

# *Child Welfare Services: Report of the Advisory Council\**

*Two advisory councils, one on public assistance and one on child welfare services, were appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the terms of the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act. Both councils submitted their reports to the Secretary and to Congress at the end of 1959. Findings and recommendations from the two reports are presented verbatim in the following pages.*

*The Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services had been directed to make recommendations and advise on implementing the child welfare provisions in the 1958 legislation. Its recommendations follow immediately; supplementary statements made by two members are omitted here for reasons of space. The recommendations of the Advisory Council on Public Assistance appear on pages 10-22.*

## **Recommendations**

### **1. A New Definition of Child Welfare Services**

Since the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935, Federal participation in child welfare services "for the protection and care of homeless, dependent and neglected children, and children in danger of becoming delinquent" has been authorized by law. The Social Security Act also authorizes use of Federal funds for the return of runaway children who have not attained the age of 18 (originally added in 1950 and amended in 1958). The Council finds the present definition of child welfare services under the law inadequate.

After considering various definitions, the Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services recommends the following definition as most nearly meeting present and future needs:

*Child welfare services are those social services that supplement, or substitute for, parental care and supervision for the purpose of: protecting and promoting the welfare of children and youth; preventing neglect, abuse and exploitation; helping overcome problems that result in dependency, neglect or delinquency; and,*

*when needed, providing adequate care for children and youth away from their own homes, such care to be given in foster family homes, adoptive homes, child-caring institutions or other facilities.*

This definition avoids labeling or categorizing children. It is frequently difficult to classify children as neglected, dependent, in danger of becoming delinquent, etc. Often only a thin line exists between neglect and delinquency. The definition also recognizes the need of every child for parental care, protection, and supervision and emphasizes the need for services to achieve this for children. It provides greater latitude for inclusion of services dealing with any social problem affecting the well-being of children and eliminates the possibility of a narrow interpretation of the scope of services. In addition, it gives greater emphasis than the present definition to services for older children.

The care of children outside their own homes is not limited by this definition to the types of facility listed — these are included only to show some of the ways children can be cared for away from home.

The Council believes that the broad definition in this recommendation encourages State leadership to use all available social service resources for child welfare. The recommended

definition has the added merit that it is specific enough to be readily understandable and administratively sound.

By adding to the definition "helping overcome problems that result in . . . delinquency," the Council recognizes that programs of many State public welfare agencies do include responsibility, not just for prevention of delinquency, but for treatment and control of delinquent children as well.

### **2. Federal Participation in Total Cost of Child Welfare Services**

Federal grants for public child welfare services under Title V, part 3, of the Social Security Act up to the present time have been used to assist in "establishing, extending and strengthening" these services in the States. The primary emphasis, therefore, has been on stimulating effort rather than on paying part of the total cost of the State's child welfare program. "Establishing, extending and strengthening" inevitably implies some elements of support since the two concepts cannot be completely divorced. Federal funds, therefore, are granted so that States and their subdivisions can do more than they otherwise could. The Council believes that this system of Federal-State cooperation should now be extended and recommends that:

*The Federal Government pay part of the total cost of public child welfare services of each State and other cooperating jurisdictions through Federal grants-in-aid on a variable matching basis, with provision for an open-end appropriation, and with continuing encouragement to establishing, extending and strengthening of such services.*

*The statutory provision for an open-end appropriation should be formulated in such a way as to assure that there would be no decrease of a particular State's expenditure of*

\* Report of the Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services, December 28, 1959.

*State or local money for child welfare services as determined by the fiscal year 1960 or some other base year.<sup>1</sup>*

The Council recommends early consideration by the Congress of this legislation because this legislation would:

a. Enable the States to develop, expand and improve services to meet social problems of children and families, strengthen family life and work toward the stability of the family and the community.

b. Recognize child welfare services as essential and basic with the Federal Government and the States carrying joint responsibility for financing.

c. Give greater encouragement to the States to develop a comprehensive child welfare program involving total community resources, public and voluntary.

d. Provide a basis for over-all program standards.

e. Encourage equalization of services to children within and between States and increase in State and local appropriations.

f. Encourage broad social welfare services for families and children making possible better planning for individual children, according to the needs of each.

g. Help bear the heavy costs of care of children outside their own homes.

h. Enable States as rapidly as possible to provide all necessary child welfare services and to expand these services to keep pace with the swelling child population, the complexity and tensions of today's living, the mobility of our population, the rise in juvenile problems.

Since the Congress of the United States has gained broad experience through its leadership in the setting of national standards in income maintenance and service programs for the aged, the blind, the disabled, and dependent children, the Council believes it is timely for the Congress to provide still further leadership in the field of expanding child welfare

<sup>1</sup> One member of the Council filed a dissent in connection with this recommendation, and one filed an explanatory statement.

services. In many States where there is disproportionate representation in legislative bodies between urban and rural areas, Congressional recognition of the unmet needs in the total child welfare program will stir State action for the tremendous job still to be done. And because the States are unequal in their ability to finance essential services, a Federal program of aid will bring needed help to more children.

Expenditure reports show that Federal funds for child welfare have helped to stimulate greater State and local financial effort. Legislation providing for payment by the Federal Government of part of the total cost of the child welfare program in the States should be accompanied by assurance that Federal funds would not be substituted for State and local funds. States, thus, would continue to spend at least as much as heretofore, or preferably, State and local funds would increase along with increase in Federal funds.

This might be accomplished through a formula similar to that enacted in the 1954 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act or by limitation such as that enacted in Title III of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 providing additional funds for vocational education. Furthermore, the fair share of the Federal Government's contribution to the total cost of child welfare services could be reached over a period of years, preferably no longer than five years by a series of planned periodical increases in the percentage of the Federal contribution. Such might be accomplished by any procedure similar to that used in connection with the Vocational Rehabilitation legislation under which a base allotment, or "floor," was established for a five-year period. In order to receive the minimum allotment of Federal funds for each year from 1955 through 1959, State funds for vocational rehabilitation must have equaled those expended in 1954 when the amendments were enacted. In this way, the Federal contribution for child welfare services, which is now about 7 percent, might be increased after five years to 50 percent of the total expended by the States.

Would an open-end appropriation

adversely affect the work of voluntary agencies or perhaps even cut the contributions upon which they depend? The Council believes that the answer is "no." In fact, in some States with high budgets, even more money might be raised for the support of voluntary agencies. For example, in foster care, more adequate funds to buy care from voluntary agencies for individual children would help these agencies improve their services. As a result, voluntary groups, with additional support from private funds, might move into developing other services — such as homemaker or day care. The net result would be to enrich the whole child welfare program.

The Council believes that public and voluntary agencies should join ranks to make use of all available resources to improve services to children. It also endorses the principle of purchase of service by the public agency from qualified voluntary agencies wherever needed. Such services should be purchased on a case-by-case, cost-of-care arrangement.

In 1935 when the Social Security Act was passed, some States had programs to care for dependent children outside the family group, but no special provision was made for them through Federal grants. As a consequence, the present law in effect discriminates against this huge group of children. Today, because of the mounting costs of maintaining these youngsters away from home, they deserve top consideration by the Congress.

### **3. Conditions of Plan Approval**

Under present provisions of the Social Security Act for child welfare services, when Federal funds are granted to a State for child welfare services, the State is required to submit a plan for the use of such funds. The provisions for approval of such State plans as provided in the law, consist mainly of a requirement for joint planning between the State agency and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This requirement has allowed flexibility in determining the plan for Federal participation in child welfare programs. It has served a very useful

purpose because of the wide variation among States in the scope and methods used in developing their programs.

The Council believes, however, that Federal legislation under Recommendation 2 should include more specific requirements for approval of State child welfare services plans and recommends that such plans:

*(a) be developed jointly by the State agency and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; (b) provide for the administration by the State public welfare agency or the supervision of the administration of the plan by the State public welfare agency; (c) provide for such methods of administration, including maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan; (d) provide that the State public welfare agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Secretary may from time to time require and comply with such provisions as he may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; (e) provide for progress in coverage and in moving towards a comprehensive child welfare program; and (f) provide for consultation with other public and voluntary agencies and citizens.*

In some grant-in-aid programs, such as in public assistance, the State plan must show that the program is in effect in all political subdivisions of the State. Such a plan requirement for child welfare programs is not feasible at the present time, because of the variation in development and scope of child welfare services in the States and the dearth of qualified personnel to provide statewide coverage. The State plan, however, should assure progress toward statewide coverage and a comprehensive program of social services for children and youth.

Many State agencies use advisory committees or other types of consultation in coordinating and planning State child welfare programs. These furnish a means for communication with and for participation of agencies, groups, and individuals in plan-

ning State and local programs. They also help to avoid gaps or duplications in services. States vary a great deal in the use of other public and voluntary agencies and citizen groups in developing child welfare programs. The Council believes that the law should provide for such consultation although it recognizes, of course, that final decisions about the public child welfare programs and the use of Federal grant-in-aid funds must rest with the official body that is charged with the administration of this program and is accountable for the expenditure of State and local funds.

#### **4. Grants for Demonstration and Research Projects in Child Welfare**

In other programs (e.g., vocational rehabilitation, mental health) special projects that discover and develop new or improved methods and facilities or evaluate present methods and facilities, have proven to be sound and effective ways of stimulating and encouraging better services. The grants under these present laws are available to both agencies and institutions of higher learning. Payments are made on the basis of an approved project, without an apportionment of funds on the basis of a formula. In addition to review by the administering agency, these laws usually provide for review and recommendation by specialists competent to evaluate specific projects or by an advisory group chosen for this purpose. The Council recommends that:

*Federal legislation provide for grants to research organizations, institutions of higher learning, public and voluntary social agencies for demonstration and research projects in child welfare.*

The Council believes that this legislative provision will give specific encouragement and incentive to experimentation and research directed towards new or improved methods for child welfare programs as a whole. It will stimulate use of resources of both public and voluntary agencies, as well as those of institutions of higher learning and research organizations. It will encourage test-

ing new ideas and evaluate effectiveness of present methods. It will make it possible to vary the amounts of grants in relation to the size and potentialities of the particular project, thereby, making possible the financing of a larger scale project if it holds sufficient promise.

In administering such a program, the Children's Bureau should seek the judgment of technical experts. This expert judgment, combined with the discretionary powers of the Children's Bureau, would provide reasonable safeguards in granting Federal funds for such projects and also would help in developing criteria and guidelines for selecting individual projects. Among the guidelines considered could be: regional and national significance of the proposed project; demonstration of a new method or service in the child welfare field.

#### **5. Grants for Training of Personnel in Child Welfare**

The personnel shortage in child welfare programs is acute and will become more so. The expansion of these programs through training grants to enlarge the number of trained personnel would greatly benefit the child welfare field as a whole and contribute to improved programs, both public and voluntary. It is estimated that at the present time 3,000 additional public child welfare employees in positions requiring professional training are needed to provide minimum geographical coverage for the entire nation. By 1970, 4,300 more will be required. The current turnover in public child welfare personnel is annually about one fourth of the total employed. These facts make it vital to increase the number of trained professional workers.

The Council therefore recommends that:

*Federal legislation provide grants for training of personnel (a) to State departments of public welfare which may be used for scholarships to individuals; (b) to accredited schools of social work which may be used for scholarships to individuals and for expanding and improving training*

*resources for the child welfare field and (c) to public and voluntary social agencies to conduct training projects in child welfare of regional or national significance.*

The Council believes that expansion of educational facilities is essential to guarantee a constant stream of professionally trained personnel entering the child welfare field. In the academic year of 1958, only 1,744 students were graduated from accredited schools of social work in the United States. These schools are the source for professional personnel in the entire field of social work. The provision recommended by the Council would encourage more people to enter the child welfare field, especially those with special interest and capacity for work with children — people who might otherwise go into other fields where more opportunities for training already exist. Training opportunities for houseparents, volunteers, and others in positions not requiring professional training also should be broadened. These latter opportunities would stimulate and encourage improved services to children, particularly in group-care facilities where practice has frequently not kept pace with current thinking and research findings on child care.

## **6. Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services**

The Council recognizes as basic the interpretation of the needs of children by interested citizens to the general public so that immediate and long-range goals may be better understood. The need for articulate support of the Children's Bureau by a group at the national level was recognized by the Council in connection with nearly every proposal under discussion.

Therefore the Council recommends:

*Federal legislation to provide for the creation of an Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services to the Children's Bureau, with its structure, function and membership authorized by the Congress; the Council to study and report to the Secretary on philosophy, broad policies and program*

*concerning social services to children and youth, and to interpret to the public the social welfare needs of children; the members of the Council to be appointed for overlapping fixed terms by the Secretary and to be representative of public, voluntary, civic, religious and professional welfare organizations and groups or other persons with special knowledge, experience or qualifications with respect to child welfare services and the public; the members of the Council to be appropriately compensated for travel and per diem in lieu of subsistence while serving away from their places of residence; and with at least two meetings of the full Council to be called each year.*

Since such a Council would not be involved in administrative responsibilities, it could help the Children's Bureau in a variety of ways. But its primary function would be leadership in the development of citizen interest and understanding of the changing needs and problems in child welfare services. In order to fulfill its functions adequately, the Council should be responsible to the Secretary, working in close cooperation with the Commissioner of Social Security and the Chief of the Children's Bureau.

## **7. Provision of Means to Examine Basic Causes of Family Disruption**

We know much through research and experience that, if carried out, would protect and strengthen child and family life in the United States. But the Council believes that every effort should be made to extend our understanding of the basic causes which contribute to problems of children and families—for example, desertion, divorce, neglect, alcoholism, unemployment.

Therefore, the Council recommends:

*(a) That the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through the Children's Bureau be charged to examine and look into the basic causes underlying those phenomena which result in problems to children and families, and (b) that Congress provide the necessary funds.*

## **The 1958 Amendments**

So far in this report, the Council has made recommendations for new and extensive Federal legislation for grants-in-aid for child welfare services. Since it was charged by Congress specifically with making recommendations and advising in connection with "the effectuation of the provisions of part 3 of Title 5 of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1958," the Council is also submitting specific recommendations relating to the 1958 amendments. The Council believes these recommendations should be considered by the Congress if the broader and more extensive recommendations made earlier in this report cannot be immediately put into effect.

## **8. Continuation of Use of Federal Funds in Urban Areas**

One of the 1958 amendments makes possible the use of Federal funds for child welfare services in urban areas on the same basis as in rural areas.

Prior to this amendment, these funds could be used only to pay for part of the cost of district, county, or other local child welfare services "*in predominantly rural areas*" and for "*developing State services for the encouragement and assistance of adequate methods of community child welfare organization in predominantly rural areas and in other areas of special need.*"

*The Council recommends no change in the present law on this point.*

## **9. Change in Formula for Apportionment of Federal Funds for Child Welfare Services**

The 1958 amendments make two changes in the formula for apportioning Federal child welfare services funds. First, the uniform grant is increased from \$40,000 to \$60,000. The amount each year bears the same relationship to \$60,000 that the total appropriation bears to the full amount authorized to be appropri-

ated. For the current year, the amount appropriated is \$13 million and the full amount authorized to be appropriated is \$17 million. Thus, the uniform grant is \$45,882, or  $13\frac{1}{17}$  of \$60,000.

The second change is to provide for apportioning the remainder through a combination of two factors: total child population and per capita income. Previously, the remainder was apportioned solely on the basis of the child population under the age of 18 in each State who were living in rural areas. Now, briefly, this amount is apportioned in direct ratio to the total child population under 21 in each State, and in inverse ratio to the per capita income of the State.

In order to assure that States will not have to reduce services in rural areas because of the change in the formula, the amendments also provide a base allotment for each State. This base allotment is the amount the State would receive for a particular year with an appropriation of \$12 million, which is the appropriation that had been made when the amendments were enacted, and the formula in effect prior to these amendments.

Accordingly, the formula recognizes the extension of Federal funds for services to children in urban areas on the same basis as to children in rural areas. At the same time, it also recognizes the importance of continuing services in rural areas initiated under the previous law. Problems have arisen because appropriations have not been increased sufficiently to enable States to benefit by the changes in the formula rather than because of the formula itself.

*The Council recommends that no change be made in the apportionment formula as applied to the existing law.*

## **10. Increase in Authorization**

Another amendment increased the amount authorized for the annual appropriation for child welfare services from \$12,000,000 to \$17,000,000. The amount actually appropriated for the fiscal year 1959 was \$12,000,-000 and for fiscal 1960, \$13,000,000. Thirty-six States received for 1960

only the base allotment as defined by the amendment. The remaining States received increases above the base allotment but these additional funds probably will be absorbed by the increase in child population and higher costs of services and care. The level of services for these States thus will be approximately the same as for 1959. But in the 36 States that received the base allotment in 1960, the 1959 level of services cannot be maintained.

While the 1958 increase in the authorization was a forward step, the Council believes that a further increment is needed immediately to enable the States to make more adequate provisions for child welfare services. Additional funds should be authorized and appropriated not only to expand services in urban areas but also to enlarge training programs to relieve present problems in recruiting and retaining qualified personnel. The States also report the need:

- a. To develop special facilities for the care of children, such as foster family homes, group care for emotionally disturbed children, and day-care centers.
- b. To expand services, including adoption, homemaker, protective and preventive services.
- c. To conduct research to benefit child welfare programs.

Federal appropriations would have to increase greatly to expand services in urban areas and even to maintain programs in rural areas at the same level. It is known that one State, because of higher salaries, has had to cut out its program to unmarried mothers and its special study of children being placed for adoption and to trim its training program by half.

*The Council recommends that the authorization and appropriation for child welfare services be raised substantially, pending passage of legislation for Federal participation in the total cost of public child welfare services. Testimony before the Congress has established the need for an immediate authorization and appropriation of \$25,000,000 as a first step.*

## **11. Federal Share Requirement**

This amendment provides for variable matching of Federal funds for

child welfare services by State and local funds, through defining the State percentage and the "Federal Share" (or the Federal percentage) of the total sum expended under the State plan.

This amendment became effective on July 1, 1959. Consequently, its effect upon programs is largely unknown. Even so, evaluation of this brief experience points up some problems in the application of the amendment within the context of other provisions of title V, part 3, of the Social Security Act.

The "Federal Share" concept contemplates a "total" of Federal and State funds for welfare services. However, the maximum amount of the Federal funds for each State under the closed-end appropriation is fixed by the total appropriation. Hence, most States expend more than is required of them as a State share. The amount of Federal funds appropriated for 1960 was \$13 million. The total estimated expenditures by States and local public welfare agencies for child welfare services in fiscal year 1959 was \$183.7 million, 93.5 percent of which was from State and local funds.

The provision for "establishing, extending and strengthening" child welfare services included in the present law places primary emphasis on stimulation rather than support of child welfare programs and is inconsistent with the "Federal Share" concept. Therefore, if legislation is not immediately passed to enable the Federal government to pay part of the total cost of public child welfare services:

*The Council recommends that the Congress and the Secretary examine this amendment to determine legislative changes needed to provide matching requirements more appropriate to the purposes of title V, part 3 of the Act.*

## **12. Reallocation Provision**

This amendment provides for the reallocation of funds not certified as required by some States to other States that have need for and ability to use these funds. It specifies that such funds are to be distributed to

the States after taking into consideration the same factors as are used in apportioning the annual appropriation.

The experience in reallocation of funds in the fiscal year 1959 indicates the desirability of a provision for reallocating funds. Fifteen States received additional funds from \$208,350 released for reallocation by four States. This sum which would not have been used in prior years, was used for meeting special program needs in the States. The reallocation of funds in 1959 appears to have stimulated all the States to more active and effective program planning not only for the year but on a long-range basis.

Since funds are reallocated by the fixed formula, a problem has arisen. It appears that the amount which will be available for reallocation in the fiscal year 1960 will be nominal, if any funds at all are available. Almost half the States have indicated they will request additional funds. This will mean the distribution of the funds by the fixed formula will result in amounts so small as to be of little use to States.

The Council believes that the reallocation provision has accomplished its objective of full utilization of Federal child welfare funds for the purpose for which they were appropriated. The Council also recognizes that division of funds in small amounts achieves no substantial gains in the individual States receiving them.

*The Council recommends continuation of a provision for reallocation of funds certified by States as not required for carrying out their State plans. It recommends, however, that provision be made for administrative discretion in the reallocation of these funds.*

### **13. Provision for Return of Runaway Children**

This amendment makes a minor modification in the provision, first included in the Act in 1950, for paying the cost of the return of runaway children to their home community in another State. The primary changes were: upper limit in age of children

was raised from 16 to 18; and the maintenance of children pending completion of plans for their return was authorized.

In general, to State welfare agencies the problem of returning runaway children to other States does not loom large. About a third of the States do not encounter the problem at all.

The effect of the amendment appears to have been slight. Of the 50 children returned to another State in fiscal 1959 with the aid of Federal funds, only seven were in the age group 16 to 18, and only two children received maintenance, as authorized in the amendment.

Even though the problem of returning runaway children to another State is negligible in relation to other problems dealt with by State welfare agencies, the provision with its amendment is a means of enabling States to meet the individual needs of these children. It also focuses attention upon this special group as an area for broad program planning of State welfare agencies with other agencies that carry responsibility for runaway children.

*The Council recommends that no change should be made in the provision for return of runaway children.*

### **14. Inclusion of Guam**

The 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act changed the definition of *State* as used under the Act to include Guam, effective for the fiscal year 1960. Until otherwise provided by Congress, the Secretary may, as he may deem appropriate, allot a smaller amount to Guam for child welfare services than would be allotted under the formula.

The Council believes that the needs of children in Guam are the same as in other States and jurisdictions and that the Federal Government should assist Guam through Federal funds and consultation, to develop child welfare services. Reports indicate the lack of public or voluntary child welfare services and great unmet needs in Guam.

*The Council recommends that Guam should receive Federal funds*

*for child welfare services as provided for other States and Jurisdictions.*

### **15. Expanding Children's Bureau Services**

Since 1912, when it was established by Act of Congress, the Children's Bureau has pioneered for a better life for children.

The Bureau began its career by undertaking to learn about why babies died. In 1913 as a Nation we did not know accurately how many babies were born each year, how many died, and why they died. The Bureau then turned to developing standards in many fields of child care —taking leadership in establishing birth registration, working for good adoption practices, juvenile courts, children's institutions, day care centers, county organization for child welfare, illegitimacy, child dependency, fighting child labor abuses, mother's pensions, and many, many others.

Today the Children's Bureau administers \$46,500,000 in grants-in-aid to the States. With help from the Bureau, State public health and welfare agencies have been able to pool Federal, State, and local funds to strengthen and improve maternal and child health, crippled children's and child welfare services. Constant queries reach the Bureau's consultative staff from States and communities, agencies and citizens groups—wanting to know: "Can you help us set up a homemaker service?" . . . "How can we improve our detention home?" . . . "Is our convalescent care outdated?" Within the limits of the size of its staff, the Bureau helps launch new programs, overhaul old ones, or make changes as the case may be.

The Bureau also has served as a reservoir of information on new developments in other States and across the country in the child welfare field. State public welfare departments want to know about new techniques and methods of work, new types of facilities for child care, and new tools for more effective services—and they are asking the Children's Bureau for this information.

Despite its outstanding record, the Children's Bureau has not been able

to contribute in this way as fully as it should. The Bureau has far too little staff to help *every* State do a good job in child welfare. Seven of the Bureau's nine regions — areas ranging from four to eight States each—have one lone child welfare representative. (Two of the regions also have a foster care consultant.)

This representative's first responsibility is administering Federal grants-in-aid for child welfare services. The remainder of his time he tries to devote to the many public and voluntary agencies and committees who would like to consult with him — committees concerned about migrant, dependent, delinquent, emotionally disturbed, and handicapped children—and the many official and citizens groups working on all types of child welfare services. A big job for one person. There aren't enough hours in the day for this worker to begin to carry it—or enough travel funds for him to get about as he should.

In the field of research, there is not enough staff to find answers to many important questions, such as "Why do so many children remain for so long in foster care? What does this do to them? How are agencies working with parents while their children are away from them?" "How can neglectful parents be helped to do a better job?" . . . "What is happening to children of working mothers?" Without the minds, hands and hearts

of a competent staff no program can achieve its objectives. How, for example, can the Children's Bureau develop and put into practice the newest proven concepts of child welfare services without the necessary specialists? Take the field of foster care for an example. Much has been learned through experience over the years. Formerly, child welfare workers took dependent, neglected, abused children out of their own homes whenever possible, put them into foster home and institutional care. The outward results were satisfying — rosier cheeks, scrubbed bodies, clean clothes. But the inward results were often devastating. In recent years, child welfare people have learned what deep-rooted damage this separation of children from families causes. To child welfare offices come many well-intentioned parents who don't know how to be good mothers and fathers because they had none of their own; girls bearing children out of wedlock with the only help given to them being quick placement of their babies for adoption; children whose bizarre behavior has made them outcasts among their schoolmates and neighbors.

Today child welfare workers try to keep the child in his own home and to help his parents become better parents. As a consequence the call is greater than ever before for home-maker service to safeguard, protect

and stabilize families; for day care to protect children of working mothers through foster family day care homes and day care centers; for agencies geared not to just a single service, but to the great variety of services required if children's needs are to be met — counseling, placement in all types of foster care, work with unmarried mothers and adoptive couples—and perhaps most important of all new professional skills in working with parents and children in their own homes.

Success in strengthening families depends largely on good community planning and organization. The coverage of child welfare services must be so complete that agencies can reach out to and serve all children and parents who need their help—whether they live on farms, in the central city, or in the suburbs, and regardless of income or of the individual problem. To give leadership to States in this complex area requires people with professional skills.

*The Council strongly believes that the Children's Bureau has been seriously handicapped in doing its job because of the lack of sufficient staff. It is incumbent upon the Congress to provide the financial means to enable the Children's Bureau to carry out its functions and duties. The need for additional personnel will become even more critical in the recommended program for expanded services.*

## Recent Publications\*

### Social Security Administration

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE. *Services for Older People: Role of the Public Assistance Programs and of the Bureau of Public Assistance in Relation to Older Persons.* (Public Assistance Report No. 38.) Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1959. 27 pp.

How the public assistance programs serve older persons. Limited free dis-

tribution; apply to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.  
LOTWIN, GERTRUDE. *A State Revises Its Assistance Standard.* (Public Assistance Report No. 37.) Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1959. 40 pp.

One agency's policy and procedures in determination of need within the public assistance programs. Limited free distribution; apply to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

### General

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND. *Directory of Agencies Serving Blind Persons in the United States and Canada,* compiled by Hilma Saterlee. (11th ed.) New York: The Foundation, 1959. 222 pp. \$3.

CONDLIFFE, J. B. *The Welfare State in New Zealand.* London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1959. 396 pp. \$8. (Distributed by Macmillan, New York, N. Y.)

Includes a description of New Zealand's social security system.

U. S. CONGRESS. SENATE. COMMITTEE ON FINANCE. *Temporary Unemployment Compensation. Hearings, 86th Congress, 1st Session, on H. R. 5640, An Act To Extend the Time During Which Certain Individuals May Continue To Receive Temporary Unemployment Compensation.* Washington: U. S. Govt. Print. Off., 1959. 81 pp.

### Retirement and Old Age

GORDON, MARGARET S. "The Older Worker and Hiring Practices." (Continued on page 31)