

XVIII.

THE DEPENDENT CHILD

Freddy-Jane Welch

Part I

"The child problem is an integral part of this whole vital and urgent social question--who shall say how far the number of wretched might be reduced if first, every friendless and exposed child should be given such protection as an informed and determined community has the power to afford; and if secondly, the causes that lie back of juvenile exposure should be sought out and their due recognition secured in all the fundamental institutions of society."¹

¹Henry W. Thurston, The Dependent Child, New York: Columbia University Press, 1930, p. 3 (preface).

Introduction

The present picture of the dependent children of today in their homes, in institutions and elsewhere gives, at the first glance, a feeling of progress and satisfaction that so many forms of care, supported by so many resources, have been developed. However, the second glance does not give a feeling of progress and satisfaction but one of regret and disappointment that there are still so many children who need care. In spite of the unusual progress made in medicine, in science, and in social work, there are still children who, because of race, religion, or color, cannot share in the provisions made for dependent children. There are others, many of them, who are separated from their homes because of poverty, unemployment, and unnecessary accidents. There are still scores of others who are receiving care in foster homes and institutions from persons without experience, training, skill, or understanding.

Yet, inadequate as our present system of caring for these children may seem, it has been attained only by persistent struggle and work over a long period of years. To make the present brighter and hopes for the future greater let us review the history of that struggle of the past.

History

The Feudal System

Feudalism lasted for centuries in Europe--it ignored the needs of the individual, his capacity and his ability. He was a part of a system, a system whereby he owed loyalty, food, raw materials and labor to his direct overlord, who in turn owed protection and the opportunity to make a living to all those below him. Support came from the area of land to which each man and his family were assigned by the feudal order. Nobody outside the particular manor of which they were a part had any obligation to support the parents or the children if they became dependent. If the parent died there was a certain claim for the support of his children from the land that he had held if the overlord chose to recognize it. Often they remained on some part of the estate and in time had their own share of land to cultivate. If the overlord did not choose to let the child remain as part of his particular feudal order he was turned out without support. Sometimes he was helped by a monastery or a church; sometimes he made his way alone.

The feudal system broke down slowly over a period of two hundred and fifty years beginning in the middle of the fourteenth century. The causes were many, but the principal one was the increased use of money; people could no longer live by the exchange of service and goods. The destruction of the old feudal order brought a new class of people into existence. People who no longer had the land for support were forced to wander around the country begging and stealing wherever they could. To make matters worse, the church was no longer able to give help because all her lands and monasteries had been taken from her. In England the situation became so bad that English lawmakers realized that some provision must be made for these people. In 1601 they passed the Elizabethan poor law which made each community responsible for the support of the poor by public taxation. This law was the basis of the care for dependent children in

both England and the United States.¹

Under this law the destitute children were to be cared for by one or all of four different ways: (1) work on community property, (2) indenture or apprenticeship, (3) poorhouse, (4) outdoor relief, or relief given in their own homes.

Under the guild system indenture was started purely as a business contract whereby a child could learn a trade and have food, shelter and clothing in return for his labor. When indenture became a part of the poor law it was still a business procedure because the child was supposed to pay for his support by working for his master. Although this was very poorly adapted to the care of very young children it was much used because it relieved the community of some of the financial burden of the care of the poor. However, it was better than homelessness and vagrancy and in some ways better than a home in the "poorhouse" because it gave the child a certain degree of security and a feeling of belonging to some one.

The Mixed Almshouse

The mixed almshouse, workhouse, or poorhouse, as it was called, was very prevalent in both England and the United States until the latter part of the nineteenth century. These almshouses were the worst possible home a child could have; yet approximately one-fourth of their population was composed of children.² The other inmates were every conceivable kind of pauper--feeble-minded, insane, blind, crippled and aged. No attempt at separation or classification was made; they ate at a common table and many times all slept in the same dormitory. Many illegitimate children were born in these homes and spent their childhood there, with no contact with normal living. Their only patterns from which to copy were prostitutes, the mentally and physically ill, and permanently handicapped paupers with neither the initiative nor the desire to support themselves.

¹Henry W. Thurston, The Dependent Child, New York: Columbia University Press, 1930, p. 100.

²Ibid., p. 130.

Gradually the revulsion against children living in the almshouse reached a point where authorities realized a change must be made. Between 1860 and 1875 several states passed laws preventing the commitment of any child between the ages of three and sixteen to a county poorhouse, and that all children who were in such poorhouses should be removed and placed in appropriate institutions.

There began to be a slow segregation of children with special handicaps, the blind, the deaf, the feeble-minded and the crippled. In spite of this legislation the change was slow. The number of children in such institutions has gradually decreased but the total number of children having lived in almshouses was over two thousand in 1923.¹

The Orphan Asylum

The orphan asylum gradually took the place of the county almshouse. Although these institutions were originally founded for orphans they soon came to be used as homes for all destitute, neglected and delinquent children.

The first orphanage about which there is any detailed record was the one built in New York City in 1806. The idea was started by a society of women who had been giving relief to widows with small children. It so happened that many of these widows died, leaving their children homeless. It was then that the society realized that it would be inhuman to put these orphan boys and girls in an almshouse. It was for them that the first home was built. "They were to be taught reading, writing, arithmetic, sewing and domestic work, and to have moral and religious instruction." As soon as they reached an age where they were capable of earning their own living they were to be bound out to some reputable family selected by the Board of Directors. Thus the children did not remain very long in the home, and though they were apparently well treated, the social philosophy taught in the institution was a big disadvantage to its occupants. The orphans were made to think in terms of gratitude and made to sing verses and songs

¹U. S. Census--Table 7, p. 10.

about their rescue from an unfortunate situation, the kindness they received and the eternal thankfulness they must feel toward the friends who cared for them during their helpless years.

Similar institutions were started in many of the other eastern and middle-western states shortly after this. One home for destitute Negro children was started in New York by two Quaker teachers.

In both England and the United States orphan homes were being built with private funds all during the time the almshouses were developing. They became more and more prevalent and developed with such rapidity during the last half of the nineteenth century that the almshouse was only rarely used as an agency for the care of dependent children. Special institutions for those with outstanding mental and physical defects were gradually established. This method of segregation was a definite step forward in the recognition of the fact that the problems of the handicapped child are individual ones.

Free Foster Homes

The free foster home movement was started by Charles Loring Brace of the New York Children's Aid Society in 1853. There were numbers of children wandering the streets of New York begging, stealing and fighting--boys and girls without education, religion, teaching security, or homes. Some of them were orphans; others were children of immigrant parents who had not been able to find employment; still others were children of poverty stricken parents who never had been able to provide for them. The situation was becoming worse, as the immigration total became higher every year and the immigrant children were turned loose to live in the streets in any way they could.

Mr. Brace believed that the solution to the problem was to send the children into the country where they could be taken into families that needed or wanted them. He became so enthusiastic about the plan that he overlooked its shortcomings, which were many. The children were literally shipped out of New York by trainloads

to country towns. They were taken to the city hall or a similar public place, and each child was selected by the family that wanted him. Neither the family nor the home was investigated. Some of the children were fortunate and some unfortunate in the homes that were selected for them. If the new member of the family was not satisfactory he could be returned to the Society at its expense. In some cases the children ran away before such arrangements could be made.

Bad as this plan was in some respects, it provided good homes for many street urchins of the large eastern cities.

Mr. Brace was the pioneer father of the idea that a child needs to be in a home, not an institution, and that a good home environment is one of the most important factors in character building. What he did fail to realize was that many of these children could have been kept in their own homes; they did not need a permanent substitute, only a temporary one.

The principles of child welfare work changed. It became a well established opinion that no child should be taken from his parents until every effort had been made to build his home into one in which he could and should live. Even if the child should have to be taken from his own home because of illness or poverty everything possible should be done to rehabilitate that home so he could be returned to it.

This policy was adopted in many of the large cities such as Boston, Chicago, and Philadelphia. The idea of temporary foster homes or boarding houses was started. The change in New York was much slower because the policies of the Children's Aid Society had been so firmly established. However, after some investigation by the New York School of Social Work the Society came to realize that there was a place for both plans, the permanent foster home and the temporary boarding home.

About thirty-five years after the beginning of the work of Charles Loring Brace, a man in the Middle West had a similar idea. He was Mr. Martin Van Arsdale, a minister who started alone, without funds, without an organization, to provide

foster homes for destitute children. He was convinced that he would not have to work alone forever; he could visualize his idea being of national importance. Two years after he had begun his independent work in Illinois he founded the first state Children's Home Society. Later he changed the name to "National Children's Home Society". After his death the work went on until there were thirty-six state societies in the national organization. It has become a federation of independent state societies for the purpose of conference education and the exchange of ideas.

After Charles Brace and Martin Van Arsdale, the pioneer founders of the great new idea for the care of dependent children, came Charles W. Birtwell of the Boston Children's Aid Society. He was not a pioneer, but a philosopher, who understood that every child was an individual with individual needs. Massachusetts was already far advanced in child welfare work, having an agent to investigate homes and make a report and a case history on each child that had been sent out. Mr. Birtwell further advanced the work of the Society by organizing around one principle: "To suit the action to the real need--to study each case as though it stood absolutely alone."¹

The purpose of the Children's Aid Society was to assist the community in seeing how far the percentage of poor and criminal could be beaten down by adequate care of the dependent child, working on one basic principle: "What does this child need?"

Progress had been made along this line of thinking before Mr. Birtwell's time. The needs of the individual had been seen, but the mistake had been made in thinking there was just one way to meet them.

The social philosophy in England progressed along much the same lines that it did in the United States, slower in some aspects, but more advanced in others, of course.

As early as 1844 Parliament gave power to each individual parish to maintain

¹Henry W. Thurston, The Dependent Child, New York: Columbia University Press, 1930, p. 186.

"residential schools" or orphanages for the needy children by providing funds through taxation. Although these schools were better than the mixed almshouse they did nothing to remove the children from the atmosphere of poverty, despondency and helplessness.

By 1896 the cottage home had come into existence. These were small institutions of the family type, caring for about a dozen children, who were at least partially self-supporting through their work on the cottage farm.

Because England was so much more industrialized than the United States indenture was more prevalent. Great carloads of children were shipped from the city streets to mines and factories in the smaller towns. They were kept in barns or old warehouses, worked night and day, and were fed just enough to make existence possible. Early in the nineteenth century a law was passed reducing the hours of labor to twelve a day but no attempt was made to improve the living conditions. Prevention of child labor was slow in both England and the United States, because it filled an economic need for cheap mass labor. It is still in existence and probably always will be as long as our social and economic systems are based on personal gain and greed.

These parish orphan homes had many inmates known as "ins and outs"; that is, those who were forced to seek temporary homes because of their family economic situation. Because of this the temporary boarding house and foster home came into existence to care for these children, until they could be returned to their own homes and parents. English welfare workers made no attempt to establish permanent foster homes, but stressed temporary care until the child had been given every chance to return to his own home.

There were also special "certified homes" which cared for children with special handicaps, as the blind, the deaf and the crippled. These homes were investigated and kept under the supervision of the welfare department.

In 1911 the almshouse was discarded as a method of caring for dependent children. Parliament passed a law requiring that the commissioners of the "Poor

Law" remove all children over three years of age from the almshouses and place them in some type of special institution.

Foundling Homes

The illegitimate child has always been a problem, more so in Europe than in the United States because of a lower economic status and crowded living conditions.

Before the day of foundling homes and hospitals these infants were left in the streets or thrown into the gutters and rivers. It was not uncommon to find the dead bodies of these babies floating in the streams or lying among the garbage heaps. Many of them were left at the doorsteps of monasteries or convents, where they were cared for by the nuns and priests.

The first English foundling hospital was founded by Thomas Coram at Bloomsbury, London, in 1746. This institution had a basket by the front door where babies could be left, with no questions to be asked or answered. They were kept there until they were old enough to be "adopted out" or placed in some public institution. Many of these hospitals were built in England, Europe, and the United States. They solved the immediate problem of preventing the death or starvation of these infants, but did nothing toward getting at the root of this tremendous social question.

No form of dependency offers a more serious problem than that accompanied by illegitimacy. More energy should be aimed against it than against any one of the other forms of neglect and dependency.

Society very unjustly has charged and does charge these children with the blame of their birth and their entire lives are spent under the handicap of this terrible injustice, while their parents, or at least the fathers, are free of shame and responsibility.

This is a situation which can be improved only by the enforcement of public authority, so that preventative work can be done. An important step is the

registration of all illegitimate births so the extent of the difficulty will be realized. The mother's name should be accompanied by the father's if it is known and can be secured. The father has no right to escape the responsibility of his parenthood, whether the child be legitimate or not. There should be some type of law requiring him to support the child, and the mother as long as it is necessary.

The Norwegian law is the most drastic legislation of this type in effect. It provides that the father shall pay the expenses of the confinement, support the mother and the baby for a certain period, and pay a definite sum toward the education of the child. The child may take his father's name and inherit his property in the same manner as a legitimate heir.¹

In the United States the burden is usually borne by the mother. In a small portion of cases marriage is brought about, but forced marriages are often disastrous. In some cases marriage is desirable because it is a great advantage to the child to have legal name and standing.

A present day problem is the immediate care of the mother and child. The confinements usually occur in some type of maternity home--public, private philanthropic, or commercial. Many of the latter operate the so-called "baby farms". The mothers pay a specified sum for the disposal of the child, who is adopted out for a fabulous sum or sent to some home with little or no investigation. State legislation is beginning to control all maternity homes and boarding houses, so institutions of this type will eventually be abolished.

It seems that there are two ways to solve the problem: legislation that can enforce for the illegitimate a standing that makes illegitimacy a burden to the parents, especially the fathers, or abolition of the state of illegitimacy so that each child is the legal child of his natural parents. However, it undoubtedly will be a great many years before either of these plans will be universal. In the interim every attempt should be made to keep the child with his mother and to help him grow to be a respected, recognized member of the community in which he lives.

¹George B. Mangold, Problems of Child Welfare, New York: Macmillan Company, 1926, p. 509.

Part II

"Children are not safe and happy if their parents are miserable and parents must be miserable if they cannot protect a home against poverty"--the power to maintain a decent family living standard is the primary essential of child welfare.

Julia C. Lathrop,

First Chief of the Children's Bureau.

Modern Trends

Modern work with dependent children begins with Charles Birtwell's idea that each child is an individual and his needs must have individual attention.

Social workers were long divided into two camps on the question of the method to be used in caring for these children. One party advocated the institution plan, the orphanage and the industrial school. The other party, advocates of the placing out system, insisted that the evils of institutional life and congregate living more than over-balanced the few unsatisfactory results gained by placing children in permanent homes. The controversy waged for years, to the great disadvantage of the children concerned. Finally in 1909 President Theodore Roosevelt called a White House conference which was concerned with the dependent child. This conference established principles and made recommendations which were used as a basis for child welfare work in future years. The principal recommendations were:

1. That children should not be removed from their own homes for reasons of poverty.
2. That the causes of dependency should be studied, and, as far as possible, ameliorated or removed.
3. That for children who must be removed from their own homes, foster homes in families are, as a rule, desirable.
4. That institutions for children should preferably be on the cottage plan.
5. That child-caring agencies should be incorporated with state approval, and the state should inspect their work.
6. That a federal Children's Bureau should be created to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children.¹

¹The White House Conference, New York: The Century Company, 1931, p. 6.

The Children's Bureau

The creation of the Children's Bureau was first suggested to President Roosevelt by Lillian Wald, founder of The House on Henry Street in New York City. A bill creating such a Bureau was introduced in Congress several times between 1906 and 1912, and was finally passed in April, 1912, after endorsement by the White House Conference.

The Children's Bureau was the first public agency in the world the function of which was to consider as a whole the condition, problems, and welfare of childhood. Its establishment was due to the belief that children are the most important of the nation's resources, and that the Federal government should foster their development and protection.

The Bureau has endeavored to serve as a clearing house of information. Through research and field studies it assembles data on the various phases of child health and child welfare throughout this country and many others. This information is analyzed, interpreted and prepared for public distribution.¹

The Children's Bureau and the Child as a Whole

The general welfare of the nation's children lies in a threefold program: (1) correction of existing conditions that stand in the way of the child's well-rounded development, (2) prevention of these conditions, and (3) application of the knowledge of those conditions which will enable children everywhere to be born, to grow, and to develop according to standards that will give them their fair chance in the world.

Immediate responsibility of the welfare of children lies with their own families and home communities. But there is one fact that has emerged from the research and study done by the bureau: "The primary essential of child welfare

¹The Children's Bureau, Washington: United States Government Press, 1937, p. 2.

is the power to maintain a decent family living standard, and this dependent upon many factors not within individual control; that is, economic security is a vital part of the whole problem of child welfare, and measures tending to promote economic security make a definite contribution to the well-being of children."¹

The role of the Federal Government, through the Children's Bureau, in promoting the welfare of children, is that of "an intelligent and interested cooperator".² The services performed are those which families, states, and private agencies could provide without the aid of research, analysis of social, medical and economic factors, to determine the standards to be used in guiding parents, and the agencies of government in dealing with the problems of their children.

The work of the Bureau for maternal and child health and for the dependent, delinquent and handicapped child is but a part of its objective in serving the needs of all children and emphasizing the interdependence of their welfare with economic security and the welfare of the community as a whole.

In the first years of its existence the organization was faced by an urgent demand for information concerning the best methods of caring for dependent, neglected and physically handicapped children and of state and federal legislation concerning the matter. The first state laws providing for mothers' pensions, so dependent children could be cared for in the home, had just been passed before the Bureau was established. Few principles of child welfare have ever been more readily accepted, even though it has never been adequate to meet the existing need. Since then numerous studies have been undertaken at the request of private and state agencies and schools of social work. These studies have covered an appraisal of state institutions as well as a survey of state laws and have resulted in legislative revision and modernization of administration.

With the cooperation of local agencies in some urban areas since 1930 a

¹The Children's Bureau, Washington: United States Government Press, 1937, p. 14.

²Ibid., p.14.

collection and publication of statistics in child welfare has been made to indicate the current trends in foster homes, institutions, clinics and day nurseries.

The day nursery is intended for children who live in their own homes but whose mothers work during the day and therefore must have some one else to care for them. They have come into use comparatively recently; that is, since women have been extensively employed in industry. They were first developed in France under private auspices. Today the French nurseries are under the medical supervision and general inspection of the state. England has a large number, especially in London, but many of them are poorly kept in old buildings by an incompetent staff.

In the United States day nurseries have been established in all the large cities and industrial centers. They are generally connected with settlements, churches, or charitable organizations and do not function as a separate institution unless supported by some philanthropist. Many of them suffer from overcrowding, and have unsatisfactory locations. The American Day Nursery Association is doing much to standardize equipment and requirements.

The ideal nursery provides medical examination, physical care and exercise, sufficient rest and recreation and kindergarten instruction. Unfortunately the ideal nurseries are few, especially in the larger cities, as they are not adequately financed. The day nursery is not a preventive method in caring for child dependency; it is merely a makeshift, because it makes it possible for mothers to work and neglect their home duties. Ideal constructive work--that is, correction of the economic deficiency in the family income--would make their earnings unnecessary and thus destroy the need for the day nursery. As a method of temporary relief, however, they have a definite place and are much used by the so-called "border-line" families.

Child Labor

Like all other phases of child welfare, child labor involves problems of

health, dependency, delinquency, education and legislation. It has the typical inter-relationship to general social and economic conditions. The causes of child labor are so numerous that the exact weight of each cause cannot be determined. They are so interdependent that one becomes largely inactive without the others. The contributing factors work with unequal force in different communities, but the most common ones everywhere are poverty, low ideals of parents, and greed among employers. Child labor is especially prevalent in large families, usually those with more than six children.

Modern industrial conditions have made way for child labor by improving machinery and by separating the lighter and heavier forms of work by minute subdivisions of labor. The keen competition among employers makes every possible chance to cut down expenses important, and utilization of child labor is certainly a saving in actual money output for the employer. Public indifference in regard to this practice is one of the reasons it has been so slow in being abolished. It encourages child labor either by ignoring it or by patronage of the small boy in the news stands and the child beggar on the street.

The first child labor law establishing a federal standard was passed in 1917. It prohibited the employment of children under sixteen in mines or quarries and under fourteen in factories, canneries, etc., and employment of any one between fourteen and sixteen for more than eight hours a day, before 6 a.m. or after 7 p.m.¹ The Children's Bureau was entrusted with the administration of this law. However, it was met with strong opposition and was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1918.

A second amendment was passed putting a prohibitive tax on the products of child labor. It was submitted to the states for ratification and has now been ratified by three-fourths of them (May, 1940).

¹The Children's Bureau, Washington: United States Government Press, 1937, p. 21.

After the depression in 1929 there was a marked breakdown in labor standards and there were many emergency problems due to the panic in industry and banking. The Children's Bureau called an emergency conference on December, 1932, to discuss the problem of child labor. There was found to be a great increase of employment among the fourteen to sixteen age group, some of whom were supporting whole families.

The Bureau has made a constant effort to obtain adequate state legislation and administration and has repeatedly emphasized the necessity for national child labor standards so that children may be offered the same protection every where.

White House Conferences

The second White House Conference was called in 1919 at the request of President Wilson, under the auspices of the Children's Bureau. The discussion of the second conference was enlarged to include five sections: economic and social standards as a basis of child welfare, child labor, child health, children in need of special attention, and standardization of child welfare laws.

The third conference, called in 1930 by President Herbert Hoover, included the subjects of the former conferences, but the range was enlarged to include not only the dependent child and the child in need of special attention, but all children and the factors which influence their development. Preliminary to the conference sixteen months were spent in research and special study by 1200 experts working on 150 different committees. The results of this conference have been far reaching and have helped to make a better life for every child in the country.¹

Statistics used at this conference revealed the extent of "child problem".

Out of 45,000,000 growing children:

35,000,000 are reasonably normal

6,000,000 are improperly nourished

¹White House Conference, Washington: United States Government Press, 1937, p.6.

1,000,000 have defective speech
 1,000,000 have defective hearts
 675,000 present behavior problems
 450,000 have impaired hearing
 18,000 are totally deaf
 30,000 are crippled
 50,000 are partially blind
 14,000 are wholly blind
 25,000 are dependent
 20,000 are delinquent¹

The recommendations of the third conference were much the same as the first two in relation to the dependent child. In brief they were:

1. The child should be kept in the home whenever possible, and each state should have legislation administering this type of relief.

2. Intelligent, properly trained personnel is just as necessary for the child under home care as it is for the one under foster care. (This is beginning to be taken care of by child welfare consultants and public health nurses.)

3. The illegitimate child should have the same care and education as any other, to be paid for by public funds if necessary.

4. Special care should be directed toward the children who are barred from welfare programs because of race or religion, such as the Negro, the Indian, and the Mexican.

5. Every community should have an agency with educated, trained personnel to direct the work for child protection.

6. The causes of child dependency should receive continuous study so they can be prevented or controlled. Sickness, accidents, unemployment and low income are all in some degree preventable.

¹White House Conference, Washington: United States Government Press, 1937, p. 6.

Part III

"As we take stock, we realize that the most priceless of our human assets are the young men and women of America--the raw material out of which the United States must shape its future.

"Nature's deepest instinct is the concern in every parent's heart for the welfare of the children. It is a law of nature which equals even the instinct for the preservation of life. Indeed, it is part of that law, for without the preservation of youth, the race itself would perish. And so, the highest duty of any government is to order public affairs so that opportunities for youth shall be made broader and firmer."

Franklin D. Roosevelt

October 13, 1936

Social Security Act

In recent years there has been much social legislation enacted by Congress, especially since the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. In August of 1935 the Social Security Act was passed to provide for the aged, the blind, and dependent children. The state and the federal government share in paying for this public assistance and see that it is properly administered. The federal government is responsible for the national program, and the states are responsible for their own public assistance activities. Each state decides for itself whether it wants to take part in any or in all of these three parts of the program. Each state must fit its plan into the general outline of the Social Security Act to receive grants of federal money.

The Social Security Act requires that assistance be given according to the actual need in each case. Thus its value lies not only in the actual money provided, but in the improved welfare service that is given.

Aid for dependent children is designed for families deprived of a father's support because of desertion, death, or accident. Its purpose is to prevent disruption of families on the grounds of poverty alone, so the mother may stay at home and care for her own children.

The theory of the system is that the families will be given enough assistance to meet their minimum budgetary needs without necessitating gainful employment for mothers of young children. The more progressive laws permit according to the family need, but the majority fix a maximum allowance per child.¹

According to the most reliable estimate available, in January of 1935 approximately 250,000 dependent and neglected children in the United States were receiving care away from their own homes, about three-fifths of them in institutions and the remainder in foster homes. These children were cared for by approximately 1600 institutions and 400 child placing agencies.²

¹The Social Security Act in America, Washington, D.C., The United States Government Press, 1937, part V.

²Ibid.

The general trend of institutional care on the basis of statistics of city areas reporting to the Children's Bureau has been downward during the depression. Foster home care has rapidly responded to meet the emergency needs.

It was considered that federal, state, and local participation would be necessary for the development of more adequate and more generally available public welfare services for children. Three forms of service needed strengthening: (1) Aid to dependent children; (2) Welfare services for children needing special care; (3) Services for maternal and child health, including services for crippled children.

For the first, aid to dependent children, it was estimated that it would require approximately \$25,000,000 from federal funds yearly for two consecutive years, rising to a possible maximum of \$50,000,000 as the progress developed. The federal government has been spending much more than \$25,000,000 on relief for families that would be eligible for Social Security aid.

The federal money is used to aid the child up to the age of 16, or 18 if he is still attending school. All states provide for children up to 16, and an increasing number are raising the age limit to 18. There is usually a residency requirement, ordinarily one year in the state previous to the application for assistance. The federal fund contributes one-half of whatever the state pays to the family up to a combined total of \$18.00 a month for the first child and \$12.00 for the second.¹

This legislation has done more to make the life of the dependent child a normal one than almost anything else that has been accomplished along the lines of child welfare.

¹Aid to Dependent Children, "Social Security", Washington: United States Government Press, 1939.

Conclusion

The dependent child of the feudal system and the child of today present a very different picture. There has been progress, yes, but there must be and there will be more progress in child welfare, despite the fact that the world is engaged in a war that seems bent on crushing individualism and is depriving children of homes and parents, and because interest not only in "my" child but in children as a whole is a fundamental human instinct.

There is much to be done and it will take years of concentrated effort to reach the goal of medical supervision, education, a home, love and security for every child, wherever he may live, regardless of his race, color, or religion, but it is a goal that will eventually be reached because it is the birthright of childhood.

Bibliography

- Payne, George, The Child in Human Progress, J. P. Putnam and Sons, New York, 1930.
- Thurston, Henry W., The Dependent Child, Columbia University Press, New York, 1930.
- Slingerlan, W. H., Child Welfare Work in Oregon, Oregon State Press, 1918.
- Social Security Act in America, Federal publication, 1937.
- White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, Century Company, New York, vol. for 1930, 1932, and 1933.
- The Children's Bureau, U. S. Government Press, Washington, D.C., 1937.
- Aid To Dependent Children in Social Security Act, U. S. Government Press, Washington, D.C., 1939.
- Mangold, George B., Problems of Child Welfare, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1926.

Magazine Articles:

- Broetz, Mary, "Needs of the Physically Handicapped Child", Public Health Nursing, vol. 30, March, 1938, pp. 171-175.
- Buckner, Dorothy, "Social Work and the Physically Handicapped Child", American Journal Public Health, vol. 28, April, 1938, pp. 464-458.
- Crothers, Bronson, "Education of the Handicapped Child", American Journal of Public Health, vol. 29, November, 1937, p. 1164.
- Johnson, Bess, "Education of Handicapped Children", Public Health Nursing, vol. 29, April, 1937, p. 261.
- Hood, R. C., "Social Security Program for Children", The Child, August, 1937.
- Palmer, Martin, "The Speech Defective Child", Public Health Nursing, vol. 27, January, 1935, pp. 22-25.