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

I presume that in consequence of the overloading of institutions and agencies by orphans and by children whose fathers are dead, there is less room available for children whose mothers are dead. In the first group these were 20½ and in the second group 15⅙, a reversal of the order of preceding statistics. Ordinarily children of this group should outnumber both the others in the care of agencies and institutions for the obvious reason that when the mother dies the chances of a father maintaining a suitable home for the children are much less than when the mother remains with the family. One can only conclude that there are numbers of motherless children left with relatives and others who would be afforded definite assistance were the resources of their States organized for this purpose. It should not be overlooked that the abnormal loads from certain groups, ordinarily cared for otherwise, prevent these institutions and agencies from accepting neglected and abused children out of families that are not suitable for their upbringing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

counties more, but unless it has authority for doing so, and the wherewithal for doing so, it cannot function in this way. The Wagner bill provides these.

Some of the most menacing situations to children that have come to the attention of the Oregon Child Welfare Commission involve families living back in the hills distant from railroads and highways. Often these families live in counties not provided with social workers, counties where no adequate local program exists for social service. This explains directly why the Oregon figures assembled last year by the American Public Welfare Association show so sharp a contrast to those for the country as a whole.

"For the United States as a whole, figures from the United States Children's Bureau show that children in institutions had decreased about 11 percent from 1929 to 1933. During the same period Oregon shows nearly a 25-percent increase in the average daily population of children in State-aided institutions." [1]

The commission is convinced that adequate local case work service in rural counties will prevent the break-up of some homes, will reduce the number of children separated from their families and placed in foster care, and will reduce the periods of foster care for many children for whom long-time care is now necessary because nothing is being done in their counties of residence toward rehabilitation of their homes. Oregon has record of some children normal mentally and physically now adolescent who have spent their entire lives in institutions. The State Child Welfare Commission does not approve this program but appears unable to control it because of lack of local service in the counties.

Juvenile delinquency as a sequence of neglect long continued often comes to light in Oregon with convincing evidence that early attention to a wrong home or a wrong community situation could easily have prevented the disaster to the child and the disgrace to his family. In this field of child protection in the counties as well as in the field of administration of relief, social case work is conspicuous for its absence. In my opinion the Wagner bill's provision for skilled services to dependent and neglected children in rural areas is its most fundamental value to the cause of children.

Sincerely yours,

CHILD WELFARE CONMISSIOS,
By (Mrs.). VIRGINIA KLETZER

VK: D B

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon at the hour of 12:15 p. m. the committee recessed until 10 a. m. of the following day, Wednesday, Feb. 13, 1935.)

[1] American Public Welfare Association.: Survey of Public Welfar Oregon, p. 33.