be shown; and, if an allocation under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section is requested, the conditions leading to such request. A State plan must include reasonable provision for State administration, adequate facilities for locating and certifying blind persons, adequate medical care of the eyes, reasonable provision for vocational training, employment, and home instruction of the blind, and cooperation with medical, health, and welfare groups and organizations. When the Secretary of Labor deems a State plan and the administration thereof to be in reasonable conformity with the provisions of this section, he shall approve the same and send due notice of such approval to the State agency concerned.

(d) For the purposes of this section, a blind person shall be defined to mean one whose vision is insufficient for the ordinary activities of life for which eyesight is essential, such insufficiency of vision to be determined by examination by a regular practicing physician, skilled in diseases of the eye: Provided, That such examining physician shall certify in writing the diagnosis, prognosis, and visual acuity of the person examined, and shall state whether in his opinion such person is blind within the meaning of this act and whether there is any likelihood that his vision could be restored or improved by proper treatment, operation, or adjustment of glasses.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Section 3 to be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. As used in this title, 'old-age assistance' shall mean financial assistance assuring a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health to persons not less than sixty-five years of age who, at the time of receiving such financial assistance, are not inmates of public or other charitable institutions: Provided, That in the case of a person so blind as to be unable to perform any work for which eyesight is essential, and so certified by a regular practicing physician, skilled in diseases of the eye, the provisions of this act shall apply to such blind person at the age of fifty years.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Where do you live, Mr. Watts?

Mr. WATTS. Richmond, Va.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Mr. Latimer of the Pennsylvania Association for the Blind.

STATEMENT OF H. R. LATIMER, PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION FOR THE BLIND

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, if I may I will just speak from here to save your time and mine. In representing the Pennsylvania Association for the Blind, which has 14 local branches working concretely and definitely and closely with individual blind people, I am intensely interested in securing the kind of assistance and cooperation from the Federal Government as will enable us, in some measure, to do the things that we have been so untiring in our efforts to do in the past year.

For 45 years I have been trying to bring the indigent blind people on their feet so as to make them independent of relief of any kind. You are engaged today in trying to solve the unemployment situation as it applies to "seeing" people. We have been engaged, throughout my lifetime, in trying to solve the problem of employment for handicapped people, who are just as sincere and earnest and desirous to meet the needs of their families and themselves. Therefore I want to speak in the utmost support of the three suggested amendments which Mr. Irwin has placed before you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Latimer. I do not know whether the question was asked, but did your committee, Mr. Irwin, or any member of it present this matter to the Ways and Means Committee which is considering this bill in the House?

Mr. IRWIN. No; we did not.

The CHAIRRIAN. There has been no presentation of this question and of these amendments to that committee?

Mr. IRWIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, thank you very much.

At this point in the record I desire to submit a statement by Mr. Ernest G. Draper, vice president the Hills Bros. Co., New York, City. In addition, there is also submitted a letter which I have received from Mr. C. W. Areson, of the Child Welfare League of America, Inc., New York City, together with accompanying statements from Mr. Areson, Mrs. Blanche La Du, chairman of the Minnesota State Board of Control, and Mrs. Virginia Kletzer, chairman of the Child Welfare Commission of Oregon.

STATEMENT OF ERNEST G. DRAPER, VICE PRESIDENT, THE HILLS BROTHERS CO., NEW YORK CITY

For 15 years I have actively associated myself with those who most vigorously and most continuously have worked for improved methods of employment stabilization, and for some years for the adoption of unemployment-compensation legislation in this country. Approaching this question as an employer, it has been my conviction that a system of compulsory unemployment reserve would not only greatly benefit employees but also, *if* properly organized, would stimulate better management and promote business stabilization.

As early as 1921 in a published article, I stressed the possibilities of improving employment conditions through stabilization under an appropriate form of unemployment-compensation legislation. Since that time I have seen the development of practical methods in some establishments which suggest in their effectiveness somewhat similar preventive work in reference to accidents under workmen's compensation laws.

I welcome the President's economic-security program as a sound method of brining about unemployment-compensation legislation throughout the country.

In an unemployment crisis such as the present, there is danger that the importance of making unemployment compensation a means of stimulating management to greater efforts to overcome so-called "normal unemployment" may be overlooked. I regret that this tendency has unfortunately been reflected at one point in Senate bill 1130 and H. R. 4142. Section 608 (a) of this bill makes it necessary for States to enact laws requiring at least one-third of the employer's 3-percent contribution to bc paid into a single State pool. This pooled fund would be used to subsidize careless or less efficient employers whose failure to stabilize employment results in an excessive rate of unemployment among their employees and a correspondingly high benefit cost. Instead of giving each company or industry full credit for its efforts in reducing unemployment, this provision in S. 1130 and H. R. 4142 would penalize efficient and socially minded employers who go to the trouble and expense of stabilizing their work forces. It would even place a premium upon inefficiency by permitting an inefficient and less scrupulous employer to depend upon his competitors to pay the cost of benefits to his laid-off employees. Surely this violates the sound principle laid down by President Roosevelt in his message on January 17, as follows:

"An unemployment compensation system should be constructed in such a way as to afford every practicable aid and incentive toward the larger purpose of employment stabilization. * * * Moreover, in order to encourage the stabilization of private employment, Federal legislation should not foreclose the States from establishing means for inducing industries to afford an even greater stabilization of employment."

In accordance with this recommendation and following the expressed purpose of leaving to the States freedom to decide for themselves the type of unemployment compensation legislation which best meets their needs, I believe that the Federal measure should not require the pooling of contributions under State laws but should permit States to adopt systems of separate-establishment reserves similar to the only American unemployment compensation law now in force, in Wisconsin.

I am in general agreement with the economic-security program represented by S. 1130 and H. R. 4142. I favor making the unemployment benefits a cost of

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Very truly yours,

C. W. ARESON,
Assistant Executive Director.

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

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

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

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

any organized social service except that of volunteers. However, 92 percent of the counties have had and now have county child-welfare boards. In spite of the fact that no State aid has been available for administrative expense a beneficial program of general service for children, with special emphasis on the handicapped and dependent children has been carried on by volunteer workers through leadership and supervision of the Children's Bureau of the State board of control. This program in counties having only volunteer workers has been instrumental in raising the standards of services to children and has accomplished much. However, in counties which have provided funds for trained workers under organized supervision, a more complete program has achieved far-reaching and more satisfactory results which have been approved by Federal, national, State, and local child-welfare agencies.

In order that there may be an adequate program for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children in every county of the State and especially in rural areas, a Federal appropriation to supplement and encourage appropriations by the State for such a program is absolutely essential.

MOTHERS' AID

As a part of the program hereinbefore outlined the board of control is required to promote uniformity and efficiency in the administration of mothers' aid, termed "county allowance" in Minnesota, by the juvenile courts. The law of 1917 provided for a refund by the State of one-third of the disbursements made by the county when the administration in such county was approved by the board of control. However, no appropriation was made by the legislature for such refund except a small sum in 1927 at which time the law providing for refund was repealed. Lack of State aid in administration of mothers' allowance has left the program without centralized supervision which has resulted in lack of uniformity and in inefficient administration.

Federal aid as proposed in S. 1130, title II would undoubtedly stimulate the legislature to make appropriations of substantial contributions and thus enable the board of control to exercise its authority which has been practically lost because of no State aid. Such Federal and State aid added to the appropriations of local subdivisions, inadequate at the present time, should insure, when added to the income of the family, security and reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health for dependent children in their own homes.

The State board of control is the State agency now designated to supervise aid to mothers of dependent children in their own homes. Administration through such a State agency would conform to rules and regulations of the Federal administrator.

CRIPPLED CHILDREN

Minnesota was the first State in the Union to establish a free hospital for indigent crippled children. This hospital, which is rated as Al by the American College of Physicians and Surgeons, serves the crippled children of the entire State by providing facilities for free traveling clinics, diagnosis, care, and hospitalization. The allocation of Federal funds for providing after care of these children, which care is now inadequate, would undoubtedly be matched by State funds sufficient, to render adequate service. Lack of after care when the child has been returned to its own home offsets many of the benefits derived from diagnosis, treatment, and hospitalization.

MATERNITY AND INFANCY

Minnesota has taken advantage of all opportunities pro\-icled by the Shepherd-Tomner Act and subsequent acts for the matching of Federal funds for furthering and strengthening State and local health services to mothers and children, and extending maternity nursing service to the entire State, especially in counties predominately rural.

The State board of control has cooperated through the Children's Bureau and through service on the State board of directors of the maternity and child-health program of the State board of health. There is no service in a welfare program for children of greater importance or more deserving of support by both Federal and State funds. We urge the allocation of sufficient funds to insure a program of adequate protection for maternity and child health.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Full orphans, that is, children with both parents dead, average 5¼ in the first. group and 17⅔ in the second group.

Children whose fathers are dead, that is, the type of families commonly aided by mothers' pensions or mothers' aid, average 12 in the first group and 30⅙ in the second group.

By contrast, children whose mothers are dead, the type most obviously in need of other home or. institution care, average 20½ in the first group and 15⅙ in the second group.

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

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

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

I presume that in consequence of the overloading of institutions and agencies by orphans and by children whose fathers are dead, there is less room available for children whose mothers are dead. In the first group these were 20½ and in the second group 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.