent flow of cash, exclusive of borrowed cash, into and out of the general fund and trust accounts of the Treasury.

² Deposits by States of contributions collected under State unemployment insurance laws.

³ Includes administrative expenses of the Bureau of the Census in connection with searching census records for old-age and survivors insurance.

⁴ Grants for employment security administration (including employment offices), for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and for maternal and child health and welfare services; and, beginning in the last quarter of 1950, for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁵ In connection with old-age and survivors insurance.

Source: Total Federal cash income and outgo from *Treasury Bulletin*; other data from *Daily Statement of the U. S. Treasury*.

CHILD WELFARE FUNDS

(Continued from page 9)

public and voluntary agencies. Nevertheless, the group believed that the Children's Bureau has a function to perform in reporting to the various agencies the efforts made in other areas and in helping them set standards through the interchange of information.

The group also pointed out that the present standards in the child welfare field are for the most part minimal

and, in some instances, practically nonexistent.

Conclusions

The policies developed during the discussions at the four regional conferences and the conference of national voluntary agencies formed the basis of the *Policy Manual* issued in April by the Children's Bureau.

These policies represent a consensus on the part of the representatives of State departments of public welfare; consultants from other public

agencies, such as juvenile courts and training schools for delinquent youth; representatives from local, State, and national voluntary agencies and from the Children's Bureau. With the cooperation and good-will of professional workers in public and voluntary agencies, and of citizen groups, these policies should do much to reinforce the child welfare program. They mark a positive approach to the setting up of policies governing the use of Federal child welfare services funds.