

THE INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON TRANSIENTS
AND SETTLEMENT LAWS, MARCH 6-7, 1936

N.J. Commission on interstate cooperation
1936

DEPOSITORY COPY
Do Not Remove From Library

974.90
T 772
1936

THE
INTERSTATE CONFERENCE

ON

TRANSIENTS AND SETTLEMENT LAWS

March 6 - 7, 1936

ASSEMBLY CHAMBERS
STATE HOUSE
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

SPONSORS

STATE OF NEW JERSEY COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION

RICHARD HARTSHORNE, *Chairman*
DAVID T. WILENTZ
WILLIAM J. ELLIS
MRS. THOMAS W. STREETER
J. H. THAYER MARTIN
JOSEPH G. WOLBER
EDWARD P. STOUT
JOHN C. BARBOUR
S. RUSLING LEAP
JOHN E. TOOLAN
JOSEPH C. PAUL
LLOYD L. SCHROEDER
ANNA GILMORE
JAMES I. BOWERS
EDWIN G. SCOVEL

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION

CHARLES J. MARGIOTTI, *Chairman*
THOMAS A. LOGUE
DAVID L. LAWRENCE
J. EVANS SCHEEHLE
GEORGE WOODWARD
CLARENCE J. BUCKMAN
FRANK J. HARRIS
HERMAN E. BAUMER
GEORGE A. RUPP
WILSON G. SARIG
JOSEPH A. SIMON
FRANK W. RUTH
JACOB M. FLINCHBAUGH
ELLWOOD J. TURNER

STATE OF NEW YORK JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION

JOHN A. BYRNES, *Chairman*
F. L. ZIMMERMAN
IRVING D. NEUSTEIN
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
EARLE S. WARNER
WILLIAM T. BYRNE
JULIUS S. BERG

Official Commissions and Committees on Interstate Cooperation have been established in twenty-five states to participate through the Council of State Governments and otherwise in establishing better cooperation between their respective states. Through these Commissions an effective attack can be made on any problem which requires the cooperative action of more than one state.

You are Viewing an Archived Copy from the New Jersey State Library
INTERSTATE CONFERENCE ON TRANSIENTS
AND SETTLEMENT LAWS

MARCH 6 and 7, 1936
THE STATE HOUSE, TRENTON, NEW JERSEY

10:00 A.M. - Friday, March 6.

Morning Session.

Presiding: Hon. Richard Hartshorne, Chairman, Commission
on Interstate Cooperation of New Jersey.

1. "The Purpose and Mechanics of the Conference"
Judge Hartshorne,
2. "Where we have come from and Where we are Going
in the Problems of Transiency"
Hon. Fred K. Hoehler of Ohio, Executive Director,
American Public Welfare Association, Chicago.
3. "The Immediate Problem"
Dr. Ellen C. Potter, Director of Medicine, De-
partment of Institutions and Agencies of New
Jersey; and Chairman, National Committee on the
Care of Transient and Homeless.
4. Facts, Figures and Observations on the Transient
Problem by Representatives of Federal W.P.A.

Presiding: Miss Ruth Blakeslee, Regional Social Worker.

Mr. Charles H. Alspach, Director Transient Acti-
vities.

Mr. John N. Webb, Research Analyst, Division So-
cial Research.

Mr. Robert C. Lowe, Legal Research Section, Divi-
sion Social Research.

12:30 P.M. to 2:00 P.M.

Luncheon.

Informal groups - no program.

5:00 P.M.

Continuation of Morning Session:

5. "Transiency in Relation to Delinquency"
Mr. Winthrop D. Lane, Director of Parole, New Jersey.
6. "Problems of Transiency in Relation to Tuberculosis"
Dr. H. E. Kleinschmidt, National Tuberculosis Association, New York.
7. "Transiency in Relation to Veterans"
Mr. Thornton Webster, Veterans Placement Service, United States Department of Labor, New Jersey.
8. General Discussion on the Problems of Transiency.

5:00 P.M.

Afternoon Session.

Presiding: Hon. John A. Byrnes, Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation of New York.

9. "Results of Florida's Study of the Transient Problem"
Henry Redkey, Director Department of Transient and Unattached, State Board of Social Welfare, Florida.
10. "Possibilities of Interstate Cooperation in Meeting Transient Problems"
 - (a) From the Legal Point of View-
Haskell C. Jacobs, Consultant on Settlement, State of New York, Temporary Emergency Relief Administration.
 - (b) From the Industrial Point of View-
Hon. Frank W. Persons, Director United States Employment Service, United States Department of Labor.
 - (c) From the Social Point of View-
Hon. Frank W. Goodhue, Director Division of Aid and Relief, State Public Welfare Department, Massachusetts.
 - (d) From the Point of View of Public Administration and Finance-
Hon. William J. Ellis, Commissioner, Department of Institutions and Agencies of New Jersey.

7:00 P.M.

Informal Dinner Meeting; Hotel Hildebrecht.

Presiding: Hon. Reeve Schley, Chairman Emergency Relief
Administrative Council of New Jersey.

Five Minute Reports from States and Cities
Concerning the Transient Situation from the
Official and Private Agency Point of View.

9:30 A.M.- Saturday, March 7.

Morning Session.

Presiding: Mrs. Thomas W. Streeter, Emergency Relief
Council and New Jersey Commission on Inter-
State Cooperation.

11. "The Problems Involved in the Long-Term Care of
Unsettled Dependents. What are the Responsibili-
ties--Federal, State, Local,"
Hon. Harry Greenstein, State Relief Administrator,
Board of State Aid and Charities, Maryland.
12. "Suggested Program for the Future"
Hon. Cornell B. Braisted, State Transient Director,
New Jersey Emergency Relief Administration.
13. Presentation of Resolutions for Consideration by
Commissioners on Interstate Cooperation.
Hon. Harold C. Ostertag, Chairman Conference
Resolutions Committee, New York.

12:30 P.M.

Luncheon.

2:00 P.M.

Afternoon Session.

Continued Deliberations of the Commissioners.

GENERAL INFORMATION
AND THEIR GUESTS

The Committee in charge of reception and registration of delegates and their guests is composed of Mrs. Charles Maddock, Mr. Edward Katzenbach and Miss Fannie Herring.

Sessions of the Conference

All of the general sessions of the Conference are being held in the Assembly Chambers on the first floor of the State House. The sessions will start promptly at the hours scheduled. Consult your program for this information.

Dinner Meeting

A dinner meeting for Friday evening at 7:00 P.M., will be held at the Hotel Hildebrecht and will be informal.

Staff Headquarters

For the convenience of the delegates the staff headquarters has been set up in the Highway Conference room, on the first floor of the State House Annex, which is the next building west of the State House. Here will be found the staff in charge of the details of the Conference, together with Mrs. H.P. Rhudy, who is in charge of publicity. All press releases will clear through this office.

CONFERENCE RULES

In voting on resolutions or motion, each State will have one vote. If there is a delegation from a State and a member of the Commission on Interstate Cooperation from that State is present then he shall be the chairman of the delegation. In the event that there is no member of the State Commission on Interstate Cooperation present then the delegates from that State shall choose a chairman.

When questions or statements are made from the floor, the speaker shall first identify himself to the chairman by name, organization and State. This will facilitate recording and will enable the chairman to properly address the speakers from the floor.

In order that we may stick to schedule, there is a red light located on the chairman's desk. Discussion from the floor will necessarily have to be limited. A time limit will be announced. If such time allowance is exhausted, the red light will be turned on and the speaker will kindly be guided thereby.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
INTERSTATE COOPERATION COMMISSION

Memorandum Relating to the Background; History and Present Status of the Problems of Settlement proposed for Interstate Conference on Transiency--Trenton, N. J., March 6, 1936.

* * *

INTRODUCTION

Experiences of the depression have served to highlight certain social needs, among which are the problems of the "transient" or "migrant" poor. This term includes a great deal more than the professional hobo; more than seasonal and migratory labor; more than homeless families temporarily "on the march". It includes uncounted numbers who, every day, find that needed public assistance is denied them by reason of strict, arbitrary, and motley technicalities of "legal settlement". Or, if assistance is not denied, its procurement makes them the helpless and buffeted victims of an interstate and inter-community battle of jealousies and reprisals.

These persons undoubtedly have an adequate understanding of what "residence" means. If asked where they "come from", they unhesitatingly name a town or state, with full belief that that is their residence. Few, however, are likely to have heard of "legal settlement". They are unlikely to be aware that "settlement" is a technical legal term, describing a particular kind of residence necessary to entitle them to receive aid when they need it. They are still less likely to realize that each State has its own particular view of just what that special kind of residence should include. Nor are they aware of the fact that when they wander afield, in search of a job, an opportunity, or relatives willing to tide them over, they run the risk of "losing settlement", and thereby of finding themselves undesirable and unprivileged persons, with no right to expect even the minimum of poor relief that society always recognizes as its obligation to the unfortunate.

Mr. X., with wife and six children, left Yonkers, New York, in 1930 to seek work in California. He found it, and for two years supported himself and family. But in May, 1932, he had to ask relief in Oakland, California. Relief was denied because he had no "settlement", that is, he had not lived in California for three years. At the same time, however, Mr. X. had lost his "settlement" in New York because of his absence from there for more than one year. Nevertheless, the Oakland authorities shipped the X family back to Yonkers. When they arrived there, the Yonkers authorities deported them back to Oakland.

Mrs. A. in New Jersey and Mrs. B. in North Carolina each found herself with a temporarily fatherless family because her husband was in jail. Well-meaning friends, knowing nothing of the labyrinthine intricacies of "legal settlement," provided transportation to send each family to the maternal grandparents. This took the New Jersey group to North Carolina and the North Carolina group to New Jersey. In the course of time, each group required public assistance. Each was denied, because each lacked settlement in the community of lodgement. Although both States were willing to assume responsibility, the local communities were not. Therefore, neither state could advance transportation costs; neither state could support these unsettled persons; neither state could send funds out of the state; and the husband in each case was in jail. There was no way to cut the Gordian knot.

Mr. Q. had lived a settled and respectable life in New Jersey. A bachelor, he supported himself on small earnings until he was 75. Turned out of employment, he successfully applied for Old Age Assistance in New Jersey. Then his heart began to fail him. The doctor ordered a higher climate. Happily, so it seemed, Mr. Q. had an old friend living in the Adirondack region of New York, and this friend was willing to have Mr. Q. come to make his home there the rest of his days; the friend would be satisfied with a moderate payment, within the limits of Mr. Q's old age relief grant. But New Jersey would not continue to pay old age relief to Mr. Q. if he went to New York; and New York, on the other hand, would recognize him entitled to no aid whatsoever.

Problems such as these have been thrown into spotlight focus by their number and types during the depression period; and more particularly by the fact that since July, 1933, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, through the formulation of its transient program, demonstrated that only by the offer of Federal funds, and even then reluctantly, could many states be induced to give some attention to these gaping leaks in their welfare programs. Now, with the liquidation of all direct Federal relief, including the transient program, this problem is again pressing and demanding solution.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SETTLEMENT LAWS

The history of settlement laws is a record of local regulation, concern for the local treasury, and community determination to avoid paying for the support of strangers. The first general English poor law of 1536 and the Law of Elizabeth of 1601 both tried to place responsibility for the support of the needy on the community in which they habitually dwelt. These laws arose in times of great economic stress following the Black Plague and the breakdown of the feudal system, when hordes of destitute persons loosed from the relative security of manorial ties poured into vagabondage on the roads of England. The laws of "settlement" which then developed represented an effort to pin these vagabonds down so that, when out of work, they could be regarded as "belonging" to some ascertainable overseer. Settlement laws were accompanied by others of severe penal character.

LAW OF PAROCHIAL SETTLEMENT

In 1662 the English Parliament passed the Law of Parochial Settlement, under which legal settlement in a parish was acquired by birth. New settlement might thereafter be acquired by marriage (the woman taking her husband's settlement); by forty days unchallenged residence in a parish after delivering a written notice to the overseers of the poor of the place of abode and number in the family, which notice was to be read in church and registered; by having an estate of his own, or renting for a year a ten-pound tenement; by paying public rates and taxes, and serving for a whole year in any public parish office; by being bound to and serving an apprenticeship for the learning of some reputable trade; or, lastly, by being hired or serving for a year when unmarried or childless, or being a widow or widower with children having legal settlements of their own.

The effect of this act was to restrict the poor to their own parishes and to prevent even the industrious and the enterprising from seeking to improve their condition in another place. The system resulted in the wholesale deportation, at public expense, of persons who were not "settled". It was further provided that, before removal, the culprit should be first publicly whipped. A large proportion of the money raised in each parish for relief of the poor was expended in thus shifting the burden of relief from one parish to another.

ENGLISH METHODS TRANSPLANTED TO COLONIES

For two hundred years England continued these harsh provisions, which meanwhile were copied and transplanted into the colonies. In England, as has been pointed out, the laws of settlement were rooted in the zeal of

local taxing authorities to avoid financial responsibility for the support of persons who did not "belong". In the colonies an added reason was interwoven: a desire to avoid receiving into the community those who did not agree with the majority in religion.*

Furthermore, the English law, harsh as it was, at least had the virtue and logic of being uniform throughout the realm. But when transplanted into thirteen independent colonies, and then grafted into forty-eight states, and subjected to many successive mutations in different places, it became wholly ill-adapted for effective treatment of the malady it purported to cure.

AMERICA A LAND OF MIGRANTS

Furthermore, the initial premise on which settlement laws were founded, i.e., the desire to keep people "put" and discourage migration, is a contradiction of the essence of American tradition. The very history of America is a saga of great migrations. The growth of America is traced in the unceasing wanderings of its people. The first settlers were migrants from the Old World, often goaded into emigration by these very laws of settlement. The expansion and development of the continent, from the Atlantic over the Alleghenies, over the Mississippi, over the plains, and over the Rockies, was a series of waves of migrant peoples, surges of adventurous pioneers, looking for new soil, new jobs, new opportunities. It was the American tradition that a man who could not get along had only himself to blame, because if he had any gumption at all, he could always pull up stakes and find somewhere a fertile corner for himself and family.

After the migrations of exploration and development, there evolved the great migrations of seasonal labor that still continue--from the wheat fields to the orchards to the canneries to the forests to the cattle ranges to the fishing camps--following the crops, following the season, following the job.

Then there were the industrial migrations, the movements from the farms to the cities and centers of industrial employment. A population that in 1880 was 71.4% rural and 28.6% urban became by 1930, 56.2% urban and only 43.8% rural.

Complementing this movement to the cities, there arose a movement away from the cities, a movement of those with disappointed hopes, the chaff of surplus industrial labor, the victims of technological unemployment. It has been estimated that from 1930 to 1933, approximately 15,000,000 people abandoned job-hunting in the cities and went "back to the farm".

And finally, there have been the migrants generated by the depression, hundreds of thousands who have dared to forage afar rather than submit to the

*See Kelso-"The History of Public Poor Relief in Massachusetts 1620-1929" (Boston 1922) chap.III

stigma of being a dependent at home.

Against such a tradition the laws of settlement constitute a puny deterrent. And against the fact of our national economic and industrial structure, the laws of settlement, as they now exist, are a glaring anachronism. As far back as 1793, Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," observed the fact that settlement laws, by being designed to obstruct the free and necessary movement of labor, had no proper place in the political economy of an industrial society. After a century and a half, his words are still vital and his warning still unheeded:

"To remove a man who has committed no misdemeanor from the parish where he chooses to reside is an evident violation of natural liberty and justice. The common people of England, however, so jealous of their liberty, but, like the common people of most other countries, never rightly understanding wherein it consists, have now for more than a century together suffered themselves to be exposed to this oppression without a remedy."

CHAPTER II

PRESENT STATUS OF SETTLEMENT LAWS

Settlement laws are State laws and as there are forty-eight states there are virtually forty-eight different definitions of what settlement is, how it is acquired, how it is lost, and what benefits it confers.

The greatest difference prevails with respect to the length of time necessary to acquire settlement. It varies from five years in most of the New England and Middle Atlantic states to three months in Wyoming. Sometimes the required period of time may be lessened by regular payment of taxes or by meeting certain property qualifications or by other devices calculated to give assurance that the prospective citizen is not also a potential indigent. Sometimes the required period of time is in effect lengthened by provisions that periods during which the resident has been in a public institution or during which he has been receiving public or private charity, shall not be counted in computing the time necessary to acquire his settlement.

There are other restrictions which make the computation of settlement difficult. The prescribed period of time must be "continuous", or "consecutive", or "without interruption", or "immediately preceding date of application", with still further refinements in defining just what continuous or consecutive, etc., means.

Further complication is found in the problem of "derivative settlement", that is, the settlement of wife and children in relation to that of the husband and father. Either by statute or court interpretation, all States follow the rule that the settlement of the male head of the family fixes that of his wife and children. Women widowed, deserted, or divorced may acquire settlements in their own right under varying circumstances. Children who are illegitimate or fatherless take the settlement of their mother. This concept of derivative settlement prevails irrespective of the actual physical residence of those whom it affects.

LOCAL RESPONSIBILITY INCREASES DIFFICULTIES

It is to be observed that the computation of length of time within a given State, complicated and diverse as it is, is not the only factor involved in determining "settlement". In addition to the State residence most laws require that the same or shorter period must be spent continuously, consecutively, etc., in a given county, city, town, or other political subdivision, before the right to receive assistance can be acquired. As a still further complication, different periods of residence, even within the same State, are sometimes required for different types of assistance,

for example, five years for outdoor relief, one year for institutional relief, fifteen years for old age relief, etc. This latter complication may possibly become more frequent as a result of the Federal Social Security Act, which prescribes different periods of state residence for the different types of assistance therein provided.

The maze of complications leading to the acquisition of settlement is equalled and perhaps surpassed by the maze leading to its loss. Some States prescribe by statute the length of absence from the jurisdiction which brings loss of settlement; in others there is no specific statute, but a fixed period has been established by judicial interpretation. In general, unless the law specifically names a lesser period, the period of time for loss of settlement is generally the same as that required for its acquisition. There are diverse refinements as to the interpretation and significance of brief periods of absence.

EFFECT OF DIVERSE STATE LAWS

While the law has generally proceeded on the theory that every person gets a "settlement" at birth, and retains one all his life, never losing the old until he has definitely acquired a new one, this rule applies only if the person spends all his life within one State jurisdiction. The moment he migrates from state to state, however, he may find himself a "man without a country", as a direct result of the diversity in State laws. It may be pointed out, for example, that if a resident of Minnesota goes to Massachusetts he will have no settlement at all for a period of at least 4 years and 11 months, since his Minnesota settlement is lost by a mere 30 days absence from that State, whereas a Massachusetts settlement may be acquired only after 5 consecutive years of self-supporting residence in one town or city.

The following table shows the present basic requirements in all the States. It is significant that there is a preponderant drift toward a State settlement requirement of one year. At the present time 33 of the 48 States have a one-year rule, 17 of these by statute and 16 by judicial or administrative interpretation. Five states have laws requiring less than one year. This leaves only ten of the forty-eight states which would find it necessary to liberalize their settlement laws to achieve substantial interstate uniformity. (Of these ten, seven are New England or Middle Atlantic states: Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey and Delaware.)

3 Months	6 Months	1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	4 Years	5 Years	laws" assumed.
Wyoming	Alabama Mississippi Oklahoma Washington (no specific statute)	Colorado Idaho Indiana Iowa Kansas Michigan Minnesota Nebraska New York North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Pennsylvania South Dakota Utah Virginia Wisconsin	Delaware	California Nevada (no specific statute) South Carolina	Connecticut	Maine Massachusetts New Hampshire New Jersey Rhode Island	Arizona Arkansas Florida Georgia Illinois Kentucky Louisiana Maryland Missouri Montana New Mexico Oregon Tennessee Texas Vermont West Virginia

Table based on State laws as of August 1935.
 Compiled by Robert C. Lowe and Staff
 Legal Research Section
 Works Progress Administration

CHAPTER III

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

That settlement laws standing alone have outgrown whatever adequacy they once had has long been recognized. As far back as 1877 the Conference of Charities and Correction (which has since become the National Conference of Social Work) first considered the matter. By 1892 the Conference's Committee on Immigration had become also a committee on Interstate Migration. The subject re-appeared for discussion at the proceedings in 1895 and again in 1896, at which time a Federal law to govern transient dependents was favored. In 1898 the consideration of this subject by the Conference was so outstanding that a standing committee was appointed.

UNIFORM SETTLEMENT LAW

The following year, 1899, that Committee submitted a report which was considered so significant it was ordered printed and circulated. The Committee had come to the conclusion that a Federal law purporting to govern legal settlement would be unconstitutional; it therefore recommended a Uniform Settlement Law for adoption by the States and submitted a draft for such a law.* It urged that a satisfactory uniform law must embrace the following principles:

1. A uniform period of state residence, preferably one year.
2. Recognition of the common-law principle that no settlement is lost until a new one is fully gained, to be applied to interstate movements as well as intrastate movements.
3. A uniform procedure requiring deportations to be authorized exclusively by a central state agency, and under no circumstances by local or municipal authorities.
4. Acceptance of the principle that no deportations should be made until the receiving state has acknowledged and accepted responsibility.
5. Provision for arbitration or other adjudication of disputed cases.

* See text of proposed uniform settlement law at end of chapter.

Such a proposed law was apparently enacted only in Minnesota and Kansas. The following year the Committee was dropped, and apparently no serious attention was again given to the subject by the Conference until 1912. Again in 1914, Robert W. Heberd, Secretary of the State Board of Charities of New York, submitted a paper in which, after a comparative study of the settlement laws of all the States, he came to the conclusion that a uniform law was desirable. He said: "I conclude that it is desirable to have uniform settlement laws throughout the entire country, such laws to be executed by the various states in a spirit of humanity and with a due regard to the rights of the other states. It seems to me that a year's residence in a new community, without the necessity of more than emergency relief, should be sufficient to entitle an adult, the head of a family or otherwise, who was not a pauper at the time of arrival, to a settlement for relief purposes in such community, without any requirement as to the holding of property, that he be voted in by the selectmen, or anything of that nature."

TRANSPORTATION AGREEMENT

Meanwhile, while legislative action lagged, private social agencies found it necessary to do something about the growing practice of "passing on" or "dumping" transient needy without reference either to the welfare of the client, the legal status of residence, or the resources of the victimized community. It was the National Conference of Jewish Charities that first, in 1900, formulated a code of transportation rules binding upon its constituent members. The outstanding principles of this gentlemen's agreement were, first, that transportation would not be supplied without consent of the agency at destination; second, that residence sufficient to establish responsibility was defined entirely apart from legal enactments; and third, that there be a central Committee on Transportation to decide questionable cases.

A similar device was originated by the National Conference of Charities and Correction in 1902, and the Transportation Agreement evolved at that time has been developing in effective use ever since. The essence of the Agreement is as follows: Before any transportation shall be provided, the agency having the matter under consideration must be satisfied by adequate and reliable evidence, first, that the applicant will have such resources at the point of destination as will save him from becoming dependent on any agency there, public or private, or that he is a proper charge on the agencies there, or that he has legal residence there, and second, that his prospects for restoration to normal life will not be decreased by sending him there.

Supervision of the Transportation Agreement was continued by the National Conference until 1921, when its administration was turned over to the Committee on Transportation of Allied National Agencies. Since that time the agencies themselves have continued to promote its effectiveness. By 1933, agencies signing the agreement numbered 1,099.

It is significant that of that number of signers only 64 were public agencies. Throughout the history of the agreement, which in spirit emphasizes the welfare of the client rather than legal settlement, conflicting statutory enactments have been a necessary and difficult consideration. At the 1926 proceedings of the National Conference, in reviewing the history of the Transportation Agreement, Joffrey Brackett, called attention to its failure so far as public agencies were concerned. The need for some device to achieve uniformity in settlement laws again became apparent. At that same 1926 session the topic was again considered by two papers representing different points of view. Dr. A. P. Hasking, County Adjuster of Hudson County, New Jersey, came to the conclusion that a uniform settlement law of one year was desirable and necessary, to be accompanied by the designation of a single State agency to be responsible for the interim care and deportation of the transient. On the other hand, J. L. Gillen, Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, advocated abolition of settlement laws and acceptance of the principle that any community wherein a person is found should be responsible for his care while there.

INTERSTATE COMPACTS

In 1930, the American Public Welfare Association recognized the problem by appointing a Committee on Uniform Settlement Laws and Transfer of Dependents. In its first report in 1931, that Committee pointed with satisfaction to the operation of the Transportation Agreement among the private agencies and proposed "that for interstate relations, at least, legal settlement should be set aside as a basis of relief or transportation, and decisions in individual cases be governed instead by the welfare of the clients, the proper responsibility of the states concerned being determined by mutual agreements. States were urged to give authority to their state welfare officials to enter into the suggested agreements, following the precedent of those already existing between a few state departments in relation to the dependent insane. Local public welfare officials, it was recommended, should be forbidden by law to send dependents to other states without the approval of the proper state officials of their own state."*

*Fred S. Hall in "Transportation of Clients." (Social Work Year Book, Russell Sage Foundation, 1933, p. 509)

THE McMILLEN STUDY

By 1932 it became apparent to what extent the depression year had even further magnified the problem. The question of settlement in the United States had been difficult enough in normal times, but with widespread economic distress its difficulties became pointed. People by the thousands set out to find work and were unintentionally losing their "settlement" in the quest for self-support. When their wanderings brought them no success, their plight was even worse. Every city, town, and village, struggling with the burden of support of its own unfortunates, adhered rigidly to its barriers against those who did not have long-time residence. The famous study undertaken in 1932 by A. Wayne McMillen for the Federal Children's Bureau of the youth of the country whom the depression had driven "to the road" brought recognition of the seriousness of this one aspect of the problem. He made the significant observation that "the problem of the wandering unemployed is national in scope and demands national action. All the facts point to the need for a federal transient service fund."

When the National Conference of Social Work met in 1932, the Committee on Interstate Problems, which had succeeded the former Committee on Uniform Settlement Laws and the Transfer of Dependents, reported its conviction that of all interstate problems, two seemed to require immediate consideration: first, interstate agreements for interchange of public dependents, and second, formulation of a uniform state law or laws to embody the necessary objectives. In cooperation with the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, the Committee had actually prepared a draft for a law authorizing interstate agreements.* The Committee emphasized its conclusion that there was urgent need for uniformity, and that settlement laws, as such, properly "apply more to the relations within the boundaries of each state, between towns, counties, and the state itself." The need for a central agency in each state to have sole responsibility for the handling of non-residents was emphasized.

THE COMMITTEE ON CARE OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS

In the same year there was organized under the National Social Work Council the Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless, and it was the intensive work of this Committee which led directly to the assumption of responsibility by the Federal Government in the following year. In January, 1933, the Committee undertook a census in 809

* See draft of proposed uniform law authorizing interstate agreements at the end of this chapter.

cities in 48 states and the District of Columbia which showed an actual count of 370,403 "transients", who were then defined as those destitute enroute, or not in the community long enough to enjoy the privileges of settlement. Among this number were 16,500 boys and 2,700 girls under 21. The total number of such transients was estimated at 1,225,000, and at that time only three states, Massachusetts, Maine, and New York, had definite provisions for caring for the unsettled destitute persons within their borders.

Subsequently, on March 22, 1933, another census, of one day, was taken. At this time "transient" was defined as any person within the State boundaries less than 12 months. Such persons actually counted in key cities numbered 201,500.

THE FEDERAL TRANSIENT PROGRAM

As a result of the gravity of the situation thus brought to light the Federal Government, through its Relief Administration, assumed responsibility and launched its transient program in July, 1933, appropriating \$15,000,000. A Transient Bureau, with a director in charge, was created within the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, supplemented by a similarly constituted Bureau in each State. The program included:

1. Regional Registration and Service Centers at vital points, with trained personnel.
2. Care of local homeless as well as transients.
3. All types of service, individualized to meet the needs of all types of persons.
4. Entire cost assumed by Federal Government.

By May, 1934, transient bureaus had been established in 43 States, with 261 transient centers and 92 transient work camps. Actual count in December, 1933, showed 228,202 persons cared for during the month. Ultimately all the States except Vermont, and including the District of Columbia, inaugurated such programs.

Meanwhile, in June, 1933, the National Conference of Social Work and the American Public Welfare Association had again met jointly and the Committee on Interstate Problems had again reported. It was not entirely in accord with the program of the National Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless as embodied in the Federal program, holding

that this program emphasized too much responsibility in the communities of lodgement and gave insufficient attention to the basic principle of returning people to where they "belong". The Committee believed it should continue its own efforts toward:

1. Centralization of authority in a state agency for transfer of dependents.
2. Enactment of interstate compacts and reciprocal agreements.
3. Elimination of settlement laws as a basis for interstate transfer of dependents.

The Committee had little progress to report, however. Its proposed draft for a uniform law on interstate compacts, as submitted the year before, had been referred to the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and was there resting in committee. Apparently only New Hampshire and Connecticut had enacted such a law.

In May, 1934, the National Conference met again at Kansas City, Missouri. By this time the Federal Government's transient program was in full stride, with more than 300 transient centers and more than 100 camps, in excess of 166,000 persons actually under care, and with a turnover of more than 130,000 persons per month. The subject therefore received pointed attention. A discussion group under the leadership of A. Wayne McMillen developed an attitude of satisfaction with the Federal program and of concern with indications that the Federal administration was contemplating the tapering off of the program.

As to a permanent solution, however, there was again negligible progress reported. The Committee on Interstate Problems advised that its three-year old proposal for a uniform law of interstate compacts had received the approval of the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, but had again been delayed by further reference to committee for drafting a suitable uniform act.

It was observed that attempts to effect settlement law unity promised little hope and that effort should rather be concentrated on getting interstate compacts for transfers and recognition of local responsibility pending transfer, particularly since 32 states already had legislation providing, in some degree, for care of the non-settled and non-resident. At the same time attention was called to the fact that the American Association of Social Workers, meeting at Washington in February, 1934, had gone on record as favoring the abolition of settlement laws.

States were not, however, indicating readiness to enact a compact law. Only Massachusetts had followed the lead of New Hampshire and Connecticut. For the immediate situation, the Committee expressed gratitude for the Federal program and the hope that it could be "indefinitely" continued.

It did continue, through 1934 and 1935, but now, in line with the general plan for liquidation of Federal relief, dissolution of the transient program has taken place. The return of responsibility for these people to the States is reviving the old system of "passing along" and the old jealousy that expresses itself in the raising of barriers to keep strangers outside the gates through fear of having to support them.

PROPOSED DRAFT OF UNIFORM SETTLEMENT LAW -- PREPARED IN 1899
BY A COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHARITIES AND
CORRECTION

AN ACT to establish the legal residence of insane persons, paupers, and other dependents, and to provide for the deportation of such as have no legal residence within the State.

BE IT ENACTED by the legislature of the State of _____:

Section 1. Legal Residence. Every person who shall have resided at any place within the boundaries of the State of _____ for one (1) year continuously shall be deemed to have gained a legal residence and settlement in the State of _____ for the purpose of this act. But no person who shall have been absent from the State of _____ for more than one (1) year continuously shall be deemed to have a residence in this State for the purposes of this act, unless it shall be shown that he has not in the mean time gained a residence in any other State or country. And no alien can gain a legal residence in this State until after he has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, in conformity to the naturalization laws.

Provided that, if any person shall have been an inmate of any public or private hospital or charitable institution, or of any almshouse, jail, prison, or other public institution maintained from the public treasury, during any part of said year, the time spent in such institution shall not be reckoned in determining the question of legal residence; and, provided further, that, if such person shall have received poor-relief from the public treasury of any county or municipality of this State, or support wholly or in part by charity, no month during which the said person has received such relief or support shall be reckoned in determining the question of legal residence; and, provided further, that the fact of having been maintained in any public institution, or having received relief from the public treasury, shall not of itself create a presumption for the continuance of such public relief to any person who shall not have gained a legal residence within the State.

Section 2. Residence in Counties, Cities, Villages, and Towns. Every person who shall have resided within the boundaries of the State of _____ for more than one (1) year continuously, but shall not have resided within the boundaries of any county for one (1) year continuously, shall have a legal residence, for the purposes of this act, in that county wherein he has resided for the longer period of time within the preceding year; and every person who shall have a legal residence in any county in the State of _____, but who shall not have resided within the boundaries of any town, city, or village therein, for one year continuously, shall have a legal residence for the purposes of this act in that town, city, or village wherein he shall have resided for the longest period of time within the year preceding.

Provided that, if any such person shall have been an inmate of any public or private hospital, or charitable institution, or of any almshouse, jail, prison, or other public institution maintained from the public treasury, during part of said year; the time spent in such public institution shall not be reckoned in determining the question of legal residence; and provided further that, if such person shall have received relief from the public treasury of any county or municipality in this State, or support wholly or in part by charity, no month during which the said person shall have received such relief or support shall be reckoned in determining the question of legal residence; and provided further that the fact of having been maintained in any public institution, or having received relief from the public treasury, shall not of itself create a presumption for the continuance of such public relief to any person who shall not have gained a legal residence.

Section 3. Admission to State Institutions. No person who has not gained a legal residence in the State of _____ shall be admitted to either of the hospitals for insane, the school for the deaf, the school for the blind, the school for the feeble-minded, the State public school, or the soldiers' home.

Provided that the State Board of Corrections and Charities may authorize the reception of such non-resident person into such institutions in cases where the legal residence cannot be ascertained, or where the peculiar circumstances of the case constitute, in their judgment, a sufficient reason for the suspension of this rule.

Section 4. Non-resident Persons applying for Admission to State Institutions. - Whenever application shall be made to any probate judge for the admission of any person to either of the State hospitals or to the State public school, or whenever application shall be made to the secretary of the State soldiers' home, or to the superintendent of the school for the deaf, the school for the blind, or the school for the feeble-minded, for the admission of any person to either of said institutions, it shall be the duty of said judge of probate, secretary, or said superintendent, to require answers to be made and duly verified to the following questions:-

1. Where was the person born?
2. When did he become a resident of the State of _____?
3. When did he become a resident of the county?
4. If not a legal resident, on what ground is the application based?

Section 5. Notification to the State Board of Corrections and Charities. - If the said judge of probate, secretary, or superintendent shall find that the said person, whose commitment to the said institution is requested, has not a legal residence within the State of _____, or if the question of his legal residence is in doubt, it shall be his duty, without delay, to notify the State Board of Corrections and Charities, by mail or telegraph; and if he recommends that such person shall be received into said institution, notwithstanding that he has not gained a legal residence, it shall be his duty to give the reasons for such recommendation.

Section 6. Investigation by the State Board of Corrections and Charities. - It shall be the duty of the State Board of Corrections and Charities, either by a committee or by its members, or by its secretary, or by such agent as it may designate, to investigate the question of the legal residence of such person as shall be reported to the said State Board of Corrections and Charities as aforesaid; and such committee, secretary, or agent, shall have authority to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths or affirmations in conducting such investigations.

Section 7. Non-resident Persons to be returned to their Homes. If, upon investigation, the said board, or their agent, shall find that the said person is not a legal resident of the State of _____, but has a legal residence in some other State or country, they may return said person, or cause him to be returned, to that State or country where he has a legal residence, or to that State or country from where he came to the State of _____; and the actual necessary expense of returning such person shall be paid from the State treasury.

Section 8. Non-resident Paupers in County Poorhouses. - Whenever any overseer of any county poorhouse or any county commissioner shall find in any poorhouse, hospital, or other public charitable institution, any pauper who is believed to have no legal residence in the State of _____ or to have a legal residence in some other State or country, it shall be the duty of the said officer to notify the State Board of Corrections and Charities, and it shall be the duty of the said State Board of Corrections and Charities, by its committee, secretary, or agent, as provided in section six (6), to investigate the question of legal residence of such person; and if they shall find that the said person is not a legal resident of the State of _____, but has a legal residence in some other State or country, they may return, or cause the return of, said pauper to that State or country where he has a legal residence, and the actual necessary expense of returning such pauper shall be paid from the State treasury. But, if for any reason the said State Board of Corrections and Charities shall deem it impracticable to return such pauper to his legal residence outside the State of _____, they shall certify that fact in writing; and the said pauper shall thereafter be a charge upon that county or that town, city, or village in the State of _____ in which he has resided longest during the year next preceding.

Section 9. Agreement with Other States. The State Board of Corrections and Charities is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into agreement with the authorities of other States which shall adopt legislation consistent with this act for the arbitration of disputed questions between such States and the State of _____ respecting the residence of insane persons, paupers, and other dependents, and for the return of such persons to their proper residence.

Section 10. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION MODEL TRANSPORTATION LAW

The following is the text of a proposed uniform law providing for interstate exchange of public dependents. This draft was prepared by the Committee on Interstate Problems of the American Public Welfare Association in cooperation with Mr. George E. Young, chairman of the Committee on Scope and Program of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, and was included in the official committee report submitted by Frank W. Goodhue, Chairman, at the 1932 Proceedings of the American Public Welfare Association.

AN ACT RELATING TO INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION
OF POOR AND INDIGENT PERSONS

Section 1. The State Department of Public Welfare (or such state board or official as may be designated) is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal agreements with other states regarding the interstate transportation of poor and indigent persons.

Section 2. Public officials of counties, cities or towns, are forbidden to remove or authorize removal of a dependent person to another state without the approval of the state department (or official) designated in section 1 of this act.

Section 3. The reciprocal agreements shall include a proviso that residence shall constitute the primary basis of interchange, and also a proviso that will safeguard the interest of the state as well as the welfare of dependent persons.

Section 4. The State Department of Public Welfare (or such state board or official as may be designated) is hereby authorized in accordance with the terms of the reciprocal agreements in advance of their removal by the authorities of a foreign state, to arrange with local public welfare officials for the acceptance and support of dependent persons.

If the dependent person has no legal settlement, the state department or official is hereby authorized to refer such person for support to the public welfare officials of the county, city or town in which it is deemed most desirable for the public support to be provided.

Section 5. The expense of removal of a dependent person to a foreign state shall be borne by the county, city or town, having jurisdiction in the granting of aid, subject to such reimbursement by local or state authorities as the law provides.

MASSACHUSETTS LAW RELATING TO
TRANSIENTS

The Department (State Department of Public Welfare) is authorized to enter into reciprocal agreements with other states regarding the interstate transportation of poor and indigent persons, and to arrange with the local boards of public welfare for the acceptance and support of persons receiving public aid in other states, in accordance with the terms of such reciprocal agreements.

CHAPTER IV.
Pertinent Questions
Concerning Legal Settlement, Relief
and Transiency

The present conference is being held under the auspices of the Com-
missions on Inter-State Cooperation of New York, New Jersey and Pennsyl-
nia. These commissions are charged with the duty of arranging for
ference between states on matters of mutual concern and in regard to
ch there may appear to be some possibility of understanding and agree-
nt.

The attempt to secure Uniform Settlement or Relief Laws is by no
ans new. It has been made by various groups, notably the National Con-
rence of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. In 1933, they referred
e whole subject to their Committee on Uniform Act for Compacts and
reements between States.

Since the whole question is very complicated, these notes have been
pared in the hope that you will study them before Saturday morning's
ssion and that they may help to focus your thoughts on the subject.

PROBLEM I

SHOULD WE TRY TO EVOLVE A UNIFORM SETTLEMENT LAW OR ONLY A UNIFORM RELIEF
LAW?

On this point, the Commission on Uniform States Laws said in 1931:

"Considering the subject of settlement law in relation to the
interchange of dependents, the Committee has come to the conclusion
that its effort should be directed toward securing uniform laws re-
garding the relief of dependents even if it were possible to
obtain acceptance of a uniform settlement law in all the states,
this accomplishment would be valueless if a state has no legal pro-
vision for the granting of out-door relief to an unsettled person or
a person who has been absent from the State."

N.B. - In 16 states there are no specific settlement laws and the
extent to which relief may be granted is very limited or entirely
lacking. In many states the interpretation of existing law is such
that an "unsettled" person can receive no assistance from the public
relief funds.

PROBLEM II

SHOULD SUCH A UNIFORM RELIEF LAW BE GENERAL IN PHRASEOLOGY OR SPECIFIC?

Again the Commission on Uniform State Laws said in 1933:

"This recommendation goes no further than proposing that this Conference draft a simple act, authorizing the proper officials in the respective states to negotiate agreements with other states governing the transfer of dependents It is the belief of the Committee that the details of the agreement which a state may negotiate with another state had best be left to the negotiating state, believing that in the course of time, considerable uniformity in those agreements would be attained."

A number of such laws are in effect; such as Indiana, Sec. 4157, and Jersey, Sec. 161-188, applying only to insane persons; and also, Connecticut, (C 117, Laws of 1933); Maine, (C 188, Laws of 1933); New Hampshire, (Act of April 18th, 1933); Vermont, (C 58, Laws of 1931), applying to all dependents.

The New Hampshire law is here given as an example:

"The Secretary of the State Board of Public Welfare, subject to the approval of the Attorney-General, is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal agreements with other states regarding the interstate transportation of poor and indigent persons, and to arrange with the proper officials in this state for the acceptance and support of persons receiving public aid in other states, in accordance with the terms of such reciprocal agreements."

This act, it will be noted, is general in its terms and limited in scope.

PROBLEM III

WHAT SHOULD BE THE PRINCIPLES OF SUCH A GENERAL UNIFORM RELIEF LAW?

Again the Commission on Uniform State Laws said in 1933, quoting P.W.A. Committee on Uniform Settlement Laws:

"For inter-state relations, settlement as a basis of transfer or relief should be set aside and decisions in individual cases be based instead on the welfare of the clients and the proper responsibility of the states concerned, as determined by an agreement entered into by signatory states. This agreement should cover (a) general principles, (b) procedure to be followed in individual cases, and (c) machinery for arbitrating disputed points."

DOES THIS ADMITTEDLY SIMPLE METHOD ACTUALLY CONTRIBUTE ENOUGH TOWARD THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF UNSETTLED PERSONS?

NO; because in most states, out-door relief is a charge against county municipal funds rather than state funds. Therefore, unless the client is a LOCAL as well as a STATE settlement, the State Commissioner of Public

are may actually be unable "to arrange with the proper officials in state for his acceptance and support" as directed by the New Hampshire law. For instance, if the person to be returned is insane, the Commissioner can place him in a State Hospital and pay for him out of state funds. But if he is merely unemployed and has a state settlement, but no local settlement, the State Commissioner is helpless to arrange for his support because no county or municipality will accept responsibility for him.

For this and other reasons, may it not be wise to make some efforts to adjust the settlement situation rather than ignoring it, as suggested by the Commission on Uniform State Laws?

PROBLEM IV

MIGHT EXISTING LAWS BE AMENDED TO SECURE LOCAL SETTLEMENT WHEN STATE SETTLEMENT IS ADMITTED?

A possible solution is indicated by the provision in the New York law regarding "State Poor". These are persons "in need of public relief who have no legal settlement in any town or city and who have not resided in any public welfare district in this state for sixty days within the year preceding application for relief". Apparently, they are a charge against the funds.

The suggestion is made that rules governing eligibility for local relief when a client has an admitted state settlement might well parallel rules governing eligibility to vote in any community. If a person has resided in a town long enough to discharge the duties of citizenship there he has an obligation toward the government of his town, it is reasonable to maintain that his town has likewise acquired an obligation toward him.

This period would vary according to each state's election laws; but it should provide a logical period during which the state ought to reimburse the local government for the care of the client. When he became a voting member of the community, it would be required to maintain him itself.

PROBLEM V

SHOULD A POOR PERSON BE ALLOWED TO ACQUIRE SETTLEMENT WHILE RECEIVING STATE RELIEF?

Practically all laws forbid this; and it is doubtless a wise provision regarding acquiring state settlement.

But, if a client admittedly has a settlement in a state but not in a sub-division thereof, should he not be allowed to acquire local settlement during the time he is receiving state relief, as suggested in Problem

Otherwise, the state would be responsible for him indefinitely instead merely for the period before he became eligible to vote.

PROBLEM VI

IT FEASIBLE TO ATTEMPT TO SECURE UNIFORM STATE SETTLEMENT LAWS?

This problem has always been considered next to impossible of solution. Actually 33 states by law or custom require one year's residence, 5 more than one year, while only 10 states require more than one year's residence, in order to obtain legal settlement. These latter states include Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island plus New Jersey, Delaware and South Carolina, in the area represented by this reference.

It would be interesting to conduct a study and see whether or not the rigid settlement laws of these states have resulted in genuine benefit to them by keeping their relief problem at a ratio notably lower than that of states with a one year settlement law; also to see whether or not these states are allowing their wandering citizens to become burdens on foreign states, while themselves refusing to extend similar care to the citizens of these foreign states. It is possible that the rigid settlement laws do not in fact operate as successfully as supposed in the "protection" of these states.

A uniform one-year settlement law is so desirable from many points of view, that unless it can be demonstrated to work a real hardship on any given state, the presumption is that a real effort should be made to secure agreement for such a law.

PROBLEM VII

SHOULD THE PERIOD OF ABSENCE FROM A STATE BEFORE LOSING SETTLEMENT BE THE SAME AS THE PERIOD OF RESIDENCE REQUIRED TO GAIN A SETTLEMENT?

This would seem only fair, and many states laws do so provide. But in New Jersey, for instance, five years are required to gain a legal local settlement for relief purposes and only one year to lose it.

PROBLEM VIII

IF NO GENERAL AGREEMENT IS REACHED ON A UNIFORM SETTLEMENT LAW, SHOULD SOME SORT OF RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT BE ATTEMPTED?

This is a more complicated procedure, but the underlying principle of "as-you-would-be-done-by" is fair. For instance, New Jersey might say to

people from Pennsylvania, New York, etc., "You can gain settlement in New Jersey after one year, because your state permits New Jersey citizens to gain residence with you in one year". But to people from Rhode Island, New Jersey would say, "It will take you five years to gain a settlement in New Jersey because your state will not permit New Jersey citizens to gain settlement there for five years".

We understand that this principle of reciprocity does now obtain in some states as applied to registration of visiting automobiles.

Though difficult from an administrative point of view, this plan in conjunction with the plans suggested under Problem VII would greatly reduce the number of transients who had no legal settlement in any state.

PROBLEM IX

IF ALL THE MEASURES SUGGESTED ABOVE WERE PUT INTO EFFECT, WOULD A LEGAL SETTLEMENT BE PROVIDED FOR ALL PERSONS?

NO, because there are always some people who move so often either in search of work or of health, that they never stay in any one place for a year. They would still be unsettled persons--though they would be much less in number than at present--and they should remain a responsibility of the Federal Government.

An excellent suggestion for a permanent treatment of this problem is contained in the Report of the Florida Transient Co-ordinating Committee, which proposes that the National Security Act be amended to provide Federal Grants to States for Transient Aid.

PROBLEM X

HAVE ALL INTERSTATE DEPENDENCY PROBLEMS NOW BEEN SOLVED?

NO, only a beginning has been made. A Continuing Committee should be selected before this Conference adjourns in order to study the matter further.

COLLATERAL PROBLEMS

With the extension of the laws covering Old Age Assistance it appears that, with increasing frequency, there will be legally responsible and financially able relatives in one state who will refuse to share in the cost of maintenance of the aged relative in the state where he resides.

The public welfare (relief) official will, in the interest of human welfare, provide assistance. Under existing conditions he would be unable

recover any part of public monies spent from the legally responsible relative living in a "foreign" state. He can recover by legal action when relative lives in his state.

AND IT BE POSSIBLE BY RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN STATES, TO MEET THIS EMERGENCY?

There are in addition a number of problems involving settlement of children in relation to parents; in relation to desertion; in relation to legitimacy, in relation to husband and wife; in regard to which uniformity in law would facilitate administration.

These matters might, with propriety, be referred to a Continuing Committee of this body.

SUMMARY OF LETTERS
RECEIVED FROM CLIENTS ALL OVER THE UNITED STATES
SINCE CLOSING OF TRANSIENT INTAKE

writing in interest of father, mother, and self, all from Chicago, used relief in Three Rivers, Michigan, because they lived there only of required twelve months. Came to Three Rivers in search of employment.

an with four children, deserted by husband, refused further transient relief by Clark County, Iowa, and denied transportation. Notice from County mission to leave county attached to letter. Requests employment or re-

ly went to Denver in August, 1935, refused further relief and offered transportation to legal residence in Kansas. Have lived most of lives in Colorado, returning to Topeka occasionally to look after home. Came to Colorado for health and do not wish to return to Kansas.

orced woman with one child. Has worked in several States and not considered legal resident of her birthplace in Oklahoma. Moved to Pampa, Texas in January 1935, where she worked until September, leaving for Los Angeles in November. She received relief in Los Angeles until residence card was investigated and she was told she would have to return to Oklahoma. Refused transportation and has since worked in toy shop for \$3.30 week, paying \$10.00 per month for rent. Asks employment or relief.

erly man receiving old age pension asks that one of the houses used by Ohio Transient Bureau be transferred to his lot. He feels he could supplement inadequate pension with subsistence gardening and free shelter.

d couple, forced from farm by mortgage foreclosure, used proceeds from sale of cow for transportation to daughter's home. Daughter's husband on relief at \$33.00 per month, 4 children in school assisted by P.T.A. Daughter asks relief for parents who are apparently ineligible, owing to non-residence status.

ly man with wife and 8 children, 5 of school age, refused further relief in California because he would not accept return to Oklahoma, where he did feel he could get work or relief.

ily of four moved from Kentucky in 1934, where they were on relief, to Ohio in search of employment. Refused relief in Ohio when employment ended because they were considered residents of Kentucky. Have now been in Ohio one year, but are still refused relief and assignment to WPA because they are not on relief.

and wife, aged 61, and 11 year old son in California over a year, refused further relief and offered only a ticket out of state.

ty-five-year-old unattached man asking for tent from disbanded Camp #2 Florida.

Widow left Texas for California on money from forced sale of home. She is now refused relief by California because she is considered non-resident. In search of health and employment.

Family of four hit road in March, 1935 when relief work closed down in New Mexico, their (?) legal residence, headed for Marionville, Mo., where there were relatives and hopes for work. Found relatives on relief and no encouragement for private or WPA employment, or relief, plan to hit the road again with their two children who are of school age. Employment.

Wife of WPA worker asking for relief to parents who are apparently ineligible owing to non-residence status.

Family of six refused relief because their legal settlement is another county within Missouri. Unable to get shelter in home county, they moved to county where they now are. Cannot send their four children to school, owing to lack of food and clothing. Employment or relief.

Family of two refused "PWA" and relief work in Harrison County, West Virginia because they had lived there only four of required twelve months. Told they would have to return to Doddridge County, their legal settlement, but man's father is on "PWA" and unable to keep them. Asks relief or employment until spring when he expects to get farm work.

Family man threatened with refusal of further relief if he continues to supplement relief with part time employment. Claims he has earned only \$29.00 on part time work since November, 1935.

Unattached man who worked on Coast & Geodetic Survey until August, 1935 refused relief in Reno, Nevada, on account of non-residence status.

Family of six refused relief at Bensonville, Ill., because they moved from Cook County to Depage County. Have no food, shoes or clothing. Told they must return to Cook County to receive relief. Relief or employment.

Family of 8 want allocation of government land in order to get off transient relief in Georgia.

Family man, wife and semi-blind daughter, on relief in Hardeman County, Texas, when forced to take daughter to Baylor Hospital in Dallas for operation on eyes. Cared for by Transient Bureau while in Dallas, returned to home in Hardeman County June 6, 1934, where they remained on County Relief until May 8, 1935, when he reentered daughter in Dallas hospital for treatment of eyes. Unable to get work when daughter was released from hospital, they caught truck for White County, Arkansas where he placed daughter in Little Rock Blind School and worked until Christmas. When employment ended, he was refused relief or assignment to WPA due to non-resident status.

Man, wife, paralyzed daughter given emergency grocery order of \$2.50 in Ft. Worth, Texas, but still regarded as non-residents and man has been refused WPA assignment, although he has been back in community long enough to vote.

-3-

Two apparently unattached men refused assignment by Louisiana WPA, told quota filled in that state and told to contact Miss. WPA since it seemed this State was their residence. Miss. reported they had been removed from rolls because they were considered residents of Louisiana. These men state that they have only been in Mississippi four months and in Louisiana less than a year.

Woman writes second letter asking WPA assignment for son-in-law in Youngstown, Ohio, who is apparently ineligible owing to non-resident status. Woman's husband makes \$11 per week and unable to care for couple.

Unattached man, after two years in Minnesota Transient Camp, returned to Pierre, S.D., where he was refused relief. He went from there to Leavenworth, Kansas, planning to break into mail box in hopes of jail sentence, but authorities would not prosecute.

Man with family of ten required to work for transportation back to Oklahoma after five months in Indiana wants to know if WPA assignment will be available in Oklahoma.

Twenty-three-year-old electrician refused WPA assignment in Knoxville on account of non-resident status. Meanwhile, he has applied for relief at ERA, Salvation Army and Red Cross without results. He and wife living with sister who makes \$10 a week; wife, expecting child in April, requires special attention. He has no legal residence because most of his life has been spent in circus work.

Man moved to Morgan County, Illinois, ten months ago where he married a resident of that community. Both unemployed at present but refused relief because he is legal resident of Cook County. Expecting eviction from house for non-payment of rent, is willing to sell furniture and accept employment anywhere. Wife expecting confinement in March.

SUMMARIZED CASE HISTORIES WHERE SETTLEMENT LAWS
WERE INVOLVED IN ARRANGING FOR PROPER CARE

parated woman returned to Camden from West Virginia where she had been sent by the Transient Bureau. She was a suspected mental case and syphilitic. On her return she requested relief from the E.R.A., Transient Bureau, and Overseer of the poor. All refused. However, she secured considerable medical assistance from the hospital. Difficulties attached to rehabilitation of this client were caused by attempted murder of her husband and the fact that her husband resided on company property as a miner and only those employed by the company may live there. In addition, relief agencies at her home refused to grant assistance. She was finally returned by the Transient Bureau after arrangements had been made to care for her adequately.

Family applied for relief in Camden. Residence status doubtful. Correspondence with authorities in given State of residence failed to authorize return because of broken parole and doubtful status. Family was finally sent to wife's relatives in Salt Lake City. From there they journeyed to the State of Washington where they planned an effective kidnapping.

Family consisting of women and two small boys, who lived in New Jersey for five years, requested assistance in returning to former home in Hawaiian Islands. Husband mental institutional case. Released and deserted. Parents objected to marriage. Family was accepted by authorities in Hawaiian Islands where brother offered home and maintenance.

Detached man, tubercular and without residence, applied to Transient Bureau for care. Formerly under care of Transient Hospital in New Mexico and San Antonio, Texas. Lack of residence was caused by migratory employment as caterer at restaurants at various race tracks during racing season all over United States. Was referred to Board of Health and placed on waiting list of hospital for tuberculars in Lakeland. Difficulties due to lack of residence and impossibility of placing a non-resident in an institution in the State.

Telegraph operator and radio technician with five-year-old son requested assistance while searching for wife who had deserted him. Refused to stay in adjacent city because he had previously been incarcerated for street lighting. Met wife on street, argument and fight followed. He was given six months for assault and battery. Child was placed with friends. Efforts to verify residence fruitless because of migratory employment. Previous history on case with two different State Transient Bureaus. On release from prison man disappeared taking son with him.

Family, legal residence Dallas, Texas, applied for care on husband's discharge from Navy in adjoining city. Residence was verified. He was returned. Later he returned to the city that paid transportation and again requested relief. Wife received transient relief in one city and he in another. Returned to Camden because climate disagreed with wife who had always lived in New Jersey and in order to search for employment.

Detached man, ill and on crutches, applied for transportation to Boston. Correspondence with Boston failed to verify residence. They reported like correspondence from Transient Bureaus in Baltimore and Washington, D.C. was sent to camp who refused to accept him because of physical disability. On return to Camden, attempted to jump out of car. He was then referred to hospital where he was under care for sixteen days for essential hypertension. On his release transportation was furnished to Boston, where a friend promised him a home and care.

Pregnant unmarried mother applied for assistance under aliases. Gave fictitious information regarding settlement. History of moral laxity. Case referred to Church Mission of Help, Salvation Army Hospital, Catholic Children's Bureau, Florence Crittenden Home and Sheltering Arms for probable assistance. Residence finally verified and woman returned. She was already the acknowledged responsibility of a hospital at the point of legal settlement.

Family consisting of three persons applied for assistance in returning to Denver. They had been living with relatives in New Jersey since 1934, who were unable to furnish room for them any longer. Came in search of employment. Residence was verified by the Transient Bureau in Denver and gasoline was furnished for the trip west. The son who was unable to secure work in New Jersey enrolled in the C.C.C. in Colorado and the family felt in better position to maintain themselves in the city where they had lived for many years.

Minor, referred to Transient Bureau by Detention Home, with request for verification of settlement. Several aliases were given and the client was illiterate. He was consistent in his statement that he had come from Richmond, Virginia, and was a "State Board Boy." He finally revealed his correct name. Residence was verified and he was returned to Richmond to be placed in a Detention Home.

Boy, 16, legal settlement in Far Rockaway, N. Y., was picked up as a vagrant and sent to the Detention Home in Camden County about July 18, 1935. The case was then referred to the Transient Bureau who made inquiries to the Department of Public Welfare in New York City. Three inquiries sent there were ignored. A telegram to this boy's father brought the necessary verification and he was returned on July 31, 1935.

Conference Arrangements Committee

JUDGE RICHARD HARTSHORNE, Chairman New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation

CORNELL B. BRAISTED, State Transient Direction, New Jersey Emergency Relief Administration

HUBERT R. GALLAGHER, Council of State Governments, Chicago

GROVER C. LADNER, Deputy Attorney-General, Pennsylvania

MRS. WINTHROP D. LANE, New Jersey State Emergency Relief Administration

MACENNIS MOORE, Executive Secretary, National Committee on Care of Transients and Homeless

DR. ELLEN C. POTTER, Department of Institutions & Agencies, Chairman of Committee on Care of Transients and Homeless

MRS. THOMAS W. STREETER, Emergency Relief Council and New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation

JOHN W. WOELFLE, Secretary of New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation

FREDERICK ZIMMERMAN, Member New York Commission on Interstate Cooperation.