



**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.

INTERSTATE CONFERENCE OF 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.

974.90  
T772  
1936 copy 2

PROPERTY OF  
NEW JERSEY STATE LIBRARY

JUL 16 1970

185 W. State Street  
Trenton, N. J.

2:00 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.

3:00 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 Depart-  
ment, Massachusetts.
  - (d) From the Point of View of Public Administration  
and Finance-  
Hon. William J. Ellis, Commissioner, Depart-  
ment 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.

---

You are Viewing an Archived Copy from the New Jersey State Library  
GENERAL INFORMATION FOR CONFERENCE DELEGATES  
AND THEIR GUESTS

The Committee in charge of reception and registration of delegates and their guests is composed of Mrs. Charles Maddock, Mrs. 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

The dinner meeting for Friday evening at 7:00 P.M., will be held in 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 Alleghonics, 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-hurting 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.)

You are Viewing an Archived Copy from the New Jersey State Library  
 Requisite time or period for legal settlement.

No specific settle-  
 ment statutes; 1 year  
 practical or "voting  
 laws" assumed.

3 Months	6 Months	1 Year	2 Years	3 Years	4 Years	5 Years	
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 reappeared 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, Jeffrey 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 would 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 county, 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 Commissions on Inter-State Cooperation of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. These commissions are charged with the duty of arranging for conference between states on matters of mutual concern and in regard to which there may appear to be some possibility of understanding and agreement.

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

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

PROBLEM I

SHALL 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 regarding 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 provision 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 New 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 inter-state 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 A.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 or municipal funds rather than state funds. Therefore, unless the client has a LOCAL as well as a STATE settlement, the State Commissioner of Public

Welfare may actually be unable "to arrange with the proper officials in this state for his acceptance and support" as directed by the New Hampshire law. For instance, if the person to be returned is insane, the State 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

HOW 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 state funds.

The suggestion is made that rules governing eligibility for local relief when a client has an admitted state settlement might well parallel the rules governing eligibility to vote in any community. If a person has lived in a town long enough to discharge the duties of citizenship there and 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 would 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 RELIEF?

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

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

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

#### PROBLEM VI

IS IT FEASIBLE TO ATTEMPT TO SECURE UNIFORM STATE SETTLEMENT LAWS?

This problem has always been considered next to impossible of solution. But actually 33 states by law or custom require one year's residence, 5 less 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 conference.

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 those 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 "do-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 a 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

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

WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE BY RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS BETWEEN STATES, TO MEET THIS CONTINGENCY?

There are in addition a number of problems involving settlement of children in relation to parents; in relation to desertion; in relation to illegitimacy, 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

1. Son writing in interest of father, mother, and self, all from Chicago, refused relief in Three Rivers, Michigan, because they lived there only five of required twelve months. Came to Three Rivers in search of employment.
2. Woman with four children, deserted by husband, refused further transient relief by Clark County, Iowa, and denied transportation. Notice from County Commission to leave county attached to letter. Requests employment or relief.
3. Family 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.
4. Divorced 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 record 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 a week, paying \$10.00 per month for rent. Asks employment or relief.
5. Elderly man receiving old age pension asks that one of the houses used by Dayton Ohio Transient Bureau be transferred to his lot. He feels he could supplement inadequate pension with subsistence gardening and free shelter.
6. Aged couple, forced from farm by mortgage foreclosure, used proceeds from sale of cow for transportation to daughter's home. Daughter's husband on WPA 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.
7. Family man with wife and 8 children, 5 of school age, refused further relief by California because he would not accept return to Oklahoma, where he did not feel he could get work or relief.
8. Family 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.
9. Man 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.
10. Sixty-five-year-old unattached man asking for tent from disbanded Camp #2 in Florida.

11. Widow left Texas for California on money from forced sale of home. Is now refused relief by California because she is considered non-resident. In search of health and employment.
12. 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.
13. Wife of WPA worker asking for relief to parents who are apparently ineligible owing to non-residence status.
14. 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.
15. Family of two refused "FWA" 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 "FWA" and unable to keep them. Asks relief or employment until spring when he expects to get farm work.
16. 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.
17. Unattached man who worked on Coast & Geodetic Survey until August, 1935 refused relief in Reno, Nevada, on account of non-residence status.
18. 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.
19. Family of 8 want allocation of government land in order to get off transient relief in Georgia.
20. 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.
21. 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.

22. 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.
23. 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.
24. 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.
25. 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.
26. 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.
27. 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

Separated 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.

Unattached 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 fighting. 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.

Unattached 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.

MINUTES OF  
INTERSTATE CONFERENCE  
ON  
TRANSIENTS AND SETTLEMENT LAWS

March 6th and 7th, 1936

Assembly Chambers, State House  
Trenton, New Jersey

C O N T E N T S

Delegates . . . . .	1
The Purpose and Mechanics of the Conference . . .Richard Hartshorne . . .	7
Resolutions Committee . . . . .	9
Where We have Come from and Where We are Going in the Problems of Transiency. . . . .Fred K. Hoehler. . . . .	10
The Immediate Problem of the Transient. . . . .Ellen C. Potter, M.D. . . .	13
Facts, Figures and Observations on the Transient Problem by Representatives of the Federal Works Progress Administration, Ruth Blakeslee; Charles H. Alspach; John W. Webb; Robert C. Lowe. . . .	17
Suggested Program for the Future. . . . .Cornell B. Braisted. . . .	24
Transiency in Relation to Delinquency . . . . .Winthrop D. Lane . . . .	28
Transiency in Relation to Tuberculosis. . . . .H.E. Kleinschmidt, M.D. . . .	32
Transiency in Relation to Veterans. . . . .Thornton Webster . . . .	34
Result of Florida's Study of the Transient Problem. .Henry Redkey . . . .	36
Possibilities of Interstate Cooperation in Meeting Transient Problems, Haskell Jacobs; W. Frank Persons; Frank W. Goodhue; William J. Ellis . .	39
Dinner Session. . . . .	59
Saturday Session. . . . .	73
The Problems Involved in the Long Term Care of Unsettled Dependents. What are the responsibilities ---Federal, State, Local? Harry Greenstein . . . . .	74
His Excellency, Harold G. Hoffman, Governor of the State of New Jersey. .	82
Continuing Committee. . . . .	88
Honorable John C. Barbour, President of Senate of New Jersey. . . . .	89
Resolutions . . . . .	90
Supplementary . . . . .	96

DELEGATES PRESENT AT INTERSTATE CONFERENCE  
ON TRANSIENTS AND SETTLEMENT LAWS  
ASSEMBLY CHAMBERS, STATE HOUSE, TRENTON, NEW JERSEY  
MARCH 6TH AND 7TH, 1936

CONNECTICUT

Coughlin, Mary, 17 Haynes St., Hartford; Director, State Study Unsettled Homeless  
Little, Eleanor H., State Office Building, Hartford; Secy. Emergency Relief Com.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alspach, Charles H., Director, Transient Division, 1734 New York Ave., NW, W.P.A.  
Blakeslee, Ruth O., Regional Social Worker, 1734 New York Ave., NW, W.P.A.  
Grant, Mrs. Ernest R., Hay-Adams Hotel; Managing Editor, Tuberculosis Assn.  
Lowe, Robert C., 1734 New York Ave., NW, W.P.A.; Legal Research Section  
Linden, David G., 2510 Que St., NW; Transient Director  
Persons, W. Frank, U.S. Dept. of Labor; Director, U. S. Employment Service  
Schaffter, Dorothy, National Youth Administration; Administration Aide  
Street, Elwood, 215 District Building; Director of Public Welfare  
Webb, John N., 1734 New York Ave., NW; Research Analyst, F.E.R.A.

DELAWARE

Williams, Mrs. Roberta, Travelers Aid Society, Wilmington; Executive Secretary

FLORIDA

Redkey, Henry, Exchange Bldg., Jacksonville; Secy., Governor's Transient Comm.

ILLINOIS

Hoehler, Fred K., 850 E. 58th St., Chicago; Director, American Public Welfare Assn  
Hosch, Louis E., 850 E. 58th St., Chicago; Research Asst., American Public Welfare  
Lyons, Leo M., Chicago, Relief Administration  
Sands, Daniel, Chicago; Chairman, Transient Committee

INDIANA

Campbell, Mrs. Virginia, Indianapolis; Asst. Dir. Gov. Com. on Unemployment Relief

MAINE

Leadbetter, George W., Augusta; Commissioner of Health and Welfare

MARYLAND

Greenstein, Harry, Baltimore; State Relief Administrator  
Judge, Miss M., Baltimore; Representative Council Social Agencies and  
Travelers Aid Society  
Matthews, W.B., 900 St. Paul St., Baltimore; Managing Dir. Maryland T.B. Assn.  
Terrell, Isador B., 16 W. Saratoga, Baltimore; Case Worker  
Jewish Social Service Bureau  
Tingley, Ruth, Baltimore; Super., Department of Public Welfare

MASSACHUSETTS

Goodhue, Frank M., 34 State House, Boston; Director of Aid and Relief

MICHIGAN

Rigterink, H.J., Kalamazoo; Director, Transient Service Bureau  
Schafer, Philip, Lansing; Director, Transient Division, S.E.R.A.

MISSISSIPPI

Ellis, Frank W., Jackson; State Director, E.R.A. Transient Division

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Corliss, Jay H., 9 Capitol St., Concord; Director of Welfare  
Wilder, Abby L., Hoyt Bldg., Manchester; N.H.E.R.A. Administrator

NEW JERSEY

Alloway, J.E., 127 E. Hanover St., Trenton; Exec. Director, State Board  
Children's Guardians

Anderson, Isabel, 812 East 23rd St., Paterson, Case Worker, F.T.B.#5  
Barbour, John C., President of Senate of New Jersey  
Bergeron, Omer A., 1060 Broad St., Newark; State Supervisor, Transient Work Camps, WPA  
Bigley, Colonel J.H., Deputy State Director, E.R.A., 20 Washington Place, Newark  
Boone, Miss C., 67 No. Munn Ave., E. Orange; State Field Worker, ERA, Newark  
Braisted, Cornell B., Montclair; State Transient Director, E.R.A., Newark  
Canady, Paul J., 471 Parkway, Trenton; New Jersey Children's Home  
Conant, Mrs. H.M., 20 Washington Pl., Newark; Supervisor, Transient Bureau, Newark  
Condit, Jessie P., 241 Springfield Ave., Newark; Exec. Secy. Children's Aid Society  
Cook, James R., 667 Rutherford Ave., Trenton; Director, Jefferson Lodge, Trenton  
Dowdell, M.P., Trenton; Assistant Director, Old Age Relief  
Easton, Ernest O., 15 East Kenny St., Newark; Executive Secretary New Jersey  
Tuberculosis League  
Ellis, Wm. J. State House, Trenton; N.J. Commissioner, Dept. Institutions & Agencies  
Ferguson, W.B., 20 Washington Pl. Newark; Deputy State Director, E.R.A., Newark  
Flynn, Eleanor J., New Brunswick; Asst. Professor of Sociology, N.J.C.  
Foote, Bryan, 21 Fulton St., Newark; Exec. Secy. N.J. Conference of Social Work  
Frankel, Emil, Department Institutions and Agencies, Trenton  
Gilinsky, Mrs. Charles, Jewish Federation, Trenton; Family Welfare  
Gilmore, Mrs. Anna, 679 Market Street, Paterson  
Glatt, Mrs. J.R., Pennsylvania Station, Newark; Exec. Secy. Travelers Aid Society  
Greer, Chester, 328 Hillcrest Ave., Trenton; Supt., New Jersey Children's  
Home Society  
Hartshorne, Richard, Essex County Court House, Newark; Chairman, Commission  
on Interstate Cooperation  
Hedden, Albert H., 266 West End Road, South Orange; State Director, E.R.A. Newark  
Herring, Fannie, Post Office Bldg., Trenton; Supervisor, Transient Bureau, Trenton  
Hever, Helen E., State Office Bldg., Trenton; Dept. Institutions & Agencies  
Huntington, Everett, 518 Perry St., Trenton; Captain, Salvation Army  
Jackson, Nelson C., Bureau of Transients, Newark; Special Project Supervisor  
Jones, Mrs. Marion, Salvation Army, Trenton; Stenographer  
Katzenbach, Mrs. Edward L., 438 Bellevue Ave., Trenton; State Advisory  
Committee on Transients  
Keating, Joseph, Jr., 98 Carroll St., Trenton; Supt., City Rescue Mission, Trenton  
Kennedy, Jean, 20 Washington Place, Newark; Asst. Mgr., Welfare Division, N.J.E.R.A.  
Kerr, Edna T., 20 Washington Place, Newark; Personnel Manager, N.J.E.R.A.  
Lane, Winthrop D., State Office Building, Trenton; Director, Division of Parole,  
Department of Institutions and Agencies  
Lane, Mrs. Winthrop D., 20 Washington Pl. Newark; Manager, Welfare Div., N.J.E.R.A.  
Leap, S.R., Woodstown; New Jersey Interstate Compact Commission  
Lippincott, Amy C., Y.W.C.A., Trenton; Residence Secretary  
Ludlow, F. Milton, Deputy State Director, E.R.A., 20 Washington Place, Newark

NEW JERSEY (Continued)

- Maddock, Elizabeth M., River Road, R.F.D. #6, Trenton; National Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless
- Malady, Owen A., 185 Elwood Ave., Newark; Deputy State Director, E.R.A.  
20 Washington Place, Newark
- McCully, Edith F., Morris County Welfare Board, Morristown, Director of Welfare
- McHugh, Elizabeth, 17 South St., Morristown; County Case Supervisor, E.R.A.
- Mendelson, Max, 43 Washington St., Newark; Legal Settlement, Essex County, E.R.A.
- Messick, Charles P. State House, Trenton; Chief Examiner and Secretary,  
New Jersey State Civil Service Commission
- Meytrett, Mrs. Cornelia B., Crosswicks; Assistant Director, Children's Bureau,  
Department Institutions and Agencies
- Moench, Theodore F., 12th Floor, New City Hall, Camden; Supervisor, Transient  
Bureau, Camden
- Montgomery, John, 531 Pearl St., Red Bank; County Adjustor & Dir., Old Age Relief
- Muller, Elizabeth E., 815 Edgewood Ave., Trenton; Case Supervisor, New Jersey  
Children's Home Society
- Murray, Mrs. J. Cornell, Yardley, Pa.; Residence Chairman, Y.W.C.A., Trenton
- Nicola, Blanche M., 246 West State St., Trenton; General Secy., Y.W.C.A., Trenton
- Paul, Joseph C., 31 Clinton St., Newark; Member New Jersey Com. (Assembly)
- Potter, Ellen C. (M.D.), 301 West State St., Trenton; Director of Medicine,  
Department Institutions and Agencies, and Chairman, National Committee  
on Care of Transient and Homeless
- Schaffer, Adjutant Charles W., 203 South Broad St., Trenton; Officer, Salvation  
Army
- Schley, Reeve, Far Hills; Chairman, State Relief Council
- Sears, Col. Joseph D., 425 Franklin St., Bloomfield; New Jersey Crime Commission
- Sena, Francis L., 1060 Broad St., Newark; Coordinator, Transient Work Camps, WPA
- Shipper, Louis B., 100 Ward Ave., Trenton; President, Y.M.H.A.
- Streeter, Mrs. Thomas W., Morristown; Member Interstate Cooperation Commission,  
State Relief Council, Morris County Welfare Board
- Thompson, Mrs. L.S., Red Bank; State Board Control, Dept. Inst. & Agencies
- Van Sickle, B. B., 1060 Broad St., Newark; Field Supervisor, New Jersey State  
Employment Service
- Webster, Thornton, 1060 Broad St., Newark; Veterans Placement Rep. for New  
Jersey, U.S. Employment Service, U.S. Department of Labor
- Wells, John A. Y.M.C.A., New Brunswick; General Secretary
- Wilde, Helen M., Department Institutions and Agencies, Trenton
- Williams, Robert, 1060 Broad St., Newark; Public Relations - New Jersey State  
Employment Service
- Woelfle, John W., Essex County Court House, Newark; Secretary, Conference  
Arrangements Committee

NEW YORK

- Bailey, Roy D., East View; Superintendent, Westchester County Home
- Baker, Alva P., Albany; Field Director, Division Camp Management
- Barrows, Raymond H., NYC; Field Director, Division Camp Management, W.P.A.
- Buffington, Adeline A., Welfare Council, 122 East 22nd St., NYC; Secretary,  
Family Welfare Division
- Byrnes, John A., Assembly Chambers, Albany; Member of New York State Assembly;  
Chairman, New York Interstate Commission
- Cotton, Thomas L., 79 Madison Ave., NYC; Director, Transient Division, T.E.R.A.  
Director, Camp Management Division, W.P.A.
- Gallagher, Hubert R., 306 East 35th St., NYC; Regional Representative, Council  
of State Governments

NEW YORK (Continued)

Galloway, Elmer, 8 East 3rd St., NYC; Bowery Y.M.C.A. Executive Secretary  
Hirsch, Harry M., 80 Center St., NYC; Asst. Com., State Department Social Welfare  
Holbrook, David H., 50 West 50th St., NYC; Secy. National Social Work Council  
Jacobs, Haskell, 79 Madison Ave., NYC; Consultant on Settlement, T.E.R.A.  
Kleinschmidt, Dr. H.E., National Tuberculosis Association, 50 West 50th Street,  
NYC: Director, Health Education  
Leighty, Chester R., 79 Madison Ave., NYC; Asst. Director, State Transient Div.  
Leonard, Barbara D., 306 E. 35th St., NYC; Council of State Governments,  
Regional Office  
Lowenstein, Solomon, 71 West 47th St., NYC; Member, T.E.R.A.  
Lowry, Genevieve, 600 Lexington Ave., NYC; Comm. on Care of Transient & Homeless  
McCall, Bertha, 1270 Sixth Ave., NYC; General Director, National Association  
Travelers Aid and Transient Service  
Moore, MacEnnis, 1270 Sixth Ave., NYC; National Association Travelers Aid  
and Transient Service; Committee on Care of Transient & Homeless  
Murray, Virginia, 144 East 44th St., NYC; Exec. Secy. Travelers Aid Society, NYC  
Ostertag, Harold C., Attica; Member of Assembly and Joint Legislative Committee  
on Interstate Cooperation  
Rabinoff, George W., 71 West 47th St., NYC; Associate Director, National  
Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds  
Wallace, Marjorie S., 368 Voorhees Ave., Buffalo; Supervisor Detention Care,  
Erie County Children's Court  
Wilson, Robert S., 1270 Sixth Ave., NYC; Staff Associate, National Association  
Travelers Aid and Transient Service  
Young, Katherine E., 144 East 44th St., NYC; Asst. Exec. Secy. Travelers Aid

NORTH CAROLINA

Grady, Paul D., Raleigh; Pres. Pro Tem N. C. Senate  
Grier, T. L., Raleigh; Field Supervisor

OHIO

Hixenbaugh, Walter A., Columbus; State Transient Director, F.E.R.A. in Ohio

PENNSYLVANIA

Bender, Thomas W., Harrisburg; Deputy Attorney General  
Desees, Arthur M., 311 S. Juniper St., Philadelphia; Exec. Secy., PA. TBC. Soc.  
Jenny, William A., 1701 Walnut St., Camp Hill; Asst. Dir., Relief Div., PA., S.E.R.A.  
Kahn, Dorothy, 112 North Broad St., Philadelphia; Executive Director,  
Philadelphia County Relief Board  
Kenney, Luna E., 3627 Warren St., Philadelphia; Executive Secretary, First &  
Sunnyside Day Nursery  
Lindgren, L. R., Harrisburg; Department of Justice  
Patterson, Dorothy G., 3627 Warren St., Philadelphia; Social Worker, First &  
Sunnyside Day Nursery  
Rutherford, Martha Linn, 260 South Broad St., Philadelphia; Case Worker,  
Mother's Assistance Fund  
Scheehle, J. Evans, 323 David Rd., Harrisburg; Secretary, Welfare  
Solly, J. Lawrence, 311 South Juniper St., Philadelphia; Executive Secretary,  
Travelers Aid Society  
Stewart, Mary, 6134 Wayne Avenue, Philadelphia; Special Field Representative  
on Unattached and Non-resident, Eastern Division, Pennsylvania  
State E. R. A.  
Townsend, George L., 3238 Green St., Harrisburg; Dir. Work Camps Division, WPA  
Woodward, Mrs. Helen A., Riverton, N.J.; Philadelphia Travelers Aid

RHODE ISLAND

Coyle, Farrell D., 205 Benefit Street, Providence; Secretary, State  
Unemployment Relief Commission

Meek, Mrs. Gertrude M., Providence; Executive Secretary, Travelers Aid Society

SOUTH CAROLINA

Bates, Jeff B., Columbia; Member South Carolina Senate

Fulp, Col. J. D., Columbia; State Relief Administrator

McElveen, H. M., Columbia; State Transient Director

VERMONT

Jones, Lawrence C., Rutland; Attorney General

VIRGINIA

Woll, Margaret, Richmond; Assistant State Relief Adm., V.E.R.A.

WEST VIRGINIA

Allen, C. L., Charleston; Relief Administration

Friday, March 6, 1936

M O R N I N G   S E S S I O N

Presiding:

Honorable Richard Hartshorne

Miss Ruth Blakeslee

A F T E R N O O N   S E S S I O N

Presiding:

Honorable John A. Byrnes

JUDGE RICHARD HARTSHORNE, Presiding  
Chairman, New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation

THE PURPOSE AND MECHANICS OF THE CONFERENCE

On behalf of the Governor of New Jersey, we bid you welcome. May I interpolate by saying that the Governor is out of the State now, but will be with us Saturday morning.

We have a most distinguished and widespread gathering, so that it is a real honor for the State to have you here. There are practically twenty-two States represented: Maine to Florida, Virginia to Mississippi, and in addition, the District of Columbia and the Federal Government. That certainly gives us a representative gathering, particularly when we bear in mind the fact that no one west of the Mississippi was invited. Those who came cover the entire gamut of the invitations, with almost none absent. That evidences in itself the widespread and definite interest in the problem which we are about to discuss.

We are discussing not the "Man without a Country", but the man and woman without a State.

We are glad to have you here, but I presume you must return home some time. Of course, being a mere judge, I confess to no understanding of the intricacies of the problem, but I confess at the same time to some understanding of some of the real dangers of the problem to the public, because a large part of my time is on the criminal side of the Bench and it is a rare sentence day, which occurs every week, that there are not before me a considerable number of individuals of exactly the class we are now considering. While in large part they come, so far as the county where I sit is concerned, from the dumps, our character study of those individuals before they are sentenced reveals that many, many of them did not originate from dumps, but originated from respectable backgrounds. Therefore, it is not fair for persons to say that the transient is a mere hobo; that is not the true picture.

We are brought together here as a result of conferences going on between the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation of New York, the Chairman of which Commission sits at my right hand, of Pennsylvania and of New Jersey, these Commissions being the ambassadorial agent, so to speak, of the States which they represent, whereby these States may come from their separate compartments and join together to discuss joint problems in which all are interested. These Commissions, then, are a mere means to enable you, ladies and gentlemen, to do the work and arrive at your conclusions.

The problem we have to consider is no small one. It involves a quarter of a million individuals or so; practically twice the entire population of the City of Trenton, including every man, woman and child. It has grown in the last seven years practically seven hundred per cent, and it is high time that something was done.

In order that we may not wander, in view of our limited time, the Committee on Arrangements would make certain suggestions to those at the

conference. The Committee would suggest that, in the first place, we concentrate our attention upon the immediate emergency, so far as these people are concerned; that, in the second place, we concentrate upon our solution of the problem from the long-range standpoint - not that we can hope to eliminate all transients - that is, of course, impossible, and in one aspect seasonal transients to meet seasonal industrial demands are an economic advantage - but we can, at least, tackle this problem of preventing transients in the future from being disinherited of their right to State support. That is, therefore, the suggestion of the Program Committee, that we confine our attention in that way to the present and then the future problem.

You find in your hands a very interesting program. That program and the physical arrangements of the conference itself, for your convenience, have largely been worked out by the gentleman whom I will now introduce to you, and ask to explain to you the details - Mr. Woelfle, the Secretary of the New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation.

JOHN W. WOELFLE

Secretary, New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation

If you will turn to your programs, you will notice that we have endeavored to develop a new scheme in developing a permanent index for all material on this particular problem of Interstate Transient Relief. You will note that the cover is composed of two separate sheets of blue paper. Inside of that you will find a mimeographed copy of the program to be followed. That consists of five sheets. Thereafter, you will find approximately twenty-five pages of background material which has been prepared by the Arrangements Committee. You will then be able to take it home and have a complete record of the entire conference.

If any of you have speeches prepared which you have not as yet turned over to the Committee, I desire that you do so as soon as possible.

So far as the proceedings outside of the general conference here in the Assembly are concerned, the dinner at the Hildebrecht Hotel tonight will be informal. It will take place at seven o'clock.

If you will turn to page five of the program, you will notice that some general suggested rules have been set forth.

The Resolutions Committee will be announced later by the Chairman. The Resolutions Committee will accept all resolutions and will take them under consideration and present a complete report at tomorrow morning's session.

I believe that covers about everything, Mr. Chairman.

**JUDGE HARTSHORNE:** Coming from all over the United States, not knowing who is coming, it would therefore be quite difficult for you to create out of hand such a Resolutions Committee. The Arrangements Committee knows that certain individuals are here, widely scattered, covering a diversified line of activities, and the Arrangements Committee would call your attention, for instance, to the fact that these individuals are here: Assemblyman Ostertag of the

Commission on Interstate Cooperation of New York; Commissioner Ellis of the Department of Institutions and Agencies of New Jersey; Mr. Logue of Pennsylvania, Secretary of Internal Affairs; Mr. Alspach, Federal Director of Transient Activities; Mr. Lyons, Director of the Illinois E.R.A.; Mr. Redkey, Director of the Florida State Board of Social Welfare; Mrs. Wilder, Director of the New Hampshire E.R.A.; Mrs. Williams, former Delaware State Transient Director; Mr. Street, Commissioner of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia; Mr. Rabinoff, Associate Director of the Council of Jewish Federations; Mr. MacEnnis Moore, Executive Secretary of the National Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless.

Now, this gives you a list of individuals that we know are here, widely scattered through this entire area, and the Chair would suggest that nominations are in order for members of the Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Assemblyman Harold C. Ostertag, New York, Chairman

Mr. MacEnnis Moore, New York

Mr. George Rabinoff, New York

Mr. Henry Redkey, Florida

Mr. Elwood Street, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. A. L. Wilder, New Hampshire

Mrs. H. Williams, Delaware

Mrs. T. W. Streeter, New Jersey

Mr. J. H. Corliss, New Hampshire

Mr. F. C. Goodhue, Massachusetts

Mr. T. W. Bender, Pennsylvania

Commissioner W. J. Ellis, New Jersey

Mr. H. Jacobs, New York

Mr. L. M. Lyons, Illinois

Mr. T. A. Logue, Pennsylvania

FRED K. HOEHLER

Executive Director, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago

WHERE WE HAVE COME FROM AND WHERE WE ARE GOING  
IN THE PROBLEMS OF TRANSIENCY

---

The letter assigning the topic, "The Problem of Transiency" to me suggested that I point out "where we have come from and where we are going in the problem of the transient person". Just as it is easier for the transient to tell "where he hails from" than it is for him to tell "where he is going" - I will probably find the first question easier to answer.

If we were to answer accurately the question "where we have come from in the handling of the transient problem", we would have to admit that we have not come very far from the English Elizabethan Period. There is little time and no need for me to describe the 16th Century Settlement Laws or the Old English practice of poor relief authorities in the handling of the unsettled person. The principle of English poor laws requiring settlement as a condition for relief as well as the anti-social practices associated with "removal" and "warning out" are familiar to us as a characteristic of our poor relief history.

We can readily understand why the English Colonists transplanted the old systems of poor relief to our American scene. We can also understand, how each colony and later each State inherited that principle of requiring settlement, and applied it to their own peculiar problems. We know that unlike the old English Settlement Laws which were national in scope, the settlement laws of the United States varied from State to State. This variation in the settlement laws created even a more confused situation - - the result is a network of conflicting laws in the various States, relating to the acquisition of settlement, derivative settlement and loss of settlement.

The right of an individual to live in a town -- the "right of settlement" carried the accompanying responsibility of all the inhabitants for the support of their own neighbors who were dependent. This concern of a town for its own dependents, when extended, naturally led to the exclusion of the non-resident. It is when this inference became a guiding principle and was crystalized into law that our problem began.

Like all principles and theories which long outlive their usefulness, this principle has survived, has been preserved in our statute books as a provincial and antiquated small-town policy for our modern industrial community. We ask ourselves the question "why has this persisted?" However, laws have changed - - we do revise our statutes when they conflict with the interest of articulate groups.

The vested interest of the petty officials associated with the administration of poor laws is far outweighed by the suffering and the hardships experienced by the unsettled person. But as long as the township and the county remain, in certain areas, the source of revenue for poor relief it cannot be expected that the abolition of settlement requirements will be secured.

Few who have not been close to the front line job in relief know anything

of the suffering and hardship which resulted from this tragic situation. Respectable and sensitive human beings have been subjected to indignities which we do not permit our dumb animals to suffer.

The resistance of public officials to use of tax funds in support of transients resulted in this work being done by private agencies before Federal funds were available. This is and has been a cooperative enterprise between public and private agencies which earlier led to the transportation agreement between social agencies and railroads for the return of indigents to their place of legal settlement.

I have stated very briefly where we have come from in the matter of settlement laws - - now let us consider where we have come from in the matter of transiency. Transiency is a problem in itself and would assume important proportions even if there were no settlement laws. Transiency which is a complex of many elements has always been an important factor in social adjustment. From the dawn of time men have traveled in search of food, civilization increased with travel and wandering tribes grew into nations.

Fundamental to every nation's development has been the very important element of the proper distribution of its population. The history of the pioneer in America and the role he played in relation to our land policy is familiar to every American. The glamour and adventures of the gold rush and the drama of the western frontier has become almost a mythology for us.

The movement of hundreds of thousands of people who migrated from rural to urban centers, the migration from the South to our northern cities - - and the rapid growth of certain industrial centers - - was not a crisis calling for emergency planning. That movement was a necessary factor in the development of this country and has become a pattern of social behavior. We, therefore, see that movement of population is directly related to economic conditions and institutional arrangements. Transiency when accompanied by success in terms of economic stability - - industrial growth - - is looked upon as a remedy to faulty distribution of population, but when it is coupled with dependency, it is considered undesirable and viewed as an evil.

Although the Western frontier and the land development of this country are not the drawing power that they once were, we will live in an industrial and agricultural economy which takes a mobile population for granted. Certain inherent factors in our American civilization will demand intelligent re-distribution of our population for many years to come. Such factors as the continued growth of many of our cities, the development of new industries (in spite of the depression) and the exhaustion of certain land areas of their natural resources mean that transiency is and will continue to be necessary.

Our experience with the transients in those States where we have made a careful analysis of their problems has revealed to us that the causes of transiency are for the most part national in character. Unemployment, one of the prime causes of motivation, is certainly not a local problem. Just as possible solutions to the unemployment problem must be worked out on a national basis by utilizing all of our national resources, so must the transient problem be worked out on a national or interstate basis.

Transients present many problems in addition to those associated with non-residence and unemployment. They are a heterogeneous group needing more than

temporary housing and food. Their problems are as complex, their needs are as varied as the cross section of any dependent resident group. As unattached individuals of all ages and as families, they present health, child welfare, and old age problems; they fall into every category set up in the Social Security provisions but their individual problems are further complicated by the non-residence factor.

Experience indicates that no one State can provide the many types of resources that the transients need. Very frequently the place of residence of the transient offers even less opportunity or provides no resource at all for a particular need. Many of them have lost their legal residence and have not gained one elsewhere.

At this conference, we will not be able to prepare answers for all these problems. We will, however, discuss the relative merits of methods for dealing with these problems.

At this conference, we will not be able to provide answers for all these problems. We can, however, point the way for experimentation in several directions:

1. Uniform settlement laws in States
2. The use of interstate compacts
3. Federal aid to transients through reimbursements  
to States for care of those without legal settlement

ELLEN C. POTTER, M.D.

Director of Medicine, Department of Institutions and Agencies  
Chairman, National Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless

THE IMMEDIATE PROBLEM OF THE TRANSIENT

Mr. Hoehler has given you the historic background out of which have come certain problems which today frustrate us in our efforts to deal humanely and justly with our fellow men, who are no longer economically independent.

Society embodied in the law more than 300 years ago its conception of the method by which the poor were to be relieved and the conditions under which the relief was to be granted. Succeeding generations have but little modified the basic conditions which were earlier set down, although in the past three hundred years the economic and social life of the people has altered beyond belief.

While America swept forward in her development, first pioneering, then in agricultural expansion and later into an industrial era such as the world had never known before, the limitations inherent in our poor laws and laws of legal settlement made but scant impression on our thinking and much less upon our mode of life.

Each man was free to carve out his own future, and should he fall on evil days, his relatives, or his good neighbor, or organized charity, or at long last the Overseer of the Poor came to his relief.

Because this relief service of the overseer came to be regarded as a "last resort", and because the prestige of that office fell from its high estate ("second only in importance to that of the governor", as was said of the overseers in the early days in Pennsylvania), it is not surprising that able men did not seek to serve in that capacity.

As a consequence in this area of the public service little has been done in the last 100 years by the public official group to modify the old poor law to meet the needs of a new era.

To be sure in the 1870's the National Association of Commissioners of Charities and Corrections, (now the National Conference of Social Work), brought up the matter, with which we are concerned today, for discussion and suggested action.

Private agencies developed the Transportation Agreement which insured more intelligent handling of unsettled cases. Later (1931) the American Public Welfare Association through a special committee, from the Chairman of which you will hear this afternoon, took action to improve the situations and still later the Commissioners on Uniform State Laws submitted recommendations looking to the development of reciprocal agreements governing the interchange of poor persons. They did not, however, dig down to the roots of the difficulty.

To meet this emergency, created by the laws of settlement, by local tradition as to relief methods and in some localities by legal restrictions against the use of funds for relief of strangers, the Federal Government, by a masterly

and statesmanlike stroke, cut through the legal restrictions and the emotional resistance to providing such relief, by assuming the entire burden itself and establishing the Transient Service. This service was administered by the States but financed completely by the Federal Government. The standards of care were set by Federal authority and during a two year period the "man without a State" was not permitted to become "a man without a country".

In January, 1935, this country received warning from Washington that the Federal Government was determined to "get out of this business of relief". Employables were to be given work, but "unemployables" were to become a charge upon State and local communities.

The months rolled on; public and private agencies alike found it difficult to believe that this could be true. Certainly no one believed that Uncle Sam could or would abandon the men, women and children who at the end of five long years of journeying had lost all claim to local settlement.

In the early days of the Federal Relief Administration its chief spokesman, in accepting responsibility for the transient, said, "This is the last phase of the Federal Relief Program which will be liquidated".

But in spite of this the edict was issued that as of September 20, 1935, all new registration of transients should cease. This brought matters to a crisis. Certain adjustments made later permitted the reopening of cases; gave men of suitable age range a chance to enlist in C.C.C. service, and give able-bodied men a chance to secure a W.P.A. job, gave no guarantee as to duration, but there was some mitigation of a most serious situation.

We began to take stock of the immediate problem in a realistic way.

We found that the mid-monthly census of transients had been running well over 200,000 throughout 1935, reaching an "all time high" of 300,460 in February of last year.

We found that every State in the country had added its quota to the number of men on the road while it lamented the fact that it was likely to be left with hundreds (or thousands) of transients as a problem to be met when the Federal Government made its last payment on obligations incurred.

We found that the numbers in care in family groups had increased steadily throughout the two year period, in August, 1935, these family groups constituted slightly more than 50 per cent of those in care.

AUGUST 1935 (Figures as taken from Federal Bulletin dated September 1935)

<u>Total under Care</u>	<u>Number of Persons in Families</u>	<u>U N A T T A C H E D</u>		
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
245,266	123,248	122,018	117,273	4,745

Here was a real problem of resettlement. More than 30,000 families already uprooted and no place for permanent settlement prepared for them.

You are Viewing an Archived Copy from the New Jersey State Library

We found in the stock-taking that as of September 30, 1933, the Federal Government had expended in approximately 24 months \$79,305,147 in support of the transient program. A substantial bill to be met by the State running close to \$4,000,000 per month, if no one was to starve.

The stock taking showed, as the weeks followed each other after September 20th, that not only were jobs not being found for the transients as rapidly as the need was shown, but there was no assurance of continued employment at an adequate wage, beyond the next few weeks.

There were found hundreds who were not physically fit for work, and who in any case would need relief.

In the careful study which was made to provide for the "return home" of unattached persons to the place of last legal settlement, it was found that while 56 per cent of them had "legal settlement" half of these had no home to which to go.

Of the family heads 49 per cent had "legal settlement" but three-fourths of these had no home to which to go. "Home" in retrospect, for the man or family a long time on the road, has become a mirage for him and for the public official who desires to help him solve his problem.

Stock taking all over the country indicated that while registration had ceased for transients that transiency had not stopped. This movement of population had not been created by the "transient program" -- it was instead a river which had been running underground and had at last emerged under pressure with the Federal Transient Program the first comprehensive attempt made to relieve and perhaps to solve the problem.

Our unremitting study of the problem during the last three years convinces us "whether fast or slow, however, migration on a large scale must remain as one of the essential methods of adjustment to the changing opportunities of a dynamic society. If, then, there is to be a greater degree of social control over distribution of population, its main purpose should be not to reduce human mobility, but to make use of it and to give it surer direction and guidance".

Only the Federal Government is equal to the task implied in this statement.

The problem which we have to attack, therefore, involves the intelligent guidance of migrating people; their successful continuous employment at an adequate wage; and the adjustment of our archaic laws of legal settlement and of relief, so that at no time will any of our people be without the right to help in time of need.

But what is the immediate situation?

The immediate situation finds us with a reduced number of transients registered in various centers; with transient men on W.P.A. jobs, knowing full well that these jobs are only of short duration. There will be fewer jobs available within thirty days if we are to believe Mr. Hopkins' announcement of Thursday morning, which cuts the jobs in New York alone by 30,000 within a month, and reduces the total for the United States by 500,000 within the next few weeks.

The immediate situation shows border patrols, with shotguns seeking to defend State borders from the stranger.

Jungles are beginning to grow up along the right of way of the railroads. Panhandling is on the increase. Missions are filled to capacity with men who can find shelter nowhere else. Sickness stalks the highways with these unsheltered people. Municipal lodging houses are full. Jails and lock-ups indicate an increased demand for shelter, and what is more, trespass and petty crime is beginning to be apparent.

Men will not starve - - they will not let their children starve in a land like this. If society will not provide an orderly method for the solution of this problem, these men will take it into their own hands.

We are, therefore, face to face with a condition full of peril for individuals who will become outcasts in our social setting if we permit this situation to progress to its logical conclusion. Not only is there danger for the individual, but for the community which turns its back on his need.

What then, shall we do about it? Can the State and local community carry the cost? Can the States by themselves alone even plan to handle the problem?

They cannot handle the financial load either for work or for relief. The poor laws as they stand in the several States prohibit the use of local funds for the relief of the unsettled person. The migrant labor problem which is tied up with this problem of transiency is a task too difficult for any State or group of States to handle successfully. The Federal Labor Department must lend a hand in this field.

In the face of these hard facts and of the pressing need, has the time not come for the States to call upon the Federal Government to resume at once its obligation to provide relief, as well as work, for these men and their families, who through no fault of their own are dispossessed of all rights to a home and a subsistence which should be theirs.

This call for the resumption of Federal assistance carries with it the obligation on the part of the States to share financially and administratively with the Federal Government in working out comprehensive plans for the future, based on the experience of the past.

We must never again let it come to pass that any citizen of the United States shall become a man without a State and a man without a country.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: Quite evidently the Conference appreciates Dr. Potter's direct and forcible presentation of the present problem. Her allusion to the Federal situation is timely, the presence of our Federal representatives is timely, and I would, therefore, ask Miss Ruth Blakeslee if she will handle the program for the next few speakers.

FACTS, FIGURES AND OBSERVATIONS ON THE TRANSIENT PROBLEM  
BY REPRESENTATIVES OF FEDERAL WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

RUTH BLAKESLEE

Regional Social Worker, in charge of Middle Atlantic Region

We have had some experience during these past two and a half years that enables us to put together analyses, and, perhaps, give to you facts in such form as we never before could have given. This material represents a wide area of research, and before the speakers present the material to you, I want to say a word about the character of that material.

Because of the numbers involved, sometimes such material takes on almost the guise of an anthropological piece of research. This peculiar problem is not that kind of a problem. It is a problem made up of individual persons who in former generations would have gone out into new frontiers, overcoming hardships and making good in spite of these, having left open to them the possibility of making their own destiny. That is denied them at this time. These people have been unable to work out a solution to their problems and have gone out into new frontiers willing to for-swear that security so dear to us all in an effort to maintain their independence or establish a new dependence in a new community.

I want to make two points in relation to that, one is, in carrying back the work of this meeting to your own communities you should stress that these are individual human persons confronted with their individual human problems. The second point is that in considering the individual aspects to this problem we are perhaps forswearing some of the most important factors in the solution of it. These individuals have represented initiative; they represent an individual effort to get out and meet this situation. Nothing we can do in the way of Federal relief will be adequate to provide that, they themselves must have that.

We can make available funds but these of themselves will never be sufficient. What is done with them counts. I think we have to consider what happens to the individual who, when he gets out into the world and is not able to make good, is sent back to his own community, denied the right to his own destiny, and is for a time impervious to ambition and shame. Few of these people remain in their own communities. We have to consider what the individual can do. He can straighten out for himself and we can give the opportunity to make the most of it.

CHARLES ALSPACH  
Director, Transient Activities

I think that much of what actually happened in the program has been reviewed by Dr. Potter and Miss Blakeslee. I think there are at least four or five things that came out during the history of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration Transient Program that certainly at the time were, and still are real contributions to this particular situation.

First, I believe the Federal Transient Program did force us to an appreciation of the individual aspects of transiency and homelessness. I think we did come to look upon these as a group of individuals, and in order to get anywhere we had to consider them as individuals as a part of a group.

Second, I think the program made a real contribution in the public health field. Dr. Kleinschmidt will tell you more about this this this afternoon, but we believe that the public health work carried on as a part of the program was of real value to the States and the communities, because of the intensive medical work, both preventive and curative, that was part of every well established Transient Program.

Third, we believe that the public work opportunities offered to the individuals that came to our attention resulted in real values for States, municipalities and counties. I believe we were very successful in carrying on public works projects that communities were very happy about, and I believe the best answer to that is that as the program was liquidated we heard in no uncertain terms from community, county and State officials, regarding the carrying on or continuing of the public work and the actual conservation activities that many of our transient camps have been engaged in.

In the next place it seems to me it gave us an opportunity to analyze this particular problem. While we have always talked about transients and homeless, I think the carrying on of the program by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration gave the first opportunity of an intensive study of just what was involved, the causes of transiency, the actual people that came to our attention, the conditions in various communities that we had to meet in meeting the situation.

Finally, it seems to me that we did, during the life of the program, bring about the raising of the standards for the care of homeless individuals, both of the transient and local homeless. Certainly most of us are very familiar with the fact that the local homeless individual in communities has been a very much neglected person. I think the fact that the Federal Government offered in this program a 100% administration cost to include care of the unattached and homeless, as well as transient families, gave the communities opportunity and did result in the raising of standards for the care of the homeless.

Of course, I think we have a right to say that the program did accomplish certain things. First, it focused our attention on the settlement law question, and this conference is a direct outgrowth of that. Second, I think it proved to us pretty well the futility of merely returning people to their place of residence or settlement. As previously pointed out, there were very good reasons why people left home. One of the disturbing factors today is that certain communities and States request money so they can return people home. That has proved not to be the full answer to the situation. Third, I think it showed us

the economic and job-seeking forces that do operate as a real means of causing migration and transiency. Finally, I think it showed us the necessity for some additional public health measures in the country, and the need for certain types of institutional care over and above those at present established by States, counties and Federal Government.

I think it should be said that the Works Progress Administration has for the first time given the non-resident an opportunity to get into a work program on a wage basis. We are particularly happy about that, despite all the many spots you may know about where particularly bad situations exist. By and large over the country the fact remains that transients as such have been absorbed into the work program. Our estimate is that at least 65,000 employable transients have been absorbed and are at work in the work program. That includes heads of families as well as unattached men. Not all of the men were assigned on to work in camps; at the present time there are roughly 35,000 men at work on these conservation projects in camps.

Now, in addition to that gain, I think that there is an increasing interest on the part of States and local communities with respect to this situation. We are discouraged and encouraged as we receive reports from States as to the provisions for the care of new cases. As Dr. Potter pointed out, the administration policy with respect to relief, and the present status of relief, is a matter for States and local communities. Fortunately, there are States right now that are actually carrying on a good transient program. It is true, by and large, that in most States, and in practically all States, there is some sort of emergency care by public and private agencies. In some States they are still using remaining Federal funds, but in other States State money, not Federal money, is actually being used. I think probably the greatest contribution that the Federal program made to the whole situation is the fact that for the first time the transient has become respected.

JOHN N. WEBB

Research Analyst, Division of Social Research

My purpose is to present a few facts and figures that have been arrived at from the studies of the transient population made by the Division of Research of the old F.E.R.A. and continued by the Division of Social Research, of the W.P.A. The results of the studies we have made have been published from time to time in mimeographed form and are about to be presented again in final report. These findings deal with the personal and occupational characteristics of the transient population and give some attention to the matter of migration. I think it might be of interest to present some figures in graphic form as to the amount of the movement and its direction. The charts which I have displayed deal with that particular aspect of transients, the amount and direction of the movement.

I have chosen three charts which I think are the most important. In presenting the information to you, I decided against an attempt to show it by States with the exception of a small group of States of particular interest to this meeting. For the country as a whole the data presented here is in terms of congressional groupings known as geographical divisions, which number nine.

(In referring to the charts Mr. Webb explained that the red squares represented

outflow of transients as of June 30, 1935, which was the last census; the green squares represented inflow of transients, and the yellow squares showed the intra-division flow).

The relationship between these squares tends to indicate the balance of inflow and outflow, contrasted with the amount of intra-division movement. The unattached transient has tended to originate in the industrial East, that is, the majority of unattached transients comes from the States east of the Mississippi River, and the greatest concentration is found west of the Mississippi. In effect, we would say the population is being redistributed. As a result of transiency there is a tendency to move the population from the industrial and urban cities of the East into the agricultural and less urban areas of the West. The amount of intra-divisional movement is large in the Middle Atlantic States and the South Atlantic States. In the West Central States the intra-divisional movement tends to be small. The conclusion we have drawn from these charts is that transiency unlike the more familiar type of migration in this country is an inter-urban movement of urban people between urban areas, and because that is true it helps to explain a great deal of the aims of the transient movement. It seems to be based on a belief by the unemployed that in some other city there must be a job.

With respect to the situation that is of special concern to us we have made a chart covering New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Ohio showing in detail the intra-divisional movement between and among these particular States. One very important fact that the chart brings out is that in the East, as always, over half of the movement is to some other section other than the section of origin. The inflow in New Jersey is about half from these three States; with about one-fifth of New Jersey inflow coming from New York, about one-twentieth from Ohio, and one-fourth from Pennsylvania; the remaining half coming from other sections of the country. You can see from this division of the four States represented here that they are making considerable contribution to the transiency of the country, without receiving as many as they give. There is a tendency for them to be a net loss to the movement in these particular States.

There is a tendency among the unattached to come from the cities to the metropolitan area. As they move out of this industrial area they tend to move to the West and sometimes the South. There is a drain on population from the transient movement away from these areas to areas which are less suited to absorb them than the areas from which they came. A further idea we might well consider is not only the movement of transients which itself is a problem, but we still have the problem of re-absorbing them. It seems fairly clear that eventually as conditions improve these transients will come back to the same areas from which they came. The extent to which they can be re-absorbed is a problem.

ROBERT C. LOWE

Legal Research Section, Division Social Research

Settlement is a technical term meaning a residence under such circumstances as to entitle a person to support or assistance from a political unit in case of his or her becoming a pauper. Settlement is a poor law concept. It is obtained in various ways. The most common manner is by continued residence for a statutory period with the additional requirement of being self supporting during such period. Settlement may be obtained in other ways such

as by birth, marriage, payment of property taxes, by lawful exercise of public office, by serving an apprenticeship, and probably others depending on local statutes.

Settlement must be distinguished from residence requirements for types of relief outside of the poor law. In most States there has been, either by statute, or in practice a residence requirement for emergency relief. Some States have adopted the settlement provisions for determining financial responsibility for this type of relief. A period of residence is required in most States for commitment or admission to welfare institutions. All of these requirements should not be classified as settlement provisions. Settlement refers only to poor relief. At this time, as it is necessary to limit my remarks, I am going to confine them in most part to legal settlement.

To what extent the assumption by the State of the financial and administrative responsibility for relief is going to affect the status of settlement laws is very difficult to determine at this time. My own conviction is that the old historical poor laws which contain these settlement provisions are gradually going to be superseded by the type of relief, which has sprung up since 1931, and generally called emergency or unemployment relief. We are at the present time in a period of transition with a great deal of confusion existing as to the status of these various laws. It is very difficult to determine what the outcome will be. If this transition is complete and the poor laws are gradually thrown into the discard, settlement, as such, must of necessity also go.

It is interesting to note how firmly ingrained legal settlement has become in our system of poor relief. In only two States east of the Mississippi are the residence periods for voting greater than the residence period required to gain settlement. In ten States the residence period required for settlement is greater, running anywhere from six months to four years longer. In the remaining 14 States the period is similar, though in the majority of these States there is no connection between the two statutes.

Of the 26 States east of the Mississippi River, five (Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Rhode Island) require a residence of five years to become eligible for relief. One State (Connecticut) requires four years. One State (South Carolina) requires three years. Delaware alone requires two years. Eight States (Indiana, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin) specify by statute a one year requirement; and eight States (Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Maryland, Tennessee, Vermont and West Virginia) in practice require a residence of one year. Virginia, West Virginia and North Carolina require a residence of three years for interstate migrants, unless they were self-supporting when they entered the State.

In most of these States the settlement must be in a local unit rather than the State. The New England States and New York have provisions for State reimbursements to political units for the care of the poor who have not resided in a political sub-division the required period. Most of the State statutes have provisions for the temporary care of the non-resident poor.

In some States there is more than one system for the administration of poor relief in effect within the State. Counties may by a vote of the electorate have either a local system in which the settlement must be gained in a town, township or city and the recipient is restricted to one of these small areas or a county system which allows movement within the county without the loss of the right to

relief, or a district system which usually has the same effects as the county system because the financial responsibility remains with the county.

In Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island, an absence of five years is necessary for the loss of settlement, the same period necessary for acquisition.

Loss of settlement by one year's absence from the State occurs in Indiana, New Jersey and New York. In these States loss is also incurred by the acquisition of a new settlement. The loss of settlement by the acquisition of a new settlement is the general rule of law applied in the majority of other States. In some of these States this ruling has been incorporated into statute. Two or three States hold that this rule does not apply if the settlement gained is outside of the State. I believe this to be the minority rule.

In view of these conflicting provisions in the several States, it is very easy to see the problem which immediately arises. A person must reside in New Jersey five years in order to be eligible for poor relief. It only takes an absence of one year to lose that eligibility, so if that person went to New Hampshire and stayed there thirteen months, because of New Hampshire's five year residence requirement and the loss of his settlement in New Jersey, he would be unable to obtain poor relief. Many instances of these gaps can be cited.

Such instances are further complicated by statutory provisions making it a misdemeanor to bring into the State non-settled poor persons.

As far as I have been able to ascertain, only seven States east of the Mississippi have given statutory authority to some State administrative department to make reciprocal interstate agreements for the removal of poor persons. Those States are Connecticut, Indiana, Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Vermont and Wisconsin. The statutes of most States provide for the removal of non-resident poor persons and for the recovery of expenses incurred for the relief of such non-resident persons while in the particular locality.

Statutes alone without reciprocal agreements provide inadequate guarantee of transfer. Judicial opinion varies greatly as to the effect of a statute authorizing the removal of a relief client from one State to another. Some courts have held that under such a statute a non-resident poor person may be removed, whereas, other State courts have held that such a statute is ineffective as it is impossible for the court to enforce the order in the other State.

Because, in general, States have assumed the responsibility for the insane and delinquent, a greater number of States have authorized reciprocal agreements for the removal of non-resident persons falling within such classes. To my knowledge, the following States east of the Mississippi have such agreements; Illinois (aliens) Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Wisconsin.

The outcome of the States assumption of the financial responsibility for relief may result in a more widespread enactment of laws authorizing reciprocal agreements.

As you are well aware, this analysis has been very brief. I have attempted to show the extent to which confusion exists. I have brought with me from Washington a number of copies of a tabulation made in our office of the statutory

[You are Viewing an Archived Copy from the New Jersey State Library](#)

provisions and practices governing the acquisition and loss of settlement. I also have a copy of more detailed provisions of the settlement laws abstracted by members of our staff. These are at the disposal of the conference and I hope they will be of some benefit.

CORNELL B. BRAISTED

State Transient Director, New Jersey Emergency Relief Administration

SUGGESTED PROGRAM FOR THE FUTURE

Our legislators have been a long time doing something about this situation of transients, and it will probably be some time before the recommendations which we may make will have any effect. We hope that it will be rapid, but we cannot expect it too soon. In the meantime, the Federal Government has made a large investment in camps throughout the United States. Here transients have been working and staying. Here unattached men have been referred from cities, given a constructive work program; where we have done our best to analyze and help them. It would seem to me a very wise thing for us to consider the fact that this is a floating, migrant group; that the numbers increase and decrease as the seasons roll around.

I would suggest to the Conference that we recommend a plan which can utilize these camps over a period of time, only so far as we need them, using the camps nearest to the cities and the labor markets, using in active cooperation the United States Department of Labor in a work plan. These men are to register with the State Department of Labor as they come into the State, be referred to the camps or to a central registration bureau, registered as to their skills and occupations, have a physical examination, and be given such care as is required on a minimum wage plan in the camps. A limited enlistment period of perhaps three months would be required, at the end of which time they would have to leave the camp for a period of one month, be returned to the State Department of Labor, to be checked in or out of that particular office.

The men would have a work registration card which would have positive identification on it. This would save us the very large administrative duties that we have had of verifying their stories, and which would be a reference not only of the public work that they have been doing, but of private work that they may have obtained on the outside.

This plan that I am suggesting is one that was discussed in Washington last fall -- Mr. Alspach, Mr. Linden, Mr. Nels Anderson and I had worked on it to see what we could suggest which would be constructive for the unattached employable man who is a migrant worker. We have looked over the situation and believe that this is a reasonable plan to present to Washington for the use of our large investment in camps, to be worked out in cooperation with our State and United States Departments of Labor. We do not believe that these men should remain static in the camps. They will not, and we cannot expect it. They are a seasonal supply of labor and a labor pool which we should have accurate data on and should use as it is needed.

It is not expected that this is a complete solution, but that it will help meet the situation all over the United States, both as to needs of these migrant workers and relieve the cities and municipalities of the difficulty of trying to take care of these people, in view of the obstacles of settlement laws. We believe that it will give transients an opportunity to apply for care on a wage program, which is what they are looking for. They are not seeking for security; they want a living and only a living.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the Conference that if, in the course of its deliberations, it views the problem of determining the resumption of Federal responsibility, that a suggested plan be included.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: Will Mr. Braisted answer a few questions? How much effect do you think this plan you have suggested would have on inviting people to see the country?

MR. BRAISTED: These men are applying for a job in any city that they come into. I do not know the answer to your question.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: Do you think it will create and increase the problem of transients?

MR. BRAISTED: I cannot answer that question, Commissioner. I don't believe any of us have an answer. Mr. Alspach might have an opinion on it.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: Does Mr. Alspach want to express an opinion? It seems to me it would be a perfect solution for some of the young fellows I know of to wander on away and forget home or local immediate responsibilities. They would be assured of a center where they could go to a camp in almost any part of the country, under that plan.

MR. BRAISTED: Of course, the registration and control at any point would be the only point at which we could do something about it. I don't know whether that will be an invitation to them to go to other States, but certainly our probings and lack of relief have not stopped this group from moving, and never has. I don't know whether the creation of facilities would increase the movement at all.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: We are approaching the hour for luncheon. As to this manner of resolutions, the Chair was given a resolution a little while ago by Mr. Hoehler and would ask him if he is not prepared to present that resolution at this time.

MR. HOEHLER: Mr. Chairman, I wrote this resolution in response to a wire received suggesting that each of the speakers present a resolution relative to his or her own thoughts on the subject, and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that after I read this resolution, it be presented to the Resolutions Committee. The resolution is this:

That this Conference declare its intention to support in the several States represented the efforts toward

- (1) Uniform settlement laws
- (2) Interstate compacts for assistance to ~~non-~~resident persons

That the Conference urge Federal aid through reimbursements for aid to persons lacking legal settlement.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: If there is no objection, this resolution will be received and referred to the Resolutions Committee. Hearing on it is so ordered.

Any further resolutions, as a result of the work this morning?

MR. OSTERTAG: I would like to offer the following resolution and move its adoption:

WHEREAS, industrial, legal and financial conditions created by the prolonged economic depression have dislodged thousands of men, women and children from their normal occupations and places of legal settlement and have thrown them, in their extremity, into communities where they are alien and have no right to relief; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government in the last two years, by its program of relief and work for transients, has demonstrated that it is possible on a national scale to alleviate the condition; and

WHEREAS, the experience of these two years has further demonstrated that transiency is an interstate problem and that it has its roots in seasonal and migratory labor and other situations that are beyond the control of the individual States; and

WHEREAS, the abandonment by the Federal Government of the relief program for these persons is returning these unfortunate, unsettled people to chaos and hopelessness, since they and the communities in which they find themselves are lacking the means to solve their problems;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT: We call upon the Government of the United States, through an appropriate permanent branch of the public service and as a part of the public assistance program to resume its responsibility for the relief and employment of these persons who are without legal settlement in any State, and we urge that this relief and employment be made effective through a permanent department of welfare of State governments and coordinate local units of administration and that funds be made available by the Federal Government on a grant-in-aid basis;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: We request that the Federal Government through the Department of Labor, in cooperation with State Departments of Welfare and State Labor Departments, undertake a thorough study of the labor aspects of this problem of seasonal industries and of migrant labor and labor reserves and that plans be based upon the findings, to the end that the management of these problems in the future may be more intelligently and successfully handled.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT: These resolutions be presented by an official delegation from this body to the President of the United States and the Federal Works Progress Administrator and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the Congress.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: If there is no objection, this resolution will take the same course.

Before we recess for lunch, may I call your attention to certain matters. Obviously, when these resolutions emanate from the Resolutions Committee for action by the Conference, they must be voted upon by the Conference. The Conference Arrangements Committee would suggest that this Conference vote in accordance with the practice of the various other interstate conferences. They all voted by State, that is, one vote for each State. Is there any objection to that method of State voting, and if so, what method is suggested?

(No response)

Hearing no such motion, I assume that the suggestion by the Conference Arrangements Committee meets with your approval.

In the next place, the Resolutions Committee will have to act promptly upon the resolutions so far submitted. Arrangements have, therefore, been made for them to lunch together at the Lawrenceville Room in the Stacy-Trent Hotel immediately. To refresh your recollection, the Resolutions Committee consists of the following:

Assemblyman Harold C. Ostertag, New York, Chairman	
Mr. MacEnnis Moore, New York	Mr. J. H. Corliss, New Hampshire
Mr. George Rabinoff, New York	Mr. F. C. Goodhue, Massachusetts
Mr. Henry Redkey, Florida	Mr. T. W. Bender, Pennsylvania
Mr. Elwood Street, Washington, D.C.	Commissioner W.J. Ellis, New Jersey
Mrs. A. L. Wilder, New Hampshire	Mr. H. Jacobs, New York
Mrs. R. Williams, Delaware	Mr. L. M. Lyons, Illinois
Mrs. R. C. Streeter, New Jersey	Mr. T. A. Logue, Pennsylvania

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: In continuation of the morning session, I will ask you to consider, with the following speakers, other aspects of the transient problem, the first aspect being that of Transiency in Relation to Delinquency, as to which the address will be delivered by the Director of Parole of New Jersey, who is also a member of the State Commission on Crime.

WINTHROP D. LANE

Director, Division of Parole, Department Institutions and Agencies

TRANSCIENCY IN RELATION TO DELINQUENCY

I shall say very little, in the few moments at my disposal, about the amount of crime and the number of criminals traceable to the conditions of transiency that have here been described.

In the first place, I should want to examine with considerable care, any figures or statistics that might be offered on the subject. I should not want to make the kind of error made by the mother of two children who planned, with her husband, to remove to the inviting land of California. She was greatly disturbed to read in some report that every third child born in California was Japanese and having two children already, she felt that she could not safely take the risk.

We know that the existence in the country of a large and unnatural number of roving, moving transients, or temporarily halted and stranded transients, is not without its perils. We know that figures will probably not tell the whole story.

We know that judges and police departments have, in many places, shown a tendency to pass on to transient shelters, young people suspected or actually accused, of the commission of minor offenses.

We know that boys and young men have been thrown into contact with older men - - contacts in the jungles, on the roads and elsewhere - - contacts that have not been useful for the boys and younger men. We know that the situation has been excellent for designing and criminal men to make deliberate use of young people away from home and discouraged already by their experiences, in the schemes and crimes of the older men.

We know that a condition in which scores of thousands of people of all ages and origins are uprooted, moving, destitute, speculative and some times desperate, is a condition containing plenty of seeds of anti-social conduct and law-breaking. Tables of statistics are not necessary to confirm the judgment of our own common sense that such a situation holds perils too real to be ignored.

There is a further phase of this matter, however, that I think it's not often enough kept in mind. It seems to me quite within reason to say that the harvest of delinquency, the harvest of crime, that this situation may produce

has not yet been reaped. The disintegration of personality, the deterioration of morale, the disorganization of habits is a progressive process. Thousands of people have been forced to go through experiences that may not yet have taken their full toll.

Is it not quite possible that law-enforcing agencies - - courts, probation offices, correctional institutions, and others - - will be handling for some years the crop of delinquents and criminals traceable to conditions existing today, which we have been describing here? I hope that this is not an alarmist note, and I hope my fear is unfounded. But it seems to me that some such unhappy development is likely to take place within the next few years.

My greatest usefulness this afternoon, I think, will be to discuss with you briefly one illustration of the kind of constructive interstate agreement and cooperation that is possible.

In the conclusion of his remarks this morning, Mr. Hoehler mentioned three devices by which States can work together for common purposes. One of these was the interstate compact. I desire to discuss with you the steps that have been taken in regard to one interstate compact.

In restoring law-breakers to society, it is often advisable to permit people on parole to live in States other than the States in which they served their sentences. They may have legal residence in other States, their families may have moved to other States while they were imprisoned, jobs may have been found for them in other States, or there may be other reasons why permission should be granted to live in other States.

It is important that a sending State be assured that a receiving State will supervise such parolees closely and conscientiously in the public interest. For this reason a few States have already worked out reciprocal arrangements whereby they agree to supervise each other's parolees as conscientiously as they supervise their own. These arrangements are informal working agreements without the sanction of law. Among such States are New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and a few others. This is in line with a progressive administration of parole and means that criminals leaving prison are not allowed to move from one State to another without proper surveillance and safeguards. It illustrates the possibilities of interstate cooperation and robs the State boundary of some of its character as a protection to criminals.

Recently a strong movement has developed for inducing all States to enter into such agreements with sister States and to give these agreements the force of law. This would be done by definite compacts between signatory States. Consent to such compacts has already been granted by Congress. Under such compacts, one State may permit a person on parole to reside in another State provided such person is a resident of the receiving State or provided the receiving State consents to such person being sent there. Before granting such permission, opportunity is to be given the receiving State to investigate the home and prospective employment of the person on parole. Within the meaning of this compact, a resident of the receiving State is one who has been an actual inhabitant of such State continuously for more than one year prior to his coming to the sending State and has not resided within the sending State more than six continuous months immediately preceding the commission of the offense for which he was convicted.

Under this compact, each receiving State would supervise the parolees of

any sending State by the same standards applicable to its own parolees. Duly accredited officers of a sending State may at all times enter a receiving State and retake any person on parole.

Statutes approving such compacts have been adopted, I am informed, in Illinois; Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota and Maryland and are at present being considered by the legislatures of New York, New Jersey and West Virginia.

Informal agreements of this kind, lacking the force of law, have worked satisfactorily, and it is believed that formal compacts of this nature are desirable.

Sample compact as drawn for States - in the field of parole

MARYLAND - ILLINOIS COMPACT

Entered into by and among the contracting States, signatories hereto, with the consent of the Congress of the United States of America, granted by an Act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts for cooperative effort and mutual assistance in the prevention of crime and for other purposes".

The contracting States solemnly agree:

1. That it shall be competent for the duly constituted judicial and administrative authorities of a State party to this compact, (Herein called "Sending State") to permit any person convicted of an offense within such State and placed on probation or released on parole to reside in any other State party to this compact, (Herein called "receiving State") while on probation or parole, if

- (a) such person is in fact a resident of or has his family residing within the receiving State and can obtain employment there;
- (b) though not a resident of the receiving State and not having his family residing there, the receiving State consents to such person's being sent there.

Before granting such permission, opportunity shall be granted to the receiving State to investigate the home and prospective employment of such persons.

A resident of the receiving State, within the meaning of this section, is one who has been an actual inhabitant of such State continuously for more than one year prior to his coming to the sending State and has not resided within the sending State more than six continuous months immediately preceding the commission of the offense for which he has been convicted.

2. That each receiving State will assume the duties of visitation of and supervision over probationers or parolees of any sending State and in the exercise of these duties will be governed by the same standards that prevail for its own probationers and parolees.

3. That duly accredited officers of a sending State may at all times enter a receiving State and there apprehend and retake any person on probation or parole. For that purpose no formalities will be required other than establishing the authority of the officer and the identity of the person to be retaken. All legal requirements which may now prevail to obtain extradition of fugitives from justice are hereby expressly waived so far as they relate to the arrest and return of parolees and probationers. The decision of the sending State to retake a person on probation or parole shall be conclusive upon and not reviewable within the receiving State. Provided, however, that if at the time when a State seeks to retake a probationer or parolee there should be pending against him within the receiving State any criminal charge, or he should be suspected of having committed within such State a criminal offense, he shall not be taken without the consent of the receiving State until discharged from prosecution or from imprisonment for such offense.

4. That the duly accredited officers of sending States will be permitted to transport prisoners being retaken through any and all States parties to this compact, without interference.

5. That the Governor or each State may designate an officer who, acting jointly with like officers of other contracting State, if and when appointed, shall promulgate such rules and regulations as may be deemed necessary to more effectively carry out the terms of this compact.

6. That this compact shall become operative immediately upon its ratification by any State as between it and any other State or States so ratifying. When ratified it shall have the full force and effect of law within such State. The form of ratification to be in accordance with the laws of the ratifying State.

7. That this compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon each ratifying State until renounced by it. The duties and obligations hereunder of a renouncing State shall continue as to parolees or probationers residing therein at the time of withdrawal until retaken or finally discharged by the sending State. Renunciation of this compact shall be by the same authority which ratified it, by sending six months' notice in writing of its intention to withdraw from the compact.

DR. H. E. KLEINSCHMIDT  
National Tuberculosis Association, New York

PROBLEMS OF TRANSIENCY IN RELATION TO TUBERCULOSIS

November 7 to 23, 1935, I visited, at the request of the Transient Bureau of the F.E.R.A., so-called tuberculosis units in Texas, Arizona, New Mexico and Colorado. My report was rendered to Mr. Alspach, Director of Transient Service. Some general impressions recorded were as follows:

- (a) The obvious success of the effort to "freeze" the thousands of wanderers with no means and no particular objectives. Machinery for the care of transients seems to have sprung up like a mushroom yet procedures and practices have already become stabilized into an orderly system.
- (b) The effort on the part of transient directors to classify clients, out of which grew the segregation of the sick and the further classification according to disease groups, such as venereal disease cases and the tuberculous.
- (c) The calibre of the officials and paid workers. Seldom have I seen more efficient and intelligent workers in any public health or social enterprise. Their interest amounts, in some instances, to fervor and their devotion is genuine.
- (d) The thoroughness of social case work being done. Apparently no stone is left unturned to help transients adjust themselves.
- (e) The liberality of the medical personnel and their interest in the problem, social as well as medical.
- (f) The general morale of the camps and hospitals; the ingenuity displayed in creating makeshift but serviceable equipment at little or no cost; the uncomplaining attitude of personnel and clients toward discomforts.
- (g) The total lack of support of the general public. The attitude of the man-on-the-street toward the non-resident on relief ranges from complete indifference to bitter scorn. "Bums", "leeches", "scum", are words I heard applied to transients.
- (h) The pettiness of local politicians and their interference with transient activities.

The report outlined the history of the transient tuberculosis problem and discussed social and medical factors involved. Travel notes were included as a supplement. The recommendations made on the basis of the report were to the effect that the Federal Government should continue to assume responsibility for the care of indigent tuberculous persons who are not residents of the States in which they are and who cannot well be returned to point of origin. The suggested plan for dealing with the situation was divided into three parts as follows:

- (1) Immediate Plan - Continuation of tuberculosis units as at present (November 30, 1935).

(2) Transitional Plan - Provision for the continuation of tuberculosis units for a further period of from ten to twelve months during which time preparations were to be made for the establishment of a permanent plan. In this period efforts should be made to:

(a) Coordinate present units.

(b) Establish central medical headquarters, perhaps by utilizing existing tuberculosis sanatoria.

(c) Build up and establish standards applying to physical equipment and personnel.

(d) Provide training for administrators, social workers and medical personnel in tuberculosis sanatorium work.

(e) Establish case-finding facilities throughout the Southwest.

(f) Add diagnosis and treatment facilities such as X-ray apparatus and instruments for collapse therapy.

(g) Develop through interpretation to the public a better appreciation of transient tuberculosis units.

(3) Permanent Plan - It was recommended that since tuberculosis is a communicable disease and that it becomes an interstate problem when a case crosses a State border the responsibility of maintaining case-finding and treatment machinery for tuberculous transients should be accepted by the United States Public Health Service.

The report was limited to facilities for the care of tuberculous transients but recognized the existence of other medical and social problems as well as granted that provision for tuberculosis would have to be fitted into a larger general scheme.

\* \* \* \* \*

On January 3, 1936, Mr. Clinton Anderson of the Transient Service visited the office and informed us that provision had been made for the continuance of the tuberculosis units for the next ten months. He stated also that the tentative recommendation that Cragmore in Colorado Springs be secured, had been rejected. Mr. Anderson could not give us any assurance that during the ten months period the several items of the tentative plan recommended would be put vigorously into action. My own unsupported guess is that the F.E.R.A. will utilize the transient period to relieve itself gradually of the responsibility of caring for tuberculous transients. This would be most unsatisfactory in my estimation. We, of the Tuberculosis Association Staff, feel that a conference of persons interested in the transient problem as well as such officers and executives of tuberculosis units who are now serving, would be desirable. Out of such a conference might come a more definite concept of the whole problem and perhaps a concrete plan worthy of recommendation to the proper Federal authorities. The National Tuberculosis Association stands ready to participate in any such conference.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: Dr. Kleinschmidt, on behalf of the Conference, may I express our appreciation of your "segment", as you call it, of the transient problem.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: There is one group of those who are actually transients which is of considerable size which is not handled through the same authorities because of the special law on the subject, but is handled through the Veterans Placement Service of the United States Department of Labor, and the Conference will in that regard listen to Mr. Thornton Webster.

THORNTON WEBSTER

Veterans Placement Service, United States Department of Labor, New Jersey

TRANSIENCY IN RELATION TO VETERANS

I am glad indeed for the privilege of appearing here today to talk on the subject of transiency in relation to veterans. I realize that the time is all too limited for a long talk on this subject, and so I shall confine myself to a brief resume of the conditions as found in the clearing of transient veterans through the Veterans Placement Service in the State of New Jersey.

While rapid strides have been made in caring for such transients, I firmly believe that continued efforts will have to be made for the care of transients.

However, as Veterans Placement Representative for this State, I feel that I would be remiss if I did not find time to help the veteran with his other problems, even though these other problems were not a part of my official duties. This resolve on my part brought me into contact with the transient veterans a great many of whom, in their will-o-the-wisp travel through this great nation of ours, picked that most industrious and charitable City of Newark as a stop-over and were eventually referred by various agencies to the office of the Veterans Placement Service for help and advice when he would accept it.

Sore of the foot, thin and woebegone, with suitcases and without, paraphernalia wrapped in newspaper bundles, no overcoats in this terrible winter we have just experienced, and an empty stomach, to say nothing of an empty pocket-book, he knocked at our open door.

Had it been just a problem of employment and had the transient been willing and able to establish a permanent residence in the city, we would have, through the facilities of the New Jersey Employment Service, tried to find him either a temporary or permanent job. However, in most instances that was not the desire of the veteran. In most instances his main ambition was to travel on and on to receive warmth, food and clothing while he tarried and regained his strength.

Is the veteran any different than the non-veteran? The veteran simply served his country in the time of war and automatically received the title of "veteran". The problem of transiency is the same, however, and no doubt the desires are the same, whether he be a veteran or a non-veteran, yet, while I hesitate to say it. In some cases the transient veteran is of the opinion that since he served his country in the time of war, the Government should take care of him. I am happy to say that such cases are rare but it presents a duty on

the part of the person interviewing the transient veteran to at least try to erase this idea from his mind, arrange, if possible, some temporary help for him and then - what?

The temporary help, food and lodging having been given him, the problem now presents itself as to what disposition is to be made of his case. He has come into the State from some other State and in a number of instances it is difficult to obtain from him information as to the State of which he was originally a resident. We have in this State of New Jersey some of the finest transient camps in the country. Is it not a question as to whether the veteran, a resident of another State, should, if willing, be sent to one of the transient camps in the State of New Jersey or given transportation back to the State of which he originally was a resident, for care and employment? I feel that if he is sent to a transient camp in our State, the problem has not been solved and I firmly believe everything possible should be done, at the time of contact with the transient veteran to arrange, if possible, a definite and permanent settlement of his rehabilitation and employment. If he is sent to a transient camp, how long will he stay there? If he is sent to a transient camp, what will happen to him at such time as he elects to leave. Is it not the belief of all of us that upon leaving he will once more start his trek across country and for months and perhaps years, if the Government provides for him, go through the same process - into one State - into another camp - out of this camp - into another, and so on.

Just what are the desires of the transient veteran? Does he desire to work? Does he wish to return to his own State? Does he want to go to a transient camp? Does he want to remain in a transient camp? I believe that this Conference was called for a frank discussion of the transient problem and I feel that you will want to hear a frank opinion from me as to these desires.

I do not believe the average transient veteran desires permanent employment. In talking with the transient veteran I have reached the conclusion that he is a traveler by choice and perhaps will always be. In looking them over from the physical standpoint, the majority of them from just a cursory examination, do not appear fit to fill a job where real physical labor is involved, to say nothing of filling a position where any mental labor is involved.

In most instances the veteran is not particularly anxious to return to his own State even if transportation were afforded him.

In some instances he is willing to go to a transient camp but feels that the wages paid him in these camps are not sufficient. This even in the face of the fact that if he did not go to camp but continued on his way, he would have no money in his pocket; this, in the face of the fact that if he did go to camp he could remit monies to those dependents, if any, left behind.

The question, "Does he want to remain in a transient camp" is difficult for the Veterans Placement Service to answer since once the veteran is taken into a transient camp we, in most every case, hear no more from him.

In conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation of the painstaking and conscientious work performed by the Transient Bureau in New Jersey. I have visited their camps and have eaten at their table, and I was amazed at the cleanliness of their buildings and the variety and quality of their food, to say nothing of the manner in which it was prepared. The cooperation tendered us by this Bureau has been of the utmost help, and I feel that this Bureau and its camps must be continued.

HENRY REDKEY

Director, Department of Transient and Unattached  
State Board of Social Welfare, Florida

RESULT OF FLORIDA'S STUDY OF THE TRANSIENT PROBLEM

I am here as a social worker who has long been interested in a solution of the transient problem. I have been introduced as the Director of the Department of Transient and Unattached of the Florida State Board of Social Welfare. I am speaking to you today, however, in another capacity, that of Secretary of Governor Sholtz's Florida Transient Coordinating Committee.

Last year, when the Federal Government decided that it was going out of the transient relief business, the State of Florida was greatly disturbed. There were columns of news comments and editorials which focused attention on the gravity of the situation. Public opinion was so aroused that the Governor of the State, realizing Florida's predicament and her agitation over what was going to happen to thousands of transients who would certainly arrive in Florida when there was no provision whatever for caring for them, appointed a Statewide Citizens Committee to make a thorough study of the problem and to recommend permanent remedies. This Committee was unlike most committees appointed to inquire into what we regard as welfare problems; it had in its personnel not only social workers and persons experienced with the transient problem, but also lawyers, mayors, sheriffs, business men and other public officials.

This morning, there was painted a graphic picture of what the transient need is and what might be done on a temporary or emergency basis to alleviate this situation. The Report of the Florida Committee, which I shall now discuss, is addressed not to the emergency problem, but to a proposed long-time remedy. Briefly, you will find that the Florida Report, due to the composition of the Committee which drafted it, recommends the modifying of certain policies which were in practice during the emergency Federal Transient Program. The report aims to bring out a practical plan appealing to social workers, legislators and Congressmen through the Country,

We propose that the National Security Act be amended by the addition of a new title which will provide for grants in aid to States for transient assistance on a modified matching basis. The underlying principle is that States should match Federal money for transients dollar for dollar, but in addition, that a certain equalization of grants should be made by the Federal Government, in order to bring about an equitable distribution of the cost between all the States and the Federal Government. The proposed formula is that each State should match dollar for dollar to provide care for its proportionate share of all transients in the country, this share to be arrived at on the basis of the ratio which the state's population bears to the population of the entire United States. Cost of care for all transients above this number to which that State might be called upon to give assistance should be borne entirely by the Federal Government through additional grants. The Committee believes that it is very important that in any proposed transient program there be decentralized administration and State and local participation, both financial and in the matter of formation policy.

The Federal legislation which the Committee recommends follows the general outline laid down in the rest of the Security Act. It provides that grants shall be made available to States only when States have complied with certain prerequisite conditions. In that part of the Plan which had to do with State plans to be submitted to the National Security Board, thirteen specific points are covered. It is our thought that when any State qualifies for Federal grants by meeting these conditions, in addition to the financial participation clause already referred to, those States will have met a reasonable share of the total transient responsibility. All of us understand how necessary it is that there shall be a certain uniformity of transient policy throughout the country, while at the same time preserving the final principles of decentralization and State participation.

Some of the points which the Florida Committee would recommend for inclusion in every State plan perhaps need some explanation. We are trying to propose a plan which will be acceptable and which will have a reasonable chance of enactment. We cannot afford to be sentimental about transients. They are human beings as good and as bad, as weak and as strong as the rest of us. Popular opinion demands some form of control and direction of what is too often regarded as purely and simply aimless migration. No control can be exercised unless some form of identification is required at the outset. Identification is the lever by which national control and direction can be applied to transient migration. That is why the Committee recommends that identification according to the standards to be prescribed by the National Security Board shall be obtained before any transient person is given assistance under this proposal. Although great progress has been made within the last two years in interpreting the transient and his needs to the public, we cannot gainsay the fact that many people still believe that transients are "bums and hobos who will not work". It is reasonable to expect that persons receiving public assistance should offer something in exchange therefor. The Committee has recommended that every able-bodied transient be required to perform useful work in a reasonable amount. Thus, the public, when asked to consider this proposal, will certainly feel that here is a transient program which is not subject to the "free hotel" abuses.

No committee can study the transient problem without running into the age-old problem of conflicting settlement laws. Ideally, all settlement laws should be abolished or at least made uniform, but these are objectives which cannot be accomplished in the near future. Again, what the Florida Committee desires is a practical solution or a workable compromise. We need little imagination in order to visualize the attitudes of almost any State legislature, if it should be called upon to lower its settlement bars in order to qualify for a Federal transient grant. We believe that States can, should and will participate financially in a transient program, but there will be no stampede to provide State funds for this purpose. This being the case, there is no sense in throwing an obstruction in the way of State financial participation. On the other hand, almost any State legislature will accept the suggestion that it provide, by proper legislation, that any person having a settlement in that State shall not lose it until one has been gained in another State. Most States, we believe, would be willing to make this concession, in order to qualify for Federal grants. If this should be done, we would not have solved the puzzle of settlement laws, but we at least would have made it possible for every person to have a settlement somewhere.

The most damaging criticism and perhaps the least warranted, made of the emergency transient program, is that it encourages transiency. The facts and figures definitely disprove that contention, but, one thing the public would

like to see in any proposed transient program is an emphasis on preventive measures. Most of you know that because the needs of families are more readily understood, they are more often provided for. Because of this, many communities actually have starved their unattached people into transiency. That is why the Committee has recommended that all unattached persons eligible for relief should be included in the State-wide plan for the administration of transient aid. This proposal, it is true, will not prevent transiency among families, but it should go a long way towards preventing transiency among unattached people, on the theory that it is always better to prevent transiency by providing decent standards of relief and assistance at home.

We know from our experience with the two-year Federal emergency program that the lack of employment is a deep-seated cause of transiency. We have been unable to intelligently direct transiency because we have never been able to find a department in Washington able to give us specific and valuable information concerning the recurring seasonal labor demands. These recommendations, therefore, propose that the Labor Department be charged with the specific responsibility of providing the type of information that would be most useful to transients, that is, to the migratory, would-be seasonal workers.

The popular idea that everyone is antagonistic to transients is considerably over-estimated. The public is not so much antagonistic as it is perplexed as to how to do something for transients that will provide humane consideration and not, at the same time, aggravate the problem. That is why we propose a plan which is progressive, and at the same time provides checks against abuses which the public fears most. Perhaps that is why, to our great astonishment, this report seems to have developed such widespread interest and approval, not only by individuals and organizations, but by powerful political groups. We have had innumerable questions to answer about these recommendations and we are always glad to answer them.

On behalf of Governor Sholtz of Florida, I wish to pay particular tribute to this very remarkable meeting sponsored by the Interstate Cooperation Commissions of New York, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. You have made a very valuable contribution by arranging such a program as this.

The Florida Committee does not pretend that these recommendations are the acme of wisdom. We pass them along for your consideration. We hope it will go a little way in supplying the necessary interest and public understanding of the problem of transients.

POSSIBILITIES OF INTERSTATE COOPERATION IN MEETING TRANSIENT PROBLEMS

From the Legal Point of View

HASKELL JACOBS

Consultant on Settlement,  
Temporary Emergency Relief Administration, New York

As I gingerly stick my legal toe into the cold water of the future of our settlement laws, I cannot help but think of that old phrase, "The Queen is dead! Long live the Queen!" For, you will remember, it was Queen Elizabeth's famous Poor Law of 1601, followed by King Charles II adding some legal settlement provisions in 1662, which started on its way that little problem which is facing us today.

Mr. Lowe, earlier today, presented a vivid picture of the status of the laws of settlement in the various States. The great diversification of these laws throughout the country constitutes one of our major obstacles in planning and developing a nationally coordinated program for the care of transients and all non-settled persons.

The termination of the Federal Transient Program has necessarily caused the States to revert once more to the provisions of their own State laws in caring for these groups who have no legal settlement within the State, bringing in its wake all the problems prevalent prior to the Federal program. This means that some States will be unable to assist these non-settled persons at all, others will grant only emergency relief, and still others will merely offer to return the clients to their place of settlement, if they have one.

With this picture in front of us, what possibilities are there, in viewing the legal aspects of this problem, for, let us say, even a partial solution?

In the light of our present day situation, some of these suggestions have proven impractical, while others contain elements, at least, which may have considerable value in finally effecting an adequate plan.

Probably the most radical plan of them all, is the suggestion that all settlement laws be abolished, and that persons in need be cared for wherever they happen to be. Ideally, this is undoubtedly the best answer to the problem, but unless, and until, the Federal Government takes over, in entirety, all the relief activities in the country, there is little likelihood of this plan ever being effected.

As long as localities are paying any part of the bill for relief, they will probably insist upon retaining these legal residence restrictions. Also, to be considered, is the fact that, unless the Federal Government did assume the cost, certain centers of population would be excessively burdened because of their particular attractions, as, for example, summer resorts, and similar places drawing large numbers of visitors. After all, it should be remembered that one of the original purposes of our settlement laws was to attempt, at least, to establish a somewhat equitable distribution of the financial costs of relief.

[You are Viewing an Archived Copy from the New Jersey State Library](#)

One other difficulty, possibly worth mentioning, is the fact that in some sections, an abolition of the settlement laws might result in a corresponding abolition of the responsibilities outlined in these laws, so that some localities, might, as a result, restrict their relief programs more than ever, with the responsibility under the law having been removed. Also, to mention one more point in this regard, it does not appear that this suggestion would eliminate that very undesirable practice of "passing on" persons from one locality to the next.

The next important proposal, and incidentally the most popular, it seems, centers around uniform settlement laws for all the States. There is no question but that uniform settlement laws would be one answer to our problem, at least from the legal aspect. Uniform legislation, including an all-around plan of relief and care for all persons, both settled and non-settled, has been the hope of many groups for years.

It would appear to me, however, that anyone listening to Mr. Lowe's analysis of the present settlement laws of the States, would become at least a little discouraged at the possibility of ever succeeding in getting forty-eight different State legislatures to voluntarily accept anything that looks like a uniform law, especially when we consider sectional differences, differences in standards of relief and in "relief-thinking", besides the fact that several States have no laws to begin with.

If we are to think at all in terms of uniform State laws, it seems the only effective method would involve Federal legislation. This, of course, would raise the very nice legal problem of the power of the Federal Government to enact such a law. Inasmuch as the relief problem of the States is not a power delegated to the United States nor prohibited to the States by the Constitution, (Art. X) it would appear such a Federal law would be unconstitutional. I am wondering, however, whether Federal legislation covering only that group of persons who have travelled from one State to another--"Transients", we've been calling them, might not be held valid, as constituting "interstate commerce", under that section of the Constitution (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Page 3) giving Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several States.

Assuming the desirability of Federal participation in our relief picture, both for financial assistance to the States and to effect the uniformity desired, there is another possibility which may be worth our examining, and that is, a program similar to, or to be included in our Federal Social Security Act, whereby allocations for general relief would be made to participating States, but only if certain conditions have first been complied with by the States, as is the policy in those fields covered in the present Act. The conditions could include settlement provisions, so drawn up as to effect the uniformity desired, and plan for uniform responsibility for non-settled persons.

This suggestion is being presented for what it may be worth. In any event, in view of the present policy of the Federal Government, it would, of necessity, probably be a long time program rather than a plan for immediate action. And for immediate action, we have the possibility of interstate cooperation through the use of interstate compacts and reciprocal agreements.

In examining the reports of those national organizations which have been interested in this problem, it was of special interest to note the change in emphasis from a program promoting uniform legislation to an approach involving interstate agreements as being more effective as an immediate step in bringing

about a solution of our interstate problems. The American Public Welfare Association has been particularly active in this regard. Through that organization the problem was brought to the attention of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and Proceedings, which has drawn up a suggested bill for enactment by State legislature in order to validate the program.

In view of the fact that interstate cooperation in this regard may answer many of the difficulties suggested in the other programs presented, I believe we have here a real key to our problem. As between the group of signatory States, it would seem that much could be done in ironing out the more or less local problems between the States in planning a program which will more adequately meet the needs and problems of the non-settled person found in any one of the cooperating States.

As thus suggested, legislative authority is necessary to empower the State Departments to enter into these reciprocal agreements, but it is the consensus of opinion that the actual details should be included in the agreement itself, as these details will differ as between the different States. They would probably include provisions for transportation procedure, for care and support both in the State of residence and State of settlement, together with provisions for the financial responsibility of such care - a uniform policy regarding the return of clients to their place of settlement, with the verification of settlement, and authorization for return incidental thereto, and a unifying of the residence requirements as between the cooperating States.

Eight or nine States already have legislative authority for entering into reciprocal agreements with other States. One thing that has been troubling me a little is the apparent limited scope of the action which has been taken under this authority. In an effort to ascertain an evaluation of the effectiveness of current laws, I communicated, during the past week or two, with officials in those States having this legislative enactment. The response necessarily incomplete because of the shortage of time, seems to indicate that there is either much to be done in developing this program, or there are serious objections to it which had not come to my attention.

The Supreme Court stated that not all agreements between States have to be approved by Congress. I feel, therefore, that it would not be necessary for the States to procure Congressional approval in the matter of interstate compacts regarding settlement laws. Incidentally, no State having this legislation has procured approval from Congress, as far as I know.

(Copy of "Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act" offered here. Refer, however, to Mr. Goodhue's speech on page 46).

From the Industrial Point of View

W. FRANK PERSONS  
Director, United States Employment Service  
United States Department of Labor

I have been greatly interested in this conference, and am gratified to be here, particularly because I hope that what I may say will provoke your thought, and, what is even better, result in suggestions to our Service.

The United States Employment Service may seem not to have prominently identified itself, as yet, with the transient problem. I think I see distinct limitations to our usefulness in that connection; but I am convinced that the United States Employment Service can render a very important service in its own field.

You will note that I am not attempting to speak from the standpoint of industry. I have no license to represent industry now, or at any time. The Program Committee intended, I am sure, that this should be a discussion from the point of view of the relationship of the United States Employment Service to this problem, and I shall so treat it.

From our standpoint, the transient does not, in all probability, present the same problem with which you are concerned. The transient who is stranded and is a burden on the community, because he is unemployable, or because he is unwilling to work, constitutes a real problem, but one that we cannot share, so far as I can see.

There are two distinct aspects of the problem in which the Employment Service may have a role. The first concerns the man who is willing and able to work, and is unable to find work; and the second relates to the field in which we can very strongly influence the diminution of this transient problem.

Let me remind you again that what I say now I present for your consideration, and that I shall be glad to have your constructive suggestions.

I have had two opportunities in the past three years to deal with situations which seem to have affected the problem of transiency.

In April 1933, I was asked to organize the selection of all the younger men to be enrolled in the Civilian Conservation Corps. When this opportunity was presented to me, it was assumed that physically fit volunteers of any age and of any marital status would be eligible for enrollment. The plan actually adopted was to limit the enrollees to unmarried men between 18 and 25, and to select them in their home communities. It was further required that they should participate in the maintenance of their own homes by allotting the larger part of their wages to the support of their families.

We did resist the importunities of those who asked us to enroll boys from transient camps, preferring to take them from their own communities, because, if we enrolled them at such camps, we would have less opportunity to know of their social and family relationships; and because migration to those camps for the purpose of being enrolled would be encouraged. The program as adopted was the means of discouraging transiency on the part of youths of that age.

The other circumstance to which I wish to refer is this. When the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed with an appropriation of three and one-third billion dollars for public works, it was stipulated that local residents should have preference when qualified for these jobs. All public works projects were carried out by private contractors. How could they have known whether the man applying for employment was actually a local resident or not? They would have had no means of determining. So, it was ordered by the Public Works Administration that such employment should be effected through the United States Employment Service.

Accordingly, the United States Employment Service established employment offices all over the country, and registered and classified all local applicants. Each unemployed man had the chance to register where his proper expectation of work was located. Therefore, a man who wanted a public works job stayed at home, knowing that if he wandered away he could not get such work elsewhere. That, in my judgment, was a profoundly important arrangement for controlling a situation that, otherwise, would have resulted in a vast migration of labor.

It seems to us that our present undertakings present a widespread opportunity, constructively, to influence the transient problem. We have registered in our 2,000 offices more than twenty-one million different people in thirty months. We now have in those offices, in what we call the "active file", a total of nine million registrations. These registrations do not stay in the active file longer than thirty days unless application is renewed, because we must know, when employers request workers, where we can find competent people to do the work. We must know where they live, and we must be advised if they are still unemployed and looking for a job. Incidentally, this affects our opportunity to help the transient worker, who may not be findable when wanted.

We are particularly anxious that you should know that we give priority of opportunity to the qualified resident, where we have a free choice, as against the qualified transient. This is done as a matter of policy.

We are now studying this list of nine million people. I can generalize in this fashion. Three million are 25 years of age and less. In other words, three million are people who have not yet had the opportunity to qualify as experienced, or qualified workers. They are the baffled youth who have not had opportunity to get started in life, and have no work record of significance.

Another three million are older people who have rather definitely lost their places in industry and are unlikely to resume their usual occupations. The introduction of machinery has erased their customary jobs, or prolonged unemployment has dissipated their confidence, energy, and skill. Vast numbers, for such reasons, have become hopeless with regard to returning to their prior places of employment.

There remain three million people who are quite certain to go back to their jobs in their accustomed places as soon as industry recovers.

In other words, there are six million applicants who need definite service and to whom we must give intelligent service in order to help them at all. No routine procedure will assure them suitable chances for work.

We are endeavoring to secure such definite interviews with young folks, that we shall not be obliged to put them all in a single classification, such as "unskilled labor". If we did that, we should have no recorded facts upon which to select suitable opportunities for their start in industry. We are endeavoring to give them more specific classifications; to determine, on the basis of personal interest and aptitude those that are suited to clerical, or service, or mechanical pursuits, for example. We wish those who are getting their first jobs to have the chance to work where their interest is greatest, where they are likely to make the best impression on their employers, and where they are likely to find the most stable work. To the extent that we succeed in this endeavor, we shall diminish the tendency to adopt a discouraged attitude and a wandering life.

We are studying job specifications, and the results of these studies are being compiled into manuals. What good does it do for us to put one hundred names in a file under the job title - "telegrapher"? There is no job now available for those so experienced. We must discover what other jobs are of the nature suited to the experience and skill of telegraphers.

It is encouraging to know that industries can be classified into family groups - that men can be transferred to new occupations without serious loss of interest or of the usefulness of acquired skills. For example, the unemployed watchmaker need not be condemned to idleness because there is no chance to continue at that trade. He may be employed in constructing or repairing electric meters, or in assembling the instrument boards on automobiles, or in many other jobs in industries that he has not regarded as open to him.

By publishing these manuals, we are enabling our Service to present actual opportunities to those who feel hopeless, because they do not see a way to get back into the same niche they formerly occupied. And when we can find a job for the watchmaker where he lives, he will be kept at home. That will avoid the need or the desire to wander.

We are making a study of occupations and locations of these nine million people. In a few weeks we shall publish the first compilation. We will be able to show for each State and for the country as a whole, as of January 1, 1936, the number of unemployed people registered with us, their customary occupations, and where they live. This will be compiled for every one of the seven hundred employment service districts in our Service, throughout the United States. Six months later we will have the same compilation for the then existing active file, and then we shall know where pools of unemployment are increasing or decreasing, what industrial changes are occurring, and in what occupations those changes are taking place. These facts should be useful to control, or at least to counsel, that migration of labor which is desirable.

I have saved for the last a discussion of one of our activities which serves an industry that utilizes vast numbers of transitory laborers. In the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Arizona, California, New Mexico, Oregon, Texas and Washington there are, perhaps, five hundred thousand agricultural workers migrating from one area of employment to another, in a single summer. We have organized a Farm Placement Service with the hope of mitigating some of the unnecessary evils incident to such transient labor. Prior to the first of July, 1933, there were in those southwest and western coast States not more than twenty employment offices altogether. Now there is no part of any State which does not have employment service. It is, therefore, now possible to do a job we could not do before.

The managers of local employment offices contact the growers in advance, and find out their needs for transient labor, - - as to number and kind. They analyze their lists of people waiting for employment. They try to match the local labor supply against the local demand. If there is a surplus of local labor, they are called upon to transfer that surplus to the nearest place where such labor is in demand. If there is a deficit of labor in the local market, the plan is to supply labor from nearby places, if possible, and to discourage, so far as practicable, the long distance movement of labor. This plan has worked well during the past summer in California, and we are extending it now to all States where substantial volume of transient farm labor is utilized.

The purpose of the Farm Placement Service is so to conduct its work, that

the movement of transient labor shall result, as little as possible, in the stranding of unemployed persons away from their homes.

If I have made any contribution, Mr. Chairman, to this discussion, I hope it is in the direction of provoking thought and suggestions. May I say in closing, that, with my own background of social work, I am interested in the transient problems which social workers and social welfare organizations must face. What we wish to do is to think out with you, in what degree and in what direction and in what field the United States Employment Service can rightfully be most helpful in the prevention, or solution, of such problems.

From the Social Point of View

FRANK W. GOODHUE

Director, Division of Aid and Relief  
State Public Welfare Department, Massachusetts  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate Problems  
American Public Welfare Association

Although I am particularly interested in the interstate phase of the transient problem, I feel I should express my strong conviction that future progress is to a great extent dependent upon the ability of States or their political subdivisions to give humane consideration and support to persons who have no legal settlement in any unit in the State wherein they fall into such distress as to need public aid. The economic phase of the problem, which I regret to have to admit is in some jurisdictions the only question receiving consideration, while important, should be subordinate to the well-being of the persons in need. It is apparent that the Federal Government proposes to discontinue its active participation in relation to transients. I regret that such a trend is evident because I am confident the transient has received much better consideration, on a case work basis, as a result of the Federal cooperation.

Any State which has no provision of law authorizing local support for persons having no legal settlement, is not, in my opinion, in a position to enter into reasonable interstate relationship with other States.

During the past forty or fifty years many efforts have been made to bring about uniform settlement laws throughout the United States, but because of the tremendous legal difficulties involved, we are still a long way from such a goal, and in my opinion the goal could not be reached for many years.

There is, however, in my opinion, a short cut through the medium of reciprocal agreements which would enable States to avoid the technicalities of settlement law, and to proceed on a uniform, equitable basis.

The question of the desirability of a uniform settlement law was referred to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1929, and after the matter was given a committee consideration it was deemed inadvisable to attempt to prepare a draft of an act for a uniform State law on this subject.

In 1930-31 a committee on Uniform Settlement Laws and the Transfer of Dependents of the American Public Welfare Committee gave further consideration to this subject and the conclusion was reached that progress might be made if

settlement laws should be considered as applying only to the relations within the boundaries of each State, between towns, counties, and the State itself, and that reciprocal agreements between States for the interchange of dependent persons, could be more easily accomplished.

Upon request of this committee, the National Conference of Commissioners of Uniform State Laws in 1932 agreed to give further consideration to the subject, and at its Annual Conference held in Los Angeles, California, last July, it was "Resolved that the Act known as the Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act be and the same is hereby adopted and approved as a Uniform Act, and that the Act is now recommended to the legislatures of the various States, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Insular Possessions of the United States for enactment, and that it be reported to the American Bar Association for its approval".

Delegates from thirty-two States and the District of Columbia voted in favor of the adoption of the Act and there were no dissenting votes.

The proposed Act was subsequently approved by the American Bar Association and recommended to the States for adoption.

#### UNIFORM TRANSFER OF DEPENDENTS ACT Prefatory Note

It is needless to mention the difficulties inherent in necessary provisions for the care of dependents. Among the many aspects connected with this problem none is more troublesome than adequate provision for those indigent persons who drift from State to State and seek financial help wherever they may be. In years gone by, the various States have attempted to solve this problem by denying public aid unless a residence had been established within the State or county where the aid has been sought. The local thought on this subject has been so diversified as to make a statutory period of residence in the State a very unsatisfactory basis. By way of illustration, it may be said that nine States have no settlement laws, nine States have a residence requirement of six months or less, twenty-one States one year, and nine States from three to ten years.

In recent years, there has been a great change of sentiment as to the basis upon which the transfer of public dependents by the States should be effected, and experience has demonstrated the wisdom of having legislation passed which will enable each State to confer upon its public welfare officials the right to enter into reciprocal agreements for the interchange of dependents, rather than in attempting to have a uniform settlement law. While such interstate agreements cannot legally be effected without the consent of Congress, no difficulty has ever been experienced in obtaining Congressional consent to legislation of that character.

From a practical standpoint, it has been found in a number of the States that a law authorizing the State officials, subject to the approval of the Attorney General, to enter into reciprocal agreements with corresponding State agencies of other States is the best method yet devised of solving the inherent difficulties of the situation. Hence the following draft of such a law.

AN ACT CONCERNING RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS FOR THE  
INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION AND THE SUPPORT OF POOR AND INDIGENT PERSONS  
AND TO MAKE UNIFORM THE LAW WITH REFERENCE THERETO

Be it enacted, etc.

Section 1. (Reciprocal Agreements). The (Department of Public Welfare), subject to the approval of the Attorney General, is hereby authorized to enter into reciprocal agreements with corresponding State agencies of other States regarding the interstate transportation of poor and indigent persons, and to arrange with the proper officials in this State for the acceptance, transfer, and support of persons receiving public aid in other States in accordance with the terms of such reciprocal agreements; provided that this State shall not nor shall any county or other political subdivision of this State be committed to the support of persons who are not in the opinion of said (Department of Public Welfare) entitled to public support by the laws of this State.

Section 2. (Uniformity of Interpretation). This act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the laws of those States which enact it.

Section 3. (Short Title). This act may be cited as the Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act.

Section 4. (Time of Taking Effect). This shall take effect -----.  
\* \* \* \*

I have with me a form of reciprocal agreement in which are incorporated basis principles which I believe should be established in the interest of uniformity of action as well as for the welfare of dependent persons. Such an agreement can easily be modified by two or more contracting States so as to have it conform to any special conditions, legal or otherwise, which may be deemed necessary.

Four of the New England States enacted a statute of this character in advance of final action taken by the National organizations to which I have referred, and will undoubtedly hold a conference at an early date for the purpose of signing such reciprocal agreements.

As a demonstration of the advantages of reciprocal agreements over a legal settlement basis, I should like to cite a recent case of a husband and wife who fell into distress in a State where they had resided but a short time. The husband had resided in Massachusetts practically all his life, but had no legal settlement. The wife had resided in Massachusetts practically all her life, and had a legal settlement there. Because the husband had no legal settlement, the city wherein the wife had a legal settlement refused to authorize the return of both husband and wife. Under a reciprocal agreement basis of transfer, if, for example, the agreement was on a basis of residence of three years and less than one year's absence, regardless of the legal settlement status, both husband and wife could be returned.

The recommendation of adoption of the principle of reciprocal agreements between States for the transfer of dependent persons, and the enactment by all the States of the "Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act" drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and approved by the American Bar Association and the American Public Welfare Association, I respectfully submit for your consideration. Favorable action by the members of this conference

FORM OF RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT  
AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE OF  
THE STATE OF ..... AND THE DEPARTMENT  
OF PUBLIC WELFARE OF THE STATE OF .....

THIS AGREEMENT, made by and between the Department of Public Welfare of the State of ..... and the Department of Public Welfare of the State of .....

WITNESSETH:

THAT, WHEREAS, the contracting parties are by the laws of their respective States severally authorized and empowered to enter into reciprocal agreements to receive from and return to their respective States, dependent persons, so as to facilitate removal of such persons from each of said States to the other, in proper cases.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED BY and between the parties hereto, as follows, to wit:

- 1 -

The term "non-resident" shall include any poor and indigent person who shall have been continuously absent less than..... from the State wherein he last resided for ..... or more consecutive years. The fact that a person received public or private relief during the said ..... years residence shall not in any manner interrupt said period of residence within the meaning of this agreement nor affect the operation of said agreement.

This provision shall not apply to cases where the dependency of such persons is likely to be of short duration, due to temporary conditions, unless it can be shown that the dependent persons are chronic relief cases.

- 2 -

It is hereby agreed that the authority for transfer shall be granted if the application for transfer is made within the period of absence established in this agreement, even though the agreed period of absence may have elapsed before the actual transfer can be effected; provided, however, that the transfer must be made within a reasonable time.

- 3 -

In all cases arising under paragraph 1 a person may be returned to the State in which he or she has resided for ..... years and such person shall be accepted by said latter State through arrangement with local Boards of Public Welfare, i.e., County, City or Town Boards providing home relief, if necessary, or admission to a proper institution.

Arrangements shall also be made for the reception of the household goods and effects of such person, if desirable.

- 4 -

The expenses of transfer and transportation shall be borne by the State requesting and making the transfer.

- 5 -

In any case arising under paragraph 1, such persons shall not be transferred if such transfer would endanger their health, or the public health.

- 6 -

For the purpose of this agreement, the residence of a married woman shall be considered that of her husband, provided there has been no legal separation; and the residence of a minor shall be considered the same as the residence of the parents, provided, however, that whenever the custody of any such minor has been awarded to either parent by final judgment or decree of any court of competent jurisdiction, the residence of the parent to whom such custody has been awarded shall be deemed the residence of the said minor.

- 7 -

It is generally agreed that the unity of families must be preserved. Any exception to this rule must be by mutual agreement in the individual case.

- 8 -

An accurate and detailed investigation in each case falling under paragraph 1 of this agreement shall be made by both States, the State requesting the transfer to present accurate and detailed personal and residence histories to the State to which such person is to be transferred.

- 9 -

By mutual consent, this agreement may be modified to meet special conditions in any particular case not covered by its terms.

- 10 -

This agreement shall be subject to approval of the Attorney General of each State which is a party thereto, and shall be executed by the officials of the respective Departments of ..... and ..... having jurisdiction over the persons described in paragraph 1, and may be terminated by sixty days notice in writing by either party.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said parties hereto have caused these present to be executed by the duly authorized officials of the respective States.

DATE..... DEPARTMENT OF .....

OF THE STATE OF ..... BY.....

DATE..... APPROVED BY.....

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF .....

DATE..... DEPARTMENT OF .....

OF THE STATE OF ..... BY.....

DATE..... APPROVED BY.....

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF .....

From the Point of View of Public Administration and Finance

WILLIAM J. ELLIS

Commissioner, Department Institutions and Agencies, New Jersey

We are aware of a changing concept concerning our public assistance laws as a result of experiences of the establishment of State and Federal Emergency Relief Administrations. It was in recognition of the fact that poor laws standing on our statute books were inadequate for their purpose, namely, the providing of needed assistance to all those who otherwise would be deprived of minimum essentials of food, shelter and clothing, that the first of the emergency relief laws were adopted in 1931. New York and New Jersey led the movement in this direction, which later became nationwide, and shortly afterward brought the Federal Government to the point of assuming some part of the responsibility and a major share of the financial load.

Thus far we have looked upon these laws merely as emergency legislation and have been thinking and talking about the eventual liquidation of the Emergency Relief Program. Nevertheless, there has been a growing recognition on the part of those administrators, legislators and members of the public most familiar with the extent of the problem, that eventual liquidation of the so-called emergency program really involves acceptance of a major portion of the responsibility on a continuing or more or less permanent basis.

Edith Abbott, in her papers on the pauper laws, published in the March 1934 and December 1935 issues of the Social Service Review, points out that the existing pauper laws with their theory of local responsibility for the settled inhabitants has invoked confusion, both legal and philosophical. The general principle of the old statutes trace back directly to the English Poor Law, which received its greatest impetus and took some persisting form during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. David Adie, the Commissioner of Welfare of New York State, has pointed out that probably the most important function of a group who are trying to make progress in this field is to convince the public generally that Queen Elizabeth is dead.

In achieving such realization, it is insufficient for us to contemplate mere amendment or amelioration of the rigors of local public welfare administration. Our modern civilization calls for acceptance of the principle that our society is no longer parochial in character. A democratic government must extend beyond the confines of its immediate community. We have now to accept as a continuing principle the responsibility of the whole State, and even the whole nation, for the security of the individual citizen.

Therefore, our discussion here of the problem of the transient person who finds himself in need must be colored by our consciousness of the fact that the traditional concept of the poor law is really dead. What we can accomplish in this conference will be of limited value, insofar as we may fail to arrive at a conviction that the tax base and administrative base for public assistance must be broader than the community in which a citizen resides. Only by building up strong administration of public welfare and providing for adequate support from State and from Federal revenues, as well as from local contributions, will we arrive at a worthwhile goal.

The absurdity of local administration of public assistance is well illustrated by the fact that in a small State, such as New Jersey, we have no less

than five hundred sixty-three local administrations of public assistance. Naturally, there have been almost as many ideas as to what constitutes a proper program of relief-giving. In the State of Ohio there has been no less than 1,500 local governments, all responsible for some form of relief. How many different assistance-giving authorities there are in this country, and how many different standards of relief-giving, no one in the world knows. The whole system is unorganized, uncentralized, inefficient and cruel. The anti-social effect is enormous.

Fortunately, we are temporarily exempt, to a large degree, from many of the consequences of this welter of unstandardized relief administrations because of the State and Federal programs now called temporary which are in existence. It is unthinkable to many of us that we will ever return to the old regime.

We can no longer afford to spend time and energy in quarrels between jurisdictions as to whether an individual should be relieved to the extent of his necessities by County A or County B, or Township X, or City Y. There must be a housecleaning of our statutes and court opinions and a reconstruction of the entire structure of security legislation. Nothing else will satisfy the requirements of our modern industrialized society.

It seems that a few guideposts might help in our consideration of some practical administrative aspects of interstate cooperation in respect to the unsettled and needy citizen.

First, as a practical essential, it is necessary to have State responsibility for dealing with the unsettled person. Obviously, it is impossible for there to be any interstate cooperation so long as the theory of complete local responsibility for the cost and administration of poor relief is adhered to. It is necessary, therefore, that any plan drawn up to deal with transiency start from the premise that the efforts of local public welfare agencies within any given State shall be coordinated fully with a State public welfare department, and that the latter shall be supplied with sufficient power and money to do what is necessary in behalf of transients.

Second, the State agency ought to be equipped to undertake the resettlement of all those persons who fall within its jurisdiction. In other words, arrangements should be made under which, when an unsettled person goes to any public or private agency seeking help, he may be routed to a transient shelter and thence to other centers as may be required where he can be cared for, pending development of a plan for his future welfare.

It seems obvious that these activities should not be limited to interstate arrangements to transfer indigents from one jurisdiction to another. The decision as to what ought to be done has been well described and discussed here today, with the many phases on the case work considerations and the welfare of the individual.

The third major reference point of our thinking should have to do with the relationship of the Federal Government to this undertaking. If the United States were truly a national government, rather than a Federal one, the solution of the problem of the transient would be much easier to work out, than is in fact the case. Being a Federal government in nature, we have forty-eight separate commonwealths, each having complete jurisdiction over its citizens and each defining legal settlement and the benefits of legal settlement in its own way.

It seems impracticable to abolish legal settlement at this time. A State probably ought to require some term of preliminary residence before it opens all its privileges to a newcomer, awarding him the rights of suffrage and whatever rights to public assistance may be vested in the voter and his family. So long as full citizenship rights are withheld from an individual or family group, pending completion of some standard recognized period of residence, there will necessarily be a group of United States residents who do not have the qualifications and benefits of State or local settlement.

If we succeed, as a result of this conference, in standardizing the definition of legal settlement as between the various States and localities, and broadly standardize the public relief benefits which may be open to the settled person, there will still remain a large class who lack qualifications to receive such benefits. These constitute a class for whom there is at present, little, if any, provision in the public welfare laws; nor is there much hope that States and localities can be persuaded to assume their care on any adequate basis unless the Federal Government can see its way clear to assist substantially with the cost.

The Florida Transient Coordinating Committee in its report dated February 1936, recommended that a system of Federal grants in aid, based on equal contributions by the State, be provided for by Congress. The Florida report, reviewed today, suggests that Federal grants to the States be limited to not more than \$12 a month per person cared for.

It seems to me that we may well agree with the statement by the Florida Commission on Transiency that "transiency is in many respects nothing but an amplification of the perfectly normal process by which unemployed persons endeavor to secure employment". This being the case, it seems to me that we can readily agree that repressive measures are undesirable. At the same time it is equally undesirable to put public money into a program which promotes aimless wandering.

A constructive approach, therefore, would seem to require that any joint State-Federal Transient Program should include a matching basis for providing the necessary funds. It should require that persons aided be required to perform public work reasonably compatible with their physical and mental needs and conditions; that one State act for another in caring for the needs of an applicant in accordance with the rehabilitation plan developed for that individual and that transportation from one State to another be undertaken only when full consent to such transportation shall have been obtained from the State agency administering the transient law in the State of destination.

In order to focus the thinking of this group on those considerations, and to bring before you the study which has antedated this conference, I wish you would turn in your booklet to Chapter IV of this program. This material has been developed by the committee on which Doctor Potter served, as the local assistant to Judge Hartshorne, and she and her associates on that group have tried to set forth ten problems in all the specific subjects for consideration here that go beyond this immediate question of making known to the national government, the President and the Congress, the immediate needs in respect to transiency. I would like to review with you very briefly these problems in the hope that the later discussion, perhaps, in this session or in the evening or morning session, might invite discussion, expressions of points of view from the floor and from the group as a whole.

First - "Shall we try to evolve a uniform settlement law or only a uniform relief law?"

You will note the comment on that subject from the Commission on Uniform State Laws.

Second - "Should such a uniform relief law be general in phraseology or specific?" This contains further observations from the Commission on Uniform State Laws. The New Hampshire law, which is cited, is general in its terms and limited in its scope.

Third - "What should be the principles of such a general uniform relief law? Does this admittedly simple method actually contribute enough toward the solution of the problem of unsettled persons?"

This is the method which makes a simple agreement as between the States and the answer to that, offered by this Committee, is "no", because in most States the out-door relief is a charge against county or municipal funds rather than State funds.

Fourth - "How might existing laws be amended to secure local settlement when State settlement is admitted?"

I wish someone from the New York group would answer a question which I have not been able to get answered from anybody, including some representatives of New York, to whom I spoke this morning. If you will notice at the end of that first paragraph, it points out that apparently New York provides for the recognition of the so-called "State Poor" as apart from the local poor. Apparently they are a charge against State funds. Does anyone from the New York delegation know whether the Department of Social Welfare secures a direct State appropriation for the care of the so-called "State Poor"? Is there such a provision?

NEW YORK DELEGATE: The State Department of Social Welfare is given an appropriation for the care of the State Poor in the State of New York.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: Is it adequate?

NEW YORK DELEGATE: It has not been adequate because each year we have had to run it at a deficiency and the counties who in the first place put in the relief were later reimbursed.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: Is there any other State here that has such a provision?

CONNECTICUT DELEGATE: Connecticut has.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: Do you have funds appropriated to your State department?

CONNECTICUT DELEGATE: Yes, with the same arrangement of deficiency - the reimbursement basis to the local municipalities.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: We have a provision of that kind relating to the blind only, in this State. That is the only group that is recognized as State Poor.

CONNECTICUT DELEGATE: State Poor in Connecticut would be a United States citizen without settlement in Connecticut and an alien may not get settlement in Connecticut, and, therefore, becomes a State Poor.

MASSACHUSETTS DELEGATE: Massachusetts has had an appropriation for reimbursing cities and towns, but unfortunately some cities and towns do not always give the amount we would like to have them give, but State funds will aid, if the local unit will go through on it.

MAINE DELEGATE: The State of Maine has a similar provision. Maine reimburses the cities and towns, but the counties of the State have no responsibility for the support of poor.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS:

Fifth - "Should a poor person be allowed to acquire settlement while receiving relief?"

Practically all laws forbid this, and it is doubtless a wise provision as regards acquiring State settlement, and then there is some other discussion on that point.

Sixth - "Is it feasible to attempt to secure uniform State settlement laws?"

Mr. Hoehler, this morning, undertook to answer that question. I understand the Resolutions Committee will have before it a resolution on that subject.

MR. HOEHLER: I think we have received it.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: Do you have a resolution that proposes a uniform one-year settlement law? Is there anybody willing to see that the Committee gets it? Mr. Hoehler's resolution this morning provides that a uniform settlement law be drafted, but does not specify any time.

Seventh - "Should the period of absence from a State before losing settlement be the same as the period of residence required to gain a settlement?"

In New Jersey we have a five-year settlement law. It takes five years to gain a settlement, but only one year to lose it. That raises some complications.

Eighth - "If no general agreement is reached on a uniform settlement law, should some sort of reciprocal agreement be attempted?"

Mr. Goodhue has advocated that in his work as Chairman of the Special Committee that has been operating for the last five years on that subject. How many States represented here already have in effect reciprocal agreements with other States? Will you kindly raise your hands? Doctor Potter, you can raise your hand for New Jersey.

(Response by New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania)

Ninth - "If all the measures suggested above were put into effect, would a legal settlement be provided for all persons?"

The answer is obviously "No".

Tenth - "Have all interstate dependency problems now been solved?"

The answer to that is "No"; that a continuing committee be selected before this conference adjourns, in order to give further consideration to that matter.

I do not know whether Mr. Jacobs has cleared up the problem in relation to this interstate compact method of solving some of these difficulties. Have you checked up on your information regarding the Ashurst-Summers law.

MR. JACOBS: No.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: I was talking to Mr. Gallagher about it after your address and he is of the same opinion that I am; that the Ashurst-Summers law is broad enough to give the assent of Congress in advance to pacts that may be worked out between the States on subjects other than crime, and I think one of his legal friends suggested to him that it would not be very difficult to write the word "crime" in such a pact, anyway use it as a preventive measure.

It seems to me that this Chapter IV of this document that we all have proposes some of the violent questions that we are to have before us. I do not want to usurp the function of the Chairman of this meeting, but I feel that it might be very well worth while, it would seem to me, if there should be some further discussion of the more pertinent aspects of that particular section of the report.

DOCTOR POTTER: Commissioner Ellis gave me credit for having formulated Chapter IV, and the credit ought to go to Mrs. Streeter.

FLORIDA DELEGATE: I would like to ask the gentleman from New Jersey a question. Commenting on the Florida report, you referred to the proposal for \$12 a month on Federal grants. I didn't quite gain from your remarks whether you favored that provision or whether you disapproved of it.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: I did not make any observation. It didn't seem to me that it would meet the situation here, certainly not for a family group.

FLORIDA DELEGATE: I would like to add, which comes from long experience at juggling Federal grants over a two-year period, that the provision of \$12 refers to a person and not to a case, and refers to a number of persons handled in a month, and I think when you construe it that way, it would make it not nearly as small or inadequate as might appear at first.

MR. BYRNES: The Chair now recognizes the Honorable Harold C. Ostertag of New York.

MR. OSTERTAG: The Resolutions Committee is prepared to make a report. In presenting the resolutions, we will request that you place at the top of the resolution the name of the introducer and the State you represent. The Resolutions Committee reports favorably the following resolutions for the consideration of the conference:

(The resolution presented here was later amended and as finally amended is given in full on page 9Q.)

MR. OSTERTAG: I move the adoption of the resolution.

(Motion duly seconded)

NEW YORK DELEGATE: May I ask if it is the plan of the conference to have a permanent committee to press this continuously beyond presenting it to the President and committees. If not, I think this might be changed from a "delegation" to a committee to press it before Congress, and continue to press it.

MR. OSTERTAG: In answer to that question, may I state that the conference will undoubtedly consider further extension. This is what we thought of for immediate consideration of the conference. There will undoubtedly be additional resolutions to cover the point you are trying to add.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: In answer to the question, may I state that I am wondering if the last "resolved" does not answer it. "These resolutions be presented by an official delegation from this body to the President of the United States etc." The change I was suggesting is that that be made a "committee" instead of a delegation, which would be continuously pressing the question, even after it was presented as here indicated.

MR. OSTERTAG: You mean to continue the committee?

NEW YORK DELEGATE: Yes, if there is no other plan of the conference for continuous agitation of this resolution, I would suggest that change. If there is, I would vote "yes" on this question.

MR. BYRNES: I would be of the opinion that there will be a resolution later which would request that the States represented here contact their Congressmen and Senators to further this resolution.

PENNSYLVANIA DELEGATE: I think, Mr. Chairman, that the group from Pennsylvania would favor the resolution with this one exception, possibly: "We call upon the Government of the United States, through an appropriate permanent branch of the

public service etc." It may be that some States who have not yet the security legislation adequate for the permanent public assistance program might want to use the existing facilities of a temporary organization, such as the Relief Administration, to carry this out, if we got the money. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the group would favor the resolution if this were inserted: "through such temporary or permanent branches of the public service to enable etc."

MR. BYRNES: Do you wish to offer an amendment to the resolution?

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: I would like to offer this suggestion: that both points would be fully covered by striking out the word "permanent" --- "through an appropriate branch of the public service". I second the motion to strike out the word "permanent".

MR. BYRNES: All those in favor of the resolution as amended signify by saying "aye".

(Roll Call revealed unanimous approval of the resolution.)

PENNSYLVANIA DELEGATE: May I suggest that the word "permanent" be stricken out at all points where it appears throughout the resolution.

MR. BYRNES: By unanimous vote the resolution is adopted.

MR. OSTERTAG: It seems only fitting and proper that in view of our recent act in the adoption of this resolution that it should be followed up, and I believe that perhaps Judge Hartshorne may have something in mind or may have given some consideration as to just how this resolution should be followed up. I would suggest that Judge Hartshorne discuss the plan.

MR. BYRNES: The Chair recognizes Judge Hartshorne.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: We got wind of the fact that this resolution was coming through and in discussing the practical way of making it effective it was felt that this conference here, representing, with possibly two exceptions, the official viewpoint of the twenty or so States that are here, should carry considerable weight with the Federal Government of itself, and yet that if the Federal Government itself, through its Congress, were to take action, that would have even greater weight with the administration in whose power lies the allocation of funds to transient relief. Therefore, the suggestion is that this conference, through their respective State delegates, wire their Congressional Representatives, asking them to attend a conference at the Hotel Mayflower at 2:30 on Sunday, to present the unanimous viewpoint of this conference to those Congressional Representatives to request an audience with the President and Mr. Hopkins and whomever else is necessary, because the administration will undoubtedly consider more forcibly the request of the Legislative Branch of the

government than it will a request coming from individual States. Now, that may or may not be a sound plan, but that is the simple suggestion that was made when it was learned that this resolution was about to emanate. There is being distributed to you now a form of wire to that effect. We can see to its speedy sending, if you desire to adopt that program.

I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that I shouldn't stop with just talking. I should move that the conference endeavor to effectuate this resolution, as just stated.

(Motion duly seconded)

MR. BYRNES: A motion has been duly made and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

WEST VIRGINIA DELEGATE: As I understand it, the plan is to call on our Congressional delegations at the Mayflower on our return from this conference. Do I understand the resolution, or rather the motion, correctly? Speaking as an individual, I came to this conference representing the Governor of West Virginia, at his special request, but I question seriously the advisability of my asking the Congressional Delegation from West Virginia to do certain things without his permission and approval to back me.

PENNSYLVANIA DELEGATE: It has been suggested by our delegates that the motion be tabled until tomorrow morning or late tonight, because we would like to contact the officials back home, just as Brother Allen from West Virginia has said. We believe that we should have the boys back home give their approval on it, even though we are clothes with full authority to act.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: I second the motion to table.

MR. BYRNES: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the resolution lay over until tomorrow morning. All those in favor please signify by saying "Aye".

(Unanimously approved)

MR. BYRNES: I have been requested to remind the members of this conference of the dinner at seven o'clock sharp tonight, at the Hildebrecht Hotel - informal. I request that all those who attend be present at seven o'clock.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: May I call your attention to the fact that at the dinner there will be no speeches but every State will be given an opportunity to express its viewpoint on these various aspects of the situation, which have been treated of more at length today.

THE INTERSTATE CONFERENCE  
ON  
TRANSIENTS AND SETTLEMENT LAWS

DINNER SESSION

PRESIDING: HON. REEVE SCHLEY  
Chairman, Relief Council  
New Jersey Emergency Relief Administration

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we are indebted in more ways than one to the Committee on Arrangements and particularly perhaps for the opportunity we have had tonight to get away from some of the heavier considerations which you have been taking up during the afternoon. Along that line of thought, the committee assigned as the presiding officer tonight some one who knew less than anybody here about the subject to be discussed and with complete unanimity they decided on me, and that is why I am here. As a possible excuse for my being here may I say that about three months ago, having led a very active business life, I was appointed to assume responsibility for relief work, something which I knew nothing about and from the present status of the situation in New Jersey, it doesn't look as though my field of activity in that particular connection would last very much longer.

Judge Hartshorne has told me that I am not supposed to do anything tonight except to remember which states are east of the Mississippi, and I will try to do that. However, it does not require a greater knowledge on my part of the subject which you discussed today to extend to you all, on behalf of the State of New Jersey, a welcome here and to tell you all of the pleasure which we have that you are breaking bread with us tonight.

Judge Hartshorne has a message which he would like to speak to you about for just a moment.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: Today, we passed a resolution unanimously and then laid it on the table for good and sufficient reasons, but if it is taken from the table tomorrow it will require rather prompt action over the wire. The question is exactly when that action should be taken. In other words, when it would be best for us to arrange with our Congressmen to meet in Washington. That largely depends upon the convenience of those present as well as the convenience of the Congressmen. You are a little more accessible. Could we, therefore, have a show of hands as to how many of you will be able to meet with the Congressmen if that meeting occurs at 2:30 Sunday in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington? Will all those who can then meet please raise their hands? A large number of five. All those who can meet on Monday please raise their hands-- if the meeting occurs at 2:30 on Monday. The large number of one. If that is the case I think we will have to change our signals very radically because I think that but five going down as a delegation from this conference to meet the two hundred or so Congressmen from the states east of the Mississippi would not be the thing to do at all.

COMMISSIONER ELLIS: How many, representing the states here, feel that they could get the Governor of their state to wire to their representatives in the Congress urging approval on their part of the action which we present in our resolution? (There was no certainty that the Governor of the states represented would be willing to take prompt action following up that resolution. Four delegates believed that a resolution could be gotten through the legislature of their state in respect to this matter.)

THE CHAIRMAN: The first delegate we will call upon will represent Washington, D. C., Mr. Street.

D.C., MR. STREET: The transient has disappeared. Those who were able-bodied were absorbed into transient camps and into a WPA project building a re-settlement village. There is no resource whatever for transients worth mentioning. They are being cared for by missions, the Traveler's Aid and organizations having inadequate funds to do more than average for a few of them. The Department of Public Welfare has a small lodging house and that is all. Washington is in bad shape; it is worse than it was when the Federal Transient program was begun.

CONNECTICUT, MISS LITTLE: In Connecticut, theoretically, the State has the responsibility for the care of transients. Persons without settlement within the State under the law are "State charges;" practically, local municipality must accept the transient before charging to the State, and it is on a reimbursement basis that they are compensated. The transient is not being accepted. The transients are more and more in the care of the police and the "flop houses" and to some extent in the care of missions in the larger places. In some of the smaller towns that have a reputation -- for one place, Richfield, gives the transient a bath and they still have quite a few transients, strange as it may seem.

With regard to the future, there are three agencies in the State at the present time considering the change of relief laws. There is a Commission to study, and revise the settlement laws; there is another Commission on the Reorganization of State Government whose recommendations will affect some of the present State departments and will affect relief and to the extent that it affects relief would include transient relief also. Also the Emergency Relief Commission of which I am secretary will make a report, and in connection with that report will make certain recommendations regarding relief including care of transients using some of the funds left at the end of the transient program. We requested it; and this is now in operation. Miss Coughlin, one of the three representatives here from Connecticut, in charge of that work could give more definite details; however, the purpose of that study is to ascertain the effect of the withdrawal of Federal transient service, what facilities are now in existence; who are the transients; where are they coming from and where are they going? Our conclusions are that we have a serious problem, which cannot be considered apart from the local problems of relief. We are convinced that the conditions as they now exist represent very serious health hazards due to the present method of handling and we believe that interstate agreements will be of no practical value unless we have Federal backing with Federal funds available.

DELAWARE, MRS. WILLIAMS: When it became apparent that transient funds from the Federal Government would cease, it was decided that possibly the best plan would be to put the transient on WPA, so before November 30, 1935, all unat-

tached transient men were placed to work through the WPA. We had only five persons who were unemployed and who could not receive work. A private agency then began to study the situation. We have sponsored a series of movements, the first brought together twenty-eight representative agencies, some private and public, State and local agencies. That committee appointed a small committee of seven representing different phases of social work to make more minute study and report back to the large committee. A census had been taken from February 4 to 17 inclusive to see how many cases (eliminating duplicates) of unattached transients and family heads came into the cities and applied to the different agencies. During that period we found that there were 671, which, if calculated for the month, would equal the number who would come in and apply for aid during the Federal transient program. We plan, if it is at all possible, to have funds made available for a central intake bureau for transients to delegate responsibility to the various local agencies in care of transients, until such time as the Federal government may see its way clear to grant money to the State. I believe that is all I can say at the moment. Five agencies are now assuming responsibility for the major part of this work.

ILLINOIS: Illinois is rather divided in its responsibility. Mr. Sands, who has served as State Director of Transients and Mr. Hull serving in the City of Chicago, I think either one or both will report.

MR. SANDS: When the order came that we were to end the transient service, some time ago, meetings were held of committees of social agencies. Protests were sent to Washington and then we tried to meet the situation. A report was made to the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission on or before November first that there would be no further money for transient work. The problem was further complicated in Illinois by the fact that it seemed probable that a strict interpretation of the law which created the commission and which gave it power of administering relief would make it illegal for the Commission to administer relief to transients since the law stated that the function of the Commission was to administer relief to indigent residents of the State of Illinois.

When that matter was brought before the Commission, one gentleman who had been very vicious in his disapproval of the program during the previous two years said, "Well, law or no law, these are human beings and they must be taken care of. We will not request an opinion from the Attorney-General: we will just go ahead and do it." So bulletins were sent out authorizing the county administrators throughout the State to extend relief to transients on a case work basis and it would be hard to know just how effective that has been.

In Chicago where there is a set up with good case workers well organized the transient families were taken over by the Family Service. The men were transferred to WPA or to the work camp and the Chicago Shelter Division provides one or two night services for transients on the road who are coming in.

The picture in the rest of the State isn't quite so cheerful. It is true that the administrators are authorized to give relief to transients but it is also true that they hold their jobs by satisfying their county committee composed of local residents, who have to listen to what is said in each locality when a new and indigent family is added to the population with the result that a great deal of "passing on" is occurring and a great deal of

medical work is not being done. We are going to pay for that in the next twenty years on our tax bill.

During the very cold weather a month or so ago a man was found on the road in the northern part of the State trying to walk on feet which had been frozen four days before. He was taken to the hospital and his feet were amputated. We are farther ahead than we were in 1931 and 1932 because there is some sentiment for transients; we are considering them as human beings instead of bums and we are giving some care, but we have gone back a long ways since November.

MAINE, MR. LEADBETTER: The transient situation in Maine is very similar to that of other states. The responsibility for taking care of the personal needs rests on the place where they may be found. We still use the word pauper in our statutes about transients. Of course, there are a great many transients who want a night's lodging or meals or a pair of shoes or something of that sort. The State is not called on to reimburse the towns. In larger places, as in cities where they have a police force and police stations, the average single transient, that is, a single man without family, usually calls upon the police and they give him shelter in the police station and something to eat and then they go on to where they want. We are not troubled very much with transient families in the State of Maine but we do have a great many single men who are simply going from place to place. As a rule, they don't want a boarding place or anything of that kind, they simply want someone to take care of their immediate needs; they prefer to keep on traveling.

One day last week three men came into the State House. They were on their way from Portland. They said they came down in the train. Having had nothing to eat that day, I sent them downtown to get some dinner. They said they were on their way to Bangor. I told them they were foolish to go there because I knew there were a great many unemployed men in Bangor, but they went there. That is a fair example of the State's transients.

In 1933 when the Government took over the care of transients, three transient camps were established in the State of Maine, two in the town of Gray which is in the southern part of Maine. One of those camps has since been closed up and the other one is closed now. I think there were about 125 men in them.

Those who care to can go to work on what is known as the "Water Project." Some of the others who don't care to go that way to work can be transferred to WPA projects. I presume out of 125 who are there now perhaps fifteen or twenty may be unable to work and they will be turned over as "State paupers" and cared for. Of course, we shall make some investigation and if we find that any of them have settlements in other states we will endeavor to send them home, but in all probability the great majority of them have not acquired any settlements. One other point that may be of interest to some of the delegates: In the State of Maine the counties have no responsibility in any matters pertaining to the care of paupers. The cities and towns take care of all cases where there is a pauper.

MASSACHUSETTS, MR. GOODHUE: I have no official relationship with the transient service. I attended some conferences last week with Mr. Kilpatrick and I am glad to tell you exactly how our situation now is. The transient service at the present time is in the division of operations of the WPA. In Massachusetts

there were seven points of registration established in seven of our largest cities in different sections of the State and there were four camps or divisions for housing facilities for transients in three towns. The capacity of these four camps was 880 and there are at the present time 615 unattached persons in our camps.

In the town of Warwick up in the Berkshires the capacity of that camp was 210. There are at present 150 unattached persons and the number of registered voters in that town, according to the 1934 registration, was 206.

Now the orders from the State Administrator are, within the last ten days, that the camp may be dissolved and those persons removed to the two larger camps. Under our law in Massachusetts, ordinarily the person needing aid receives the aid from the town on which he calls in distress and that is a pretty tough "break" for the town of Warwick. If they suggested that some individual might take over a camp like the Warwick camp on a profit basis on their own account and use these men and these men have provided for their own maintenance, there is a suggestion that may seem unfair.

We have quite a large project in establishing a National Guard camp but there might be a possibility of taking all these 615 men in the present camps down there and having them work on that project, but, of course, the time will come later when these 615 people would be in a position where they might call in distress on some small adjoining town.

From my point of view it is an unfair thing for the government to start a transient service and then to tell us that eventually we are going to have a lot of people that we don't know what to do with. In addition to those four camps we have a large number of individual families that were in contract housing. That, I think, is the present situation in Massachusetts. We are a little at sea as to what the final outcome will be.

MARYLAND, MISS JUDGE: In Baltimore there has been no State-wide study made but as it was realized that there is to be no escape and that all new intake ceases the Committee on Transients of the Council of Social Agencies immediately called not only the members of that committee but a large number of prominent laymen and women into consultation as we believed that Baltimore faced a serious emergency.

It was decided at the very first meeting of that group that they would have to go to the Mayor and ask for an extension of that program in the Department of Public Welfare. Five prominent laymen and a few social workers went to the Mayor and he said, "We cannot be rushed into it. A committee should make a complete study and survey of the situation, report its findings and make recommendations." That survey was immediately begun and thirty-two social agencies, public and private--in social agencies, we include missions--and every sort of group or institution which might have any contact whatever with transients of any sort or description, and eight police stations were included.

At the end of two weeks it was proven that during that period as many new transients had made application in Baltimore as had made any application in any similar period during the Federal Transient Program.

The committee believed, after that survey was finished, that an emergency program for transients would be necessary and it undertook to make recommendations for such a program, thinking that it should be cared for in the Department of Public Welfare and even went into a very large degree of specifications and standards but before these recommendations were presented, after due consideration by all members of the committee representing both public and private agencies, the director of the State Emergency Relief, and laymen who were very wise and very sympathetic, it was decided that it would be unwise to put on any emergency program under the Department of Welfare of Baltimore City because we would certainly have a very much harder time to induce the Federal Government to believe we needed Federal assistance for the program; so for a while that emergency program was laid aside and the committee finished its work and made its recommendations.

We believe that we must have grants in aid from the Federal Government to be matched by the State and further than that we believe that whether we get the grants or whether we don't, whatever part the State plays in a program for transients must be tied up with the regular State program for relief and welfare. As our State Legislature is now in emergency session all of this undoubtedly will be considered, and maybe Mr. Greenstein will know something about it; but right now we know nothing about what the State of Maryland is going to do but we are awaiting the action of the Federal Government

In the meantime, private agencies are standing by in a gentleman's agreement as to the care of families, nothing written down. There are a very few women transients. Young people have never been a problem because they remained the problem of the Traveler's Aid Society. It is the great army of the unattached needing care for which we must have a program.

FLORIDA, MR. REDKEY: Some of you probably know the transient problem in Florida is seasonal so that the closing order in September came at what we might call "low tide". It was possible, because of that, for all of our employable transients to be immediately absorbed in local WPA projects. We still have something like 175 unemployable persons for whom we are still caring from our final grant from FERA. The tragedy of the thing in Florida right now is that since the program was closed down we are having just as many transients, new ones drifting into the State this winter, as we ever had before.

I think you are already familiar with the work of the Florida Committee. I would like to call attention to just one other thing that we think we are going to have a lot of fun with. We sat down to see if we could figure out just how many dollars it is costing the State of Florida, that is, the mere existence of the transient problem. We are already started and when we get through we think we will have a potent argument for some kind of real State participation. As the thing stands now, I think we can say, now as far in the future as we can care to look, there will be transient chaos in Florida until we have some kind of Federal aid.

MICHIGAN, MR. SCHAFER: Fortunately for Michigan we have the use of the State funds for the care of transients and homeless. The load in Michigan has varied from the peak in the number of approximately 11,700 cases which approximated the beginning of the automobile industry. The load at the present time is about 2,875 cases.

Michigan has approximately two residents from other states in its State as compared with three of its residents elsewhere. The load today is about a ratio of seventy per cent unemployable and thirty per cent employable.

Michigan has tried through the leadership of the State Emergency Relief Administration as one definite department to set up and establish definite lines of responsibility for the care of transient and local homeless. The transient bureaus in the State are definitely charged with the care of transient and local homeless both State and Federal. They make no discrimination in intake between State and Federal. The State Relief Commission has authorized funds for the care of transient and local homeless and by that method attempted to assume responsibility and prevent a passing or migrating of undomiciled persons. You notice we use the terms domiciled and undomiciled. The domiciled persons are cared for in the various counties in the State.

In each county in the State there has been chosen one person who shall be directly responsible for the care and intake of all persons coming into that county. The domiciled, non-residents are the responsibility for the County Emergency Relief Administration. They receive their funds for that group from the State Emergency Relief Administration. We receive our funds from the State sales tax which is a three per cent sales tax on all transactions. The funds are given to the State Emergency Relief Administration to the amount of nine million dollars a year of which at the present time the transient division is receiving about thirty-five thousand per month. This is, of course, quite inadequate, but we are trying to make it go and so far have not had to curtail any real services.

What the future holds is pretty hard to see. As long as this present act and appropriation is in effect we can reasonably expect to continue our present program. At the present time the Michigan Council of Social Workers is trying to have passed in the Legislature a bill unifying the agencies responsible for the poor persons in the State. In the State of Michigan there are two agencies responsible for the care of relief. It is hoped that an agency will be established on a non-partisan and non-political basis. However, as long as the present law is in effect we will be able to go along in our present status.

I would like to request the chairman that in this plan which has been proposed, rather than having a delegation visit the Congressmen, that this conference write a resolution sending it to the Governors of each of the States rather than having the delegate here take it. I think there is more prestige connected with this conference than any of us individually might have and I think it will do a great deal more. We might ask, in that resolution, that the Governor present the proposition to the Congressmen from the various states. I think it would be more effective.

NORTH CAROLINA, MR. T. L. GRIER: The North Carolina Emergency Relief Administration has been integrated into the State Board of Charity and Public Welfare. The county superintendents of public welfare have instructions to assume the responsibility of service to the transients. I can't say just how well they are doing their jobs because their funds are very limited. The WPA program has absorbed the employable transients. We have in the State at present approximately 175 unemployable transients. That is our greatest problem right now. What the future holds for them I can't say.

NEW HAMPSHIRE, MRS. ABBEY WILDER: As the Federal Administrator of Emergency Relief in New Hampshire, I was concerned with the transient activity when we had a Federal program. Although we have registered these transients we have found it impossible to place them on WPA projects for the local communities are compelled to furnish funds; therefore, we now have some two hundred employable transients in what are called work camps. We do not know how long the work camp projects will continue. It is hard to tell what will happen to those transients unless the Federal Government will make funds available. We have only twenty-six unemployables and we are trying to take care of those with the unexpended balance of our Federal funds.

NEW JERSEY, MRS. STREETER: The experience of the Moore family, involving problems of legal settlement as between New Jersey and Florida, the local communities in these states responsible for the welfare of these people, etc., was entertainingly related by Mrs. Streeter and served to emphasize the need of sound social policy in handling such people and interstate agreements covering the transaction.

NEW YORK, MR. COTTON: According to the WPA rules and regulations there are two states within the borders of New York State. You remember New York City is the forty-ninth state so far as WPA is concerned, so I am asking your indulgence in order to cover two states at once.

In New York State the operations have been under the ERA which is a temporary emergency relief administration and the transient division in that administration has been very keen about work for employable transients, consequently we have developed quite a camp program. As a matter of fact, about the time the transient division began thinking of shutting up we began to expand. We found that the transients in camps, especially in parks and forest reserves, were not only excellent for doing work, but were a great benefit wherever there were any fires to be put out or any floods and as you know New York State had, last summer, the greatest flood in years and our camps being right in the middle of the area were able to pitch in and do a lot of work so that by the time the ball rolled around we had extended ourselves until we had twenty-two operating camps in New York State.

Another thing that happened is, that right after the order to close, came the agitation for a committee in New York State and instead of having a committee we decided to have a study, so the Governor's Commission which had already studied the relief administration began studying the transient division just before it began to liquidate, so we have an excellent report of an organization which is going out of business; but it is an excellent report and has some very good recommendations and was published. I hope you will be able to get a copy and profit by the suggestions made in it.

The work for the transients falls into three divisions: The work which the private agencies have done, the work which has been done by the transient division, and the work of the Department of Social Welfare. I am going to ask about three people to cover these three different divisions giving them two minutes each. We will start off with Miss Buffington. Will you report on the private agencies in New York City and something about them?

MISS BUFFINGTON: I would say that New York City was worse off than it was in 1930 because we have more people to take care of than then, and we were in such a chaotic condition when the transient program went out. I think we had about

8,000 unattached transient men. About four thousand of them went over on WPA and we gradually eliminated some of the others and some of them dropped out. When the last of the money we could spend on unattached men ran out we had 125. They were referred down to the municipal lodging house. Later on three hundred showed up in various places in the City and the others we haven't traced.

We have in New York City now eight thousand unattached persons being taken care of in shelters, about 24,000 being taken care of in domiciles and about 625 families which are still being taken care of with a combination of State and local funds. The local Emergency Relief Organization carefully husbanded itself so we are still taking care of 625 and the majority of those either have no residence anywhere or else they have a residence, an actual, legal residence in the City but have not been long enough in the state to come under the State Emergency Relief Administration. They have to live two years in the State and they must be residents in the City one year. The City of New York was hedged about with all sorts of restrictions. It could not give relief to any family or any person in their own home. They can only give them relief in shelters and so we are restricted to the use of shelters to take care of our transient persons. We can, however, turn over to the State Department of Social Welfare for care those persons who have been less than sixty days in any welfare district of the State, so there is that resource. There is nothing else except what private agencies can do and for the last five years they have been taking care of five per cent of the load anyway and they have more applications than they can handle and some very desperate cases. We have no central registration bureaus anywhere and we are feeling the lack of statistical information very much. The Welfare Council is now trying to set up some sort of system whereby we can get some statistics for the next two months.

Mr. Cotton: I will now introduce Mr. Leighty, my assistant.

MR. LEIGHTY: As the problems created by the liquidation of the transient program are not much different in New York State than other states except perhaps more serious, I will confine my remarks to the WPA camp program. It may have some bearing upon our future plans.

In New York State, with the creation of the Works Progress Administration, the camps were organized under a separate division. As you probably know the Works Progress Administration was divided into two districts. The divisional camp management is a district but it covers all other districts. In other words, our present operation of the camp program is very similar to what it was under ERA central control, central direction, and central management. We have fourteen camps in operation now with something like 2500 men. This has given us a greater opportunity of studying the results of the paid work program with unattached men and the effect upon the men is quite remarkable. They are saving the money, outside of the first spree on their first pay day. They are really saving it, putting it in a bank, buying clothing, getting ready to go out and look for a job. The camp program is not stopping them. I mean, they are not necessarily staying in camp. They get two or three months pay, a little nest egg, and they start out on their own looking for a job. I think that a camp program such as that with really constructive work projects is very essential to any future program of transients.

MR. COTTON: I would like to mention one or two things in the transient division, one of them now closed, and that is a project which we had with a select group of white collar men congregated in shelters in New York City and there we did some special case work and counselling and helping in the way of getting into private work such as is usual for white collar men. That was quite successful. They registered about fifty per cent success in the placement of men who were sent there specially selected.

Then there is Hardwick Academy which we are running as a camp school for the transients. It is near Cooperstown, an old academy which we took over. The boys there were doing very well in their studies, doing some work, but mostly study. The best men were taken into our camps as assistants, those who had clerical courses in school. It has been a very interesting experiment and has been carried on under WPA as a camp school, the men working one day and studying the next. They are giving about half as much time as regular WPA men to to their work. We now have another aspect of the work, sending men back to other states and all centralized in the Department of Social Welfare. I am going to ask Mr. Haskell Jacobs, who is deputy commissioner of the Department of Social Welfare of the State of New York, to give you some of the aspects of our program along that line.

MR. HASKELL JACOBS: Under the provisions of the public welfare law, dependent families and individuals are cared for in the localities where found in need. As Miss Buffington has already explained, the State is responsible for the care and support of those who had not resided for sixty days in any county within the year preceding application for relief, and without settlement in the State of New York. The counties are responsible for the care and support of those who are not State poor without settlement. The commissions on public welfare throughout the State refer the "State poor", non-resident cases to the State Department of Social Welfare in order that it may be determined whether the individual or family should be removed from the State of New York or other disposition made. Each and every case is considered by the State Board on an individual basis. Before any removals are made from the State, settlement is definitely established and authorization is received for the return of the person to his place of settlement and we make it our business to ascertain whether it is in the interest of the person to be removed. The local public welfare authorities have no authority to effect these removals. The function rests entirely with the State Department of Social Welfare.

These cases are not just unattached men, families are brought to our attention, individuals who are under-care in hospitals and other institutions are removed. We transfer the furniture belonging to these families when necessary and the authorities in the other state are always notified in advance of the time of the arrival of the family or individual in order that provision may be made for their care.

It will interest you to know that during the calendar year ending December 31st, we effected the removal of over 4,100 cases to other states and foreign countries. We recently made a study of removals made during the year 1934 and we found that ninety per cent of the cases studied remained in the localities to which they had been removed. Thirty-eight per cent have made a complete adjustment, having found employment, and were self-supporting. Sixty-two per cent were found receiving public relief or under care in institutions in the states to which they had been returned.

MISSISSIPPI, MR. F. W. ELLIS: I am a good long ways from home to try to attempt to talk before this distinguished company; however, I would say to you, sir, that whatever you may have heard to the contrary, we have something else in Mississippi besides cotton, malaria and mosquitos--one of them is transients.

In the transient program that we conducted in my State under the old ERA we handled something over 66,000 clients. When we closed on September 20, we still had those clients or we still have those transients and it has been brought forcibly to the attention of our people the need and the demand for some service to these unfortunate people. Our State is broke. We don't have any money in our State and we feel that the transient program is a national program. In other words, we feel that the Federal Government should conduct this program.

We have observed with increasing interest the very fine work done by the committee appointed by the Hon. Governor Sholtz of Florida under the fine administration of my good friend Mr. Redkey of Jacksonville, and the Governor of our State has agreed, in fact he has already appointed a committee of our prominent citizens from every nook and corner of our State to make studies of this problem.

It would be presumptuous of me to state what this committee is going to do, but I feel I can state with certainty that our committee will approve the work of this committee in Florida. They will also recommend to our delegation in Congress that they follow the recommendations that are made from this committee; in other words, what we intend to do, we intend to "turn the heat" on the boys in Congress. So if our Congress don't do right by us we will "turn the heat" on them. This is election year in Mississippi.

OHIO, MR. HIXENBAUGH: When the transient Federal funds were withdrawn from Ohio and the program terminated, we had about 4700 unattached men under care. We were fortunate to have the ready cooperation of the WPA and all employable were absorbed. The unemployed which could not leave us were taken care of. We have somewhat the same situation in Ohio as in Illinois. We were concerned, however, that such gains as we had made through the Federal program should be retained as far as possible. We met with individual civic groups and social agencies to see that the counties assumed some responsibility and would retain a central medical program.

The larger counties in which the cities of Cincinnati and Columbus are, were willing to do that. They took our transient facilities and continued our medical officers and took over our staff, curtailed somewhat in those cities. Those counties were fortunate enough to have county funds before the State Relief Commission was set up and expended on their program approximately in each of those cities one-half of what we had been allocating them for transient relief purposes. This degree of care and this program will not be able to go on. We face, shortly, the dark picture these other states have been reporting, because we have a pretty terrible relief law that has been passed limiting administrative expenses.

Up to this point they have been extending care to transient families particularly investigating and providing transportation, and maintaining, as I say, the medical program.

We didn't go into a camp management program in Ohio. It was what we intended to do. Then camps were set up, projects had been approved and money allotted, but the WPA Administrator felt that it was desirable to transfer these people to general WPA projects so that eventually we wouldn't have a non-resident population in each of these camps; so our ten camps were evacuated and out entire load was put on WPA.

PENNSYLVANIA, WILLIAM A. JENNY: When the "Armistice" was signed on September 20, 1935, Pennsylvania laid down its guns and hasn't fired any shots since. The reason is twofold; funds were inadequate and we, like many of the other people here tonight, felt that it is a distinct Federal problem and we are only going to do a half job by trying to patch it up among individual states for the only answer is probably Federal aid or interstate compacts or both.

In September we had about 4300 individuals, Federal individuals, as a case load. This number was reduced steadily in the following months by some returns to legal settlement and so on but the big change came in December when ten of the thirteen camps and farms in this State were transferred to the WPA so that now there are only 539 people, Federal people, still under care with the remaining Federal funds.

I might say that in addition to the ten camps turned over to WPA, ERA still operates three farm camps, two in Pittsburgh and one in Philadelphia, for local homeless, and there is a small but important project at the Thaddeus Stevens Industrial School where there are about thirty very carefully selected transient boys, and from all I hear from Dr. Townsend, who was our transient director and went over as a director of the WPA work camp, that is a very successful type of project.

There are just a couple of points I want to make, the first has been presented several times here tonight about the residual load. To be sure, we have only 539 individuals left, unemployable families and so forth on the Federal funds. A little over 1400 went over to WPA in camps and of those there are only 900 left at this time. About 300 of those we are glad to report were transferred to regular WPA projects and about 261 were either discharged or drifted out of camp as transients sometimes do. But what will happen when and if WPA folds up? Somebody will have to care for these people.

There is another thing: Most of these camps are long time projects, two to five years. The public lands reforestation work, the fish and game commission are perfectly good public projects and the sponsors have given lots of time and energy and equipment and money towards making these successful and we think the Federal Government has the responsibility of carrying them on.

And lastly I want to say this, it is high time that we looked at the transient program not so much as a transportation problem but as primarily a problem of dependency just like all other forms of relief and aid we are talking about; and that secondly it can be considered no longer as a temporary proposition. All forms of relief including transiency, I believe firmly, are going to be with us for a long time to come and should be planned on a permanent basis.

SOUTH CAROLINA, MR. MCELVEEN: In the State of South Carolina we have handled 125,000 individuals. When the "Armistice" was signed on September 20th, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, it wasn't as severe a blow as I received when

Mr. Hopkins sent out the message Thursday a week ago that we had to reduce WPA loads. We did not have any of our camps in the State on WPA, all of the individuals were absorbed individually on projects. We were sailing along fine until we got down to sixty individuals in a camp. We are stuck with sixty.

Now, what I want to know is where do we go from there? (In satirical vein the speaker continued.) I will be frank with you. I don't want to work myself out of a job so I have come to the conclusion to keep my sixty men unless I can send them down to Henry Redkey in Florida to pick strawberries. I have one bright spot and that is that WPA will take the remainder of my men, leaving me with a total of thirty unattached individuals, unemployable and one family of four unemployables. Gentlemen, there is the question!

The State of South Carolina has always frowned on the transient. It is absolutely obvious that they don't want transients in that State, but I do. The more the merrier! That is the way I feel about it. My peak load at one time was around 6,000. Boy, was I happy then. I couldn't keep them together; they wanted to go on to Florida. We had a veteran's camp too, about 135 veterans. They sent them up on Form 3286. That form 3286 is pretty long and when you fill one out you have a day's work. The veterans came in and we would ask them, "Well, where did you want to go?" - "Well, I think the climate is good in California, I will go out there. I think the climate is good in Florida." The veterans were passed on. The problem is what are we going to do and where do we go from here?

WEST VIRGINIA, MR. ALLEN: West Virginia's problem is very similar to that in most of the other States represented here. We spent, last year, approximately \$410,000 up to December 1st when the Works Progress Administration took over, and since that time we have been spending two or three thousand dollars a month. We are now operating on State funds and we are wondering what will happen when the WPA turns most if not all of these people back on our hands. The logical and constructive plans of our committee today I propose to take home and use my endeavor to induce the Governor of West Virginia to make representations to our Congressman to get some Federal participation in carrying this thing on some way.

VIRGINIA, MISS WOLL: No one really knows what the real problem is in Virginia because we still have no method, since the transient ERA program went out, of gathering any state-wide statistics. Richmond City I suppose is the only place in the state that really is making a real effort to study their problem. There are no public funds there to take care of transients. The private agencies, the Family Society and the Travelers Aid and Missions are the ones that are taking care of transients.

In the transients work camps under WPA we have had as of the last week in February, 3850, to be exact, unattached men. For Mr. Street's benefit, he acted a little doubtful as to where those transients from Washington had gone. I can say 2100 of them were sent over to Fort Eustis in Virginia. The destitute veterans sent from the District came to Virginia. We have about ninety of them.

Most of them were like this: They reported with their long form that South Carolina speaks of. They were given transportation and twenty-five cents to get to the district offices. We had no local relief units and no local funds to help them on to their place of residence but most of them, when they

got to the district offices, said they hadn't wanted to come there. One man insisted he go back to Danville where he paid his taxes. The South Carolina Veteran's Camp gave us twenty-six at one shot. All of them had been residents of the Home for Veterans at Hampton, Virginia, which is only supposed to house disabled veterans. When we informed Colonel Rand that twenty-six of his former residents, none of them residents of Virginia, had already been given transportation and sent back to the Home, he said, "How can I take them back? How can the WPA give them work if they are disabled and I have to take them back and they can't work? We are up against a problem." As a matter of fact, most of them can't work although we have taken them back to the Home. They are not Virginia residents.

There are really no agencies taking care of transients, no centralized agencies. If you know Virginia, you know we have one hundred counties in Virginia and twenty-two cities and we had 119 local relief units. All but one have been liquidated and now in the State out of 100 counties we have twenty welfare organizations. Only sixteen of the public welfare organizations are organized really as permanent welfare units under the welfare code. Fourteen of the twenty-two cities have welfare set-ups.

Of course, we have Red Cross, Salvation Army organizations and various missions and a few private agencies, but that is all we have to take care of the load.

Fort Eustis gives us a lot of concern because that entire load was sent in in groups of two or three hundred from the District of Columbia and Maryland. We are wondering what is going to happen. In the last few weeks we have had orders to liquidate all camps except Fort Eustis. The camps we hope we can maintain a while longer because the projects we are having under WPA in the camps are all fine projects, constructive projects that will be a tragic loss to the communities if they are abandoned. We hope we can persuade them to carry on a while longer in the State.

There were 63,000 cases certified to the WPA. We were given a quota of 45,000; that in the last two weeks has been reduced to 40,000; and today we have a notice that by the end of March it will be reduced to 30,000. I think the population in the camps will certainly suffer and the officials of the State are greatly concerned as to what is going to happen in the State when camps are liquidated, particularly Fort Eustis, where the majority of transients now are. When that is liquidated and that population turned out, we know that they won't receive care in any of the localities in the State.

Just as big a problem as anything is the problem of intrastate transients. We have just about as much trouble getting a county to take back a resident as we do have to persuade them to take care of a transient. Once the resident leaves, it is pretty difficult to get them to assume responsibility again. That problem is coming up under WPA now as the people are moving from one county to another and as quotas are being reduced the counties are not wanting to give the opportunity for employment on WPA to someone who doesn't belong in their county.

THE CHAIRMAN: That completes the roll of the States. I have been asked by Mr. Ostertag, chairman of the resolutions committee, to announce that there will be a meeting of that committee after we adjourn here.

Saturday, March 7, 1936

F I N A L   S E S S I O N

Presiding:

Honorable Thomas W. Bender

Doctor J. Evans Scheehle

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: As indicated when we convened yesterday morning, this Conference is being called by the Commissions on Interstate Cooperation of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The representative of the New Jersey Commission presided yesterday morning, the New York Commission yesterday afternoon and the Pennsylvania Commission this morning. The Chair will therefore turn the meeting over to Deputy Attorney-General Bender of Pennsylvania.

MR. BENDER: I am sure that I am an interloper and you would much rather have the charming Mrs. Streeter preside at this meeting this morning. However, Pennsylvania will try to carry on.

First on the program this morning is an address by the Honorable Harry Greenstein of Maryland.

HARRY GREENSTEIN  
State Relief Administrator  
Board of State Aid and Charities, Maryland

THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE LONG TERM CARE OF UNSETTLED DEPENDENTS  
WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES - FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL

I am terribly sorry I was unable to be here at the State House in New Jersey yesterday to listen to what, I am sure, must have been a very interesting series of papers and discussions, but I happened to be quite preoccupied in the State House in Annapolis, and I expect to be for some few weeks after I return. As I walked into the room here this morning, I picked up the Trenton morning paper and noticed the headline about the relief crisis here and the arguments raised by the economy group with regard to the necessity of keeping the tax down to a minimum. I don't know whether it is mental telepathy between the legislators in Maryland and the legislators in New Jersey, but somehow or other the very statements in the paper this morning had a strangely reminiscent ring because they were almost duplicated in the same phraseology used insofar as Maryland is concerned.

We have had the very interesting experience of having a Governor's Committee work for about three or four months in preparation of a plan to be presented to the Special Session of the Legislature in Maryland to provide revenues for the State for the ensuing fourteen months. The Legislature came together to hear the Governor read his special message and endorsed the plan and referred it to the Finance Committee. After it was referred to the Finance Committee, including the tax measure calling for a sales tax, a record was established, for the Finance Committee within five minutes thereafter brought in a unanimous unfavorable report, rushing it to the Senate where it was not only sustained, with only one dissenting vote, but they added a clincher to it which will make it impossible for it to be reconsidered again. This leaves us entirely wide open without any plan at all for relief financing and with a block of Senators ready to adjourn without doing anything at all in the matter.

I certainly hope that New Jersey will be much more statesmanlike in its approach to the problem and while the chapter hasn't ended by any means, we are facing a terrific fight insofar as adequate appropriations are concerned and from the point of view of developing a reasonable acceptance of relief

taxation that is tremendously important if we are to get anywhere.

I mention that only by way of a few introductory remarks, because it does have a distinct relationship to the adequate financing of the transient program in Maryland and indicates the amount of spade work that we have ahead of us, despite our feeling that we made some progress in the direction of State acceptance of tax measures we really haven't gotten very far and the battle still looms ahead of us. We have a tremendous amount of work to do.

I am certain, after looking at the program presented to you yesterday, that I am really going to cover ground that has already been plowed here, and that there isn't going to be anything new or any novel point of view that I may present. I take it for granted that perhaps your program committee felt that it was perfectly all right and were willing to take the chance thinking that it would be all part of the record and would perhaps add testimony and evidence from several States of the need of future programming and planning. I hope you will bear with me if you find that I am really covering ground that has already been covered yesterday.

\* \* \* \*

The history of the growth and development of the United States has been along the lines of mass changes in population moving ever westward in periodic surges impelled by the desire for economic improvement. We have a relatively short history of remaining fixed in one area and it is only a comparatively small number of people that can boast of grandparents born in the community in which they reside at present. These newly uprooted groups of individuals and families on the march joined the already existing army of fluid labor that for years had shuttled from harvest fields to urban centers. Intolerable home conditions aggravated by the prolonged depression intensified the normal adolescent quest for adventure and caused thousands of young people to take to the highway.

It soon became apparent that existing facilities for the care of the homeless and transients were often shockingly inadequate. Forced to devote more attention to this problem, welfare agencies were compelled to create new resources and institutions for the care of non-residents and it was then that the archaic nature of our laws of legal settlement became apparent.

Recognizing the difficulty that transients would have in securing care in States which were unable to supply their own needs, the Federal Government in 1933 assumed complete responsibility and ignored State lines. The philosophy of program was expressed by the Federal Transient Administration as follows:

It is rather peculiar to say that in America people are homeless and have no residence. It is more significant when we stop for a moment and consider the fact that this is not a nation. It is a combination of nations - at least 48 governments in America which makes it possible for people merely by crossing an imaginary line to become homeless and nonresident. It is time, perhaps, for those of us who are identified with this sort of work to lend our efforts towards breaking down such barriers. They are people, by and large, who because of a very serious condition have been shaken loose from such little economic security as they may have enjoyed and who are making a desperate attempt to peg on to something more secure. So the Federal Government stepped in and said "We will remove the obligation of caring for these people. We will assist them financially, take care of them so there will be no drain upon local resources."

The objectives of the Federal Transient Program were threefold. They were first, to relieve the community of the immediate problem of care of transients; second, to check the migration of dependent persons; and third, to reestablish or to integrate the transient in whatever community it was believed he could most easily adjust.

The first objective was achieved satisfactorily. Communities were relieved of all financial responsibility and transients received a degree of care which was generally superior to that heretofore given.

The second objective of checking migration was never attained. One of the initial steps taken by the Federal Transient Administration was to work out a cooperative arrangement with the railroads. Placards were posted in all railway depots and relief centers, warnings of penalties involved in unauthorized riding of passenger and freight trains. Instead, the numbers increased and many transients were known to accept these warnings as a challenge. It soon became apparent that the principal cause of transiency was unemployment.

The attainment of the third objective, namely, the rehabilitation or immobilization of transients was to be accomplished through treatment centers in the large cities and the establishment of work camps. It had been hoped to use these camps for vocational rehabilitation in order to be prepared to feed transients back into the industrial world as the need for them developed. Economic pressure continued unabated. The net result was an excellent program of intake and no program for discharge. In many instances where legal residence was established and the individual was returned to that community it was soon found that the same pressures had forced him to move again. Camps were erected without any coordinated program. The experiences of C.C.C. were ignored and there was little attempt at camp specialization by age or problem grouping. In a program based on Federal control, State boundaries were still held paramount as to jurisdiction and location. The camps themselves, in most instances, were conducted with complete disregard of the fact that they were created for the benefit of the client. The emphasis in the program was upon developing the camp as a camp and not as a tool of rehabilitation.

After two years of a Federal Transient Program, what have we learned about the transient: - We know who he is - what his skills are - how numerous he is and how numerous he can be expected to be.

The F.E.R.A., Research Bulletin of February, 1935, TR-6, states:

"Age - From the standpoint of age, the great majority of the transient unemployed are employable. Among the unattached, 41 per cent were 25 years of age, 71 per cent under 35, and only 13 per cent were 45 or older. While the heads of families as a group were somewhat older than the unattached, only 19 per cent of them were 45 years of age or older. The age concentration for both groups was between 20 and 35 years; this age interval includes 57 per cent of the unattached and 55 per cent of the heads of family groups. Considering that unskilled and semi-skilled manual workers predominate, it would seem that the majority of the transient unemployed are of an age when their efforts should be most productive.

"Employability - Factors such as age, usual occupation, and employment status determine employability in large measure. Although very few of the registrants had employment at the time of registration, 96 per cent of the

unattached and 88 per cent of the heads of family groups were reported as able and willing to work. The reason given most frequently by the unattached for their inability to work was "temporary disability", while half of the heads of family groups reported as unable to work were women with families.

The number of transients receiving relief has increased and decreased in almost exactly the same proportion as the number of people on Federal Relief throughout the country. The graph of cases under transient care and under F.E.R.A. overlap when properly weighted.

What have been some of the benefits derived from the Federal Transient Program:

1. An immediate and pressing need was met.
2. This need was met with a standard of relief generally superior to that given local homeless and as a result standards of care for local homeless were improved throughout the country.
3. Work relief programs which were established proved that in general transients were anxious and willing to work.
4. Research data available furnish valuable and accurate records of the transient and the factors causing transiency.
5. Statistical studies of transients returned to legal residence show that residence is only one of a number of factors to be considered in individual and family adjustment.
6. It was demonstrated that the transient is part of the group of unemployed in this country and must be considered as part of the general group of unemployed in any projected plan.
7. A uniform system of accounting and reporting of numbers on transient relief was established.

#### What have been the Unfavorable Aspects of the Federal Program

1. F.E.R.A. did not provide adequate supervision for the Transient Program, consequently, some States developed stronger and better organizations than others, according to the strengths of their personnel.
2. Local participation was not solicited.
3. Some of the functions of the Transient Bureau were identical to those of the Emergency Relief Administration, such as: intake and investigation. Integration of those activities was not attempted, nor accomplished.
4. The policy of establishing congregate shelters, created in the public mind a fear of large groups of men congregated at different points throughout the State.
5. The return of non-resident persons to places of legal settlement was over emphasized. Many transients were returned to communities when such ties they previously had were broken or opportunities for employment were not available, resulting in a considerable number moving elsewhere.

#### Basis for Future Program

1. Permanent program for the care of Transients should be set up on the basis of continued Federal support. There is no positive possible justification for the complete

withdrawal of Federal funds for the care of transients. If there is one phase of the relief program which cuts across State lines and which needs Federal support, it is certainly in this category of need. How can we possibly expect States burdened and harrassed with their own general relief problems to assume any leadership or provide any funds for transients if the Federal Government withdraws from the field entirely. On the other hand, I do not think the care of transients should become a national undertaking, controled, paid and administered by the Federal Government. It can be regarded as almost axiomatic for the more remote the control of the administration of relief, the less responsive it will be to the best interests of all concerned.

- There is another important principle in this connection which I believe should be kept in mind. So long as the States do not have any financial participation in the development of the transient program, to that degree will the care of transients always be regarded as an alien activity, in no sense related to, or a part of State or local responsibility. For this reason, I believe there should be Federal grants in aid to the States; the grants from the Federal Government to be substantial because this is primarily a National program, but I believe it is equally important that the States share some of the cost.
2. State and local autonomy should be respected in the administration of relief for transients, with integration of activities, as far as possible. Federal participation should be on a supervisory basis only, establishing minimum standards for personnel, relief, accounting and reporting of statistics.
  3. Relief should be provided on a non-congregate basis, as far as possible. This will serve the three purposes of, first, a more normal life, second, the distribution of the large numbers of men congregated, and third, prevent isolation of groups of men which has proved a detriment insofar as maintaining connections with normal sources of employment.
  4. The prime purpose of the program should be to utilize the services of transients on a work relief basis, rather than to return them to their places of legal residence, if they do not have existing ties in their home communities or work opportunities do not exist.
  5. To avoid the complexities and variations of Settlement laws which tend to shift the burden of care of transients to States with less stringent laws, mutual agreements should be developed and accepted whereby all States should share the problems of Transiency.
  6. The Federal Government should maintain a Department whose function it would be to assist in the development of interstate and city agreements as to settlement. It should also be the function of the department to correlate the work of the Department of Labor and the Federal Labor Employment Bureau so that these mobile supplies of labor can be utilized where needed.
  7. The States, in turn, must do their part. There has been too much of a tendency to regard the Transient Program as a step-child of Public Welfare Departments. The administration of transient relief has just as significant a place, and is just

as important a part of a total State relief program, as any other welfare activity. It should not be regarded as an isolated thing. As Dr. Ellen Potter very well put it "it should not be allowed to stick out like a sore thumb." In the organization of our State Welfare Programs there should be a State Transient Department which should have the responsibility of cooperating with the Federal authority in laying a foundation for State agreements in regard to settlement Laws. In addition, it is tremendously important that the State assume leadership in coordinating all local transient activities.

In the final analysis, we will never be able to make any real progress however in the care of transients until we are able to change the attitudes and prejudices which exist at the present time. We must recognize that transients are simply a cross section of the general population, that by and large they have the same strengths and weaknesses, are subject to the same problems, but much more complicated and aggravated, because of the fact that their roots have been torn up.

It has been very properly stated that success in the development of Federal and State Transient programs will be in direct proportion to the understanding and cooperation which can be developed covering the three levels of Government, and that the problems involved cannot be solved without the combined efforts of public officials and interested lay people. There is so much work to do in the way of interpretation, and this will require all the skill we can possibly bring to bear in the solution of this most vexed and intricate problem. It is a challenge which we must meet and a responsibility which we must face.

I sincerely hope this Conference will serve to continue to crystallize public opinion and will take proportionate action in impressing upon Congress and our Federal officials the real need which exists, the intolerable conditions which prevail, and which can only be remedied through continued Federal support of the Transient Program.

MR. BENDER: Mr. Greenstein, I know, from the way the Conference received your ringing message, that the Conference has gotten something real from your address.

MR. BENDER: Now we will call on Mr. Ostertag, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee.

MR. OSTERTAG: It seems expedient that the Resolutions Committee make a report at this time - not a complete report - but we have a resolution favorably acted upon by your Resolutions Committee that it seems desirable to pass upon before the end of the conference. It reads as follows:

"In view of the social, economic and legal problems involved in any attempt to modernize the existing State laws concerning settlement and relief of the poor, and in view of the fact that it is desirable that in spite of these difficulties we should adjust our laws and practices in order to meet adequately the needs of our citizens, whether residents or transients, and of the several States,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that there be appointed by the authorities calling this conference, a special committee for study of these problems with instructions to report back from time to time with recommendations as to appropriate modifications of our existing laws and practices in matters relating to settlement and relief of the poor, which recommendations may become the basis of interstate agreements in this field of public welfare."

I move the adoption of the resolution, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BENDER: It has been regularly moved and seconded that this resolution, as read by the Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, be passed.

(The motion was carried)

MR. OSTERTAG: In our deliberations last evening over the question that was brought up here yesterday in regard to meeting with the Congressmen at Washington it seems advisable to follow another course. In the resolution adopted yesterday by this conference, the last part of it provides as follows:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that these resolutions be presented by an official delegation from this body to the President of the United States and the Federal Works Progress Administrator and the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee."

The Resolutions Committee has adopted and is presenting for your consideration an amendment to that resolution already adopted by this conference whereby that provision that I just read with unanimous consent should be stricken from that resolution and a new section added. In other words:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the conference authorize and direct the Continuing Committee to take such action as it may deem desirable to make effective our resolution calling upon the Government of the United States to accept immediate responsibility for the relief and employment of transients. The Continuing Committee is further authorized and directed to communicate with the following individuals and organizations throughout the nation urging them to press the Federal authorities

to take such action:

- a. The President of the United States
- b. The Federal Works Progress Administration
- c. Governors
- d. State Legislatures
- e. State Relief and Welfare Departments
- f. Chairman of the House and Senate Appropriations Committee
- g. Private agencies particularly interested

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the delegates present at this conference be requested to take similar action immediately with their Governors and Legislature and with the delegates from these States in the Congress of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment to the resolution adopted yesterday as reported favorably by your Resolutions Committee.

(The motion was seconded and carried)

MR. BENDER: The amendment is now substituted in place of the section of the resolution as of yesterday which you read, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: New Jersey, for the past year or so, has been particularly active in pressing for interstate cooperation along many lines, crime, transient relief and others. The secret of this activity is not far to seek because, while Commissioner of Motor Vehicles of the State, while a member of the Congress of the United States, the present Governor of this State saw clearly and acted upon the need of this State in seeking aid from the other States in achieving results in line of their joint problems. It is, therefore, not surprising that when the mantle of Governor fell upon his' shoulders, the activity of this State along the lines of interstate cooperation should be redoubled. It is, therefore, not only a happy occasion but auspicious for our continued activity in an effort to help the transients, that we are able to hear from the dynamic Governor of the State of New Jersey, His Excellency, Harold G. Hoffman.

HONORABLE HAROLD G. HOFFMAN  
Governor, State of New Jersey

It is truly a happy privilege this morning to extend a rather belated welcome to those who come from beyond the border lines of the State of New Jersey in order to join with us in the solution of a problem which I know at the present time is very perplexing. As you may imagine, I am having a rather hectic and busy period at the present time. The matter which you have been discussing is very important in the several States represented in this particular conference, the problem of the unemployed and particularly the transient unemployed. It is a problem which I am quite convinced we are going to have with us for some time because the history, I think, of nearly every nation of the world engaged in relief for the unemployed is that even after the depression passes at least one-third of those who are upon the relief rolls at the peak of unemployment become permanent public charges. During a period such as this, we do care for a large number of people who I suppose will expect throughout the rest of their lives to be carried along upon a silver platter by the Government.

One of the great problems of the country is the unemployed and I am not speaking now entirely of the worthy unemployed. I am not speaking of the man who walks the street day after day seeking a job that doesn't seem to exist. He goes back at night and sees his child eating the bitter crust of charity and wonders why it is that the children of other men seem to have more than his children. He sees a mother's youth wasting away in the passage of the fruitless years and the hopes she once held for her children dimming in the passage of time. I am not speaking of this man but of the drone and the man who can't seem to find the proper place or cannot stay in one job; he is the great problem at this present time.

Someone said that the drone is the kind of fellow who had something left out when the Creator put him together. Somewhere along the assembly line something must have been left out, some bolt or nut which would coordinate life. Often the spark plug is the thing left out of the drone! To use one phrase, he is "too smart to work" and he wants to encourage others in the thought that they don't have to work. Many of these people do drift from one place to another and they do become a problem.

On Wednesday of this week I attended a meeting of the State Council of the National Safety Conference and at that time a letter was received from the Chief of Police at Los Angeles who asked the National Safety Council to sponsor legislation throughout the various States to prevent hitch-hiking because they said

that it was carrying some of these transient unemployed into California. It was thought by members of that committee that it was not as much of a safety problem as it was a problem effecting crime or the result of economic problems in the States.

The Federal Government derives its own power from the sovereign States. All of the States have ceded some part of their authority to the Federal Government so that the Federal Government might exist and function. The constitution itself is adopted by grace of ratification by the several States. The President of the United States is elected by the electoral votes of the several States. The members of the Senate and House Representatives are elected by popular vote in their respective States, and it is their responsibility to develop and support policies in the interest of but not encroaching on the sovereignty of these States. There are today many problems that are problems that should have the mutual understanding and study of the States themselves within a region and that is why it seems to me that this new instrument that has been designed, the Inter-State Compact, may become useful in solving some of these problems that by their very nature go beyond the boundary lines of the several States, and it is toward the solution of one of these problems that you people are working at the present time.

It is my hope that you may enjoy your stay within our little State of New Jersey and that your stay may be a profitable one. Sometimes I think that these regional conferences bringing together representatives of the several States may be just as important as some of the proceedings that revolve around Geneva, in Switzerland, and it may be that your deliberations at this conference may lead to a Treaty of Trenton or Treaty of Albany that may be very important in the history of the nation and to the solution of one of the problems of today, a very human problem as well as one that affects the economic life of the States.

We have found in New Jersey that the Federal Works Program has not entirely taken away our relief problems. While about one hundred thousand people have been employed on the Federal program within our State only eighty thousand have been taken from the relief rolls. Today the State and the municipalities of the State are attempting to carry the burden of relief for between three hundred and four hundred thousand people. I assume that in many of your States you find a somewhat comparable situation. It is my hope that this conference today may be one of mutual understanding. I know your deliberations of yesterday were very helpful and out of this may come something which will be of mutual advantage to all of the States represented.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: I am sure we all appreciate very much the fine message which the Governor of this State has brought to us. His thought is definitely along our line.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: Before turning the meeting back to the present Chairman or rather new Chairman, in view of the fact that the Conference has just adopted a resolution calling for the appointment of a Continuing Committee by the Conference Arrangements Committee, may I ask this committee to meet immediately in the room in the rear of the dais and we will then take up that matter of the appointing of the Continuing Committee. May I, therefore, introduce to you at this time as your continuing chairman a member of the Pennsylvania Commission on Interstate Cooperation and also the director of their State Welfare Department, Doctor Scheehle.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: I want to express my apology for being late. I was waiting for some of the other members of the Pennsylvania commission and they failed to appear, so I am at a disadvantage not knowing what has gone before.

It is my understanding that the resolutions which were brought up that there was some discussion as to changes and they are not ready at this time to present these resolutions and I would like to have an open discussion from the floor.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: Mr. Chairman, I understand the situation. Several of the delegates present stated that during the course of the speeches there were many points raised to which there was considerable, well, clarification of opinion necessary. I think that was expressed as to the remarks by Commissioner Ellis of New Jersey and if I might suggest, sir, that an opportunity might well be now given for a presentation of views along those lines.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: It has been suggested by Mr. Braisted that we study the particular problems as suggested in Chapter IV of the program. What is your pleasure?

MR. WOELFLE: Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the record, may I request that anybody speaking state his or her name and the State from which he or she comes.

MR. BRAISTED: Assuming that we wish to do something about our own settlement laws, cannot we agree upon one method of approach to our individual States. Our laws differ, but we might agree that the settlement provisions remain as they are, provided we add that the State settlement shall not be lost in the given State until a person has gained such settlement in another State. I believe that this will provide a working arrangement for all of us and will certainly enable our people to receive relief when they are entitled to it, at any place where they may be. Pennsylvania has such a law on its books, I believe. It is a workable, sound plan, and I very much favor it.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: The Chair welcomes any further discussion on this matter.

MR. OSTERTAG: I might state that the Resolutions Committee has before it for final consideration within a few moments, several resolutions which may throw some light on this subject. This may bring to a head something which you desire to act upon.

MR. REDKEY: May I add my support to Mr. Braisted's suggestion that this conference go on record, so far as the laws of settlement are concerned, as endorsing the idea that all States follow the precedent of Pennsylvania and other States; urging that a settlement providing eligibility for relief, will not be lost in a given State until such eligibility or settlement has been gained in another State. Mr. Braisted's suggestion is good and I would like to see the conference adopt it.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: Inasmuch as the Resolutions Committee is about to report, and we do not know what they have to bring before us, it might be well, before we take any definite action, to hear just what that committee has to report.

MR. SANDS of Illinois: While we are waiting, may I speak about the resolution which we passed yesterday. The original resolution was to the effect that we call upon the Government of the United States through an "appropriate permanent branch" of the public service, etc. Then we amended it to strike out the word "permanent". I voted for that, but I think it was a mistake for two reasons: first, it evades facing the fact that transiency will be a permanent problem in the whole of the United States; that pushing it off to a temporary agency only means that in a little while we have got to fight this all over again.

Also, in a permanent department of the government we would have a much more stable policy. Those of us who gave all we had to building up the transient program during the last two years, know what it is to have changes made seemingly, almost, upon the basis of an individual decision. There is not much use for us to attempt to build up a new transient organization, do all the work of building it again; take care of the people for a time; help some of them to lose legal settlement where they have it now; and then suddenly some day receive a letter beginning, "In view of the prospective liquidation of the transient program, etc." and then we go through all of this again. There is not one thing to be gained by it. We should rescind the amendment to this resolution and stand solidly for a transient program administered under a permanent Federal department. I, therefore, move that we rescind that amendment, leaving the resolution in its original form.

MR. McELVEEN Of South Carolina: I appreciate Mr. Sands' attitude, but if we say in this resolution "appropriate permanent branch" they may have the transient bureaus under the post office or under the resettlement or farm administration. However, I agree thoroughly with Mr. Sands that we should set forth now some provision whereby the work for transients could be included in a permanent branch of the service.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: Is Mr. Sands' motion seconded?

MR. JENNY of Pennsylvania: I suggested this change yesterday. The Pennsylvania delegation has no objection whatever to having a permanent agency of the Federal government take this thing in hand, We were concerned with the word "permanent" so far as the State is concerned, for the reason that we have not yet heard from Governor Earle's Commission on Public Assistance out of which may grow a permanent program for public assistance. Our present permanent organi-

zations for welfare are not set up for county organizations, etc. to care for the transient program, whereas, for instance, the relief administration might be. I simply want to make sure we get some public assistance from the government, an agency now ready to take on the job could do it, pending it being taken over by a permanent organization outlined by the Governor's Commission. It is a matter of expediency of being able to do a job as soon as we are able. I see no objection to having a permanent Federal organization set up, allowing some discretion in the State as to who should administer it.

MR. SANDS: That could be accomplished by rescinding only the same amendment rescinding the word "permanent" from the consideration of the branch of public service, and also in the line below, "effective through permanent departments of the State governments". I am particularly concerned with the first deletion and I would be willing to change my motion to rescind the amendment only as it regards the Federal service.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: Will you restate your motion, please?

MR. SANDS: I move that we rescind that part of the amendment which applied to the Federal service so that it shall read: "We call upon the government of the United States through an appropriate permanent branch of the public service, etc."

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: Do I hear a second?

(Motion duly seconded)

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: It has been regularly moved and seconded. We are ready for questions.

MR. ALLEN of West Virginia: I share the opinion of the gentleman of Pennsylvania. You are asking in this resolution that the States set up permanent departments. Most of the States (our own has not) have not legislated on the Social Security Bill. While I believe that in all probability the Department of Public Welfare will take over these various functions, it seems to me it should be left to the discretion of the State governments. I believe that "permanent" in the last section of that paragraph should still be omitted, and leave it to the discretion of the State governments.

MR. STREET of the District of Columbia: It seems to me that this resolution as we have it now is entirely sound and it would be unwise to strike out the words "through an appropriate permanent branch" because of the fact that it should be assigned, doubtlessly, either to the Social Security Board, although unlikely, or to the Department of Labor, and after all I think we must recognize the permanent problem of transiency - the fact that the handling of it must be a permanent part of the Federal public assistance program, exemplified by the Social Security Act. Therefore, I am heartily in favor of not accepting the amendment and in leaving this resolution as it stands.

MR. SANDS: May I just make clear to you the fact that as it stands, the word "permanent" is out, because we amended it to that effect yesterday afternoon.

MR. STREET: An amendment was passed deleting the word "permanent"? I beg your pardon -- I am in favor of "permanent".

MR. RABINOFF of New York: It seems to me that this resolution as originally presented, with the word "permanent" in both places, applying to both the Federal and State governments, is still wise. We are not legislating for either the Federal or State governments. On the other hand, we are affirming the principle to which Mr. Street has just referred. Transiency is a continuing problem and requires a permanent branch of the government service to handle it. I think we all recognize, and ought to say so, that we are out of the condition of "emergency" in reference to this particular problem. Whether a particular State has a permanent department of the government at this moment or may have it in the future is not at issue; the issue is the principle as to whether we believe that the problem should be dealt with through some permanent body in the Federal government and through some permanent body in the State government. Therefore, I would prefer to go further than the motion now on the floor presented by Mr. Sands for an amendment of the present resolution to leave the word "permanent" in, in reference to the Federal government. I would prefer that both words with reference to Federal and State governments be replaced, and the resolution stand as originally presented by the Resolutions Committee yesterday afternoon. It is a matter of principle and not of legislation. Mr. Chairman, I, therefore, move that the word "permanent" be replaced in the resolution as adopted yesterday, so that the resolution reads as it was originally presented by the Resolutions Committee.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: For the sake of simplification, will the original maker of the motion accept that?

MR. SANDS: Yes.

MR. GRIER of North Carolina: I believe that the resolution as originally introduced should stand. This matter of transient relief, while we are through the emergency feature of it, does present a permanent condition that we are going to have to meet for some years to come. I think that the resolution as originally introduced meets that situation; that we are going to do this not as a situation soon to be remedied and disposed of, but a condition we will have to continue to meet through the years that lie ahead. I, therefore, join with the gentleman of New York and second the motion that the original resolution be passed.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: Anything further on the question? If not, I am going to ask the Secretary to call the roll by States.

MR. OSTERTAG: In order to expedite this meeting, will the Resolutions Committee meet briefly in the adjoining room. If it is necessary for any member of

vote at this time, will he report as soon as the vote is taken.

(A vote was taken and the roll called, with the following result

Affirmative: All States with the exception  
of West Virginia

Negative: West Virginia

Motion Carried)

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: The Chair recognizes Judge Hartshorne.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: Under the resolution recently adopted, calling for the Conference Arrangements Committee to appoint a Continuing Committee, that Committee has met, and I am authorized to announce the following persons as members of the Continuing Committee, to carry on the work of the Conference, holding further conferences if necessary, pressing for action on the resolutions adopted here, etc. You will recall that this calls for administrative and for legal work as well. We have, therefore, attempted to put upon this Continuing Committee persons of both administrative and legal ability, and at the same time, to give the Committee as wide a geographic scope as possible. The Committee will consequently consist of the following:

C. L. Allen, W. Va.  
Karl De Schweinitz, Pa.  
James Donn, Fla.  
Frank W. Ellis, Miss.  
Hubert R. Gallagher, N. Y.  
Paul D. Grady, N. C.  
Harry Greenstein, Md.  
Fred K. Hoehler, Ill.  
Haskell C. Jacobs, N. Y.  
Lawrence C. Jones, Vt.  
Charles Margiotti, Pa.  
Herold C. Ostertag, N. Y.  
Ellen C. Potter, N. J.  
Elwood J. Street, D.C.  
Ruth W. Streeter, N. J.

It is the suggestion of the Conference Committee that, since this Continuing Committee must function promptly, in order that word may be carried forcibly and urgently to the President as to the need for transient relief, before he delivers his relief message to Congress. It is our suggestion that this Continuing Committee should meet in the anteroom immediately after it is vacated by our Resolutions Committee. It can then organize and proceed.

Mr. Chairman, I see here the President of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, who is also a member of the New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation, and with your permission, sir, I would like to suggest that we hear a word from Senator Barbour.

JOHN C. BARBOUR

President of the Senate of the State of New Jersey  
Member New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation

I promised Judge Hartshorne that I would try to get down here some time during this conference, and am sorry I am arriving at a time when you are nearly through with your deliberations. I have been interested in the question of interstate cooperation and have felt that inasmuch as I saw fit this year not to appoint myself to the permanent commission, but to put someone on who will be able to maintain a continued and more active interest in the work, I ought at least to come down and "sing my swan song" as an official member of the group, although the Judge insists that I, by virtue of my office as President of the Senate, have the right to be ex officio a member.

I suppose you know that the bill which I sponsored to create a permanent Commission on Interstate Cooperation by statute because of my membership on the Commission has been enacted and signed by the Governor.

I trust that you who come to us from other States will enjoy the hospitality of New Jersey. You come to us to discuss a troublesome problem at a time when we have the whole question of relief before us, an even more troublesome problem, and that is another reason why I am here today. This afternoon we have a further conference to determine whether New Jersey is going to feed those on relief or let them go out and eat the tender sprouts of grass as they come up in the springtime. I trust that the fights that will start in the latter part of the day in another part of the State House will not interfere with your enjoying yourselves during the time that you do remain with us. I have enjoyed this opportunity of being here.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: The Chair will declare a ten-minute recess, until the Committee is ready to report.

(Ten-minute recess from 11:20 to 11:30 A.M.)

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: Will the assembly please come to order? We are ready for a report from the Resolutions Committee.

MR. OSTERTAG: The Resolutions Committee is prepared to bring before you its FINAL report. Before presenting the additional resolutions, I think it is wise that we hear a review of the resolutions as passed and the resolutions about to be presented to you by one of the active members of the New Jersey Commission and a member of the Resolutions Sub-Committee, Mrs. Streeter, and I would like to ask Mrs. Streeter if she will present the program in substance.

MRS. STREETER: The Resolutions Committee thought that the fewer resolutions there were presented, the less confusing it would be, and yet we wanted to have a well-rounded program, so we thought in voting openly you would like to know what was involved in the whole rounded program before you began to vote on the parts, and I was asked to give you a key to this puzzle.

There are to be five major resolutions.

THE FIRST you have voted on, to urge the Federal government to help with the immediate transient problem.

THE SECOND you have already voted on, to provide for a Continuing Committee.

THE THIRD, which will come before you next, is to urge the States to liberalize their laws, so that they can cooperate with the Federal government in the immediate transient program.

THE FOURTH is to urge the States to revise their laws in such a way that new transients will not be created, that is to work out matters of settlement in a more liberal fashion, so that the new transients will not be as numerous as the present-day transients.

THE FIFTH resolution recognizes the fact that this question of State settlement laws is very complicated and will take a long time to work out and, therefore, urges the States in the meantime to work our reciprocal agreements with each other.

In that way we felt a well-rounded program was developed and that all the ground which we could cover had been covered. The resolutions will now be read to you. They are couched in general terms, a matter of principle rather than of detail. We hope you will approve of them.

MR. OSTERTAG: The FIRST RESOLUTION for your consideration is as follows.

"WHEREAS industrial, legal and financial conditions created by the prolonged economic depression have dislodged thousands of men, women and children from their normal occupations and place of legal settlement and have thrown them, in their extremity, into communities where they are alien and have no legal right to relief; and

WHEREAS, the Federal Government in the last two years, by its program of relief and work for transients, has demonstrated that it is possible on a national scale to alleviate the condition; and

WHEREAS, the experience of these two years has further demonstrated that

transiency is an interstate problem and that it has its migratory labor and other situations that are beyond the control of the individual States; and

WHEREAS, the abandonment by the Federal Government of the relief program for these persons is returning these unfortunate, unsettled people to chaos and hopelessness, since they and the communities in which they find themselves lack the means to solve their problems; and

WHEREAS, most States cannot legally use State funds to relieve unsettled persons and residual Federal funds in the hands of State agencies are now practically exhausted;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

We call upon the Government of the United States, through an appropriate permanent branch of the public service and as a part of the public assistance program, to accept immediate responsibility for the relief and employment of transients, and we urge that this relief and employment be made effective through permanent departments of State governments and coordinate local units of administration and that funds be made available by the Federal Government on a grant in aid basis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

We request that the Federal Government through the Department of Labor, in cooperation with State Departments of Welfare and Labor Departments, undertake a thorough study of the labor aspects of this problem and of migrant labor and labor reserves and that plans be based on the findings, to the end that the management of those problems in the future may be more intelligently and successfully handled.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

The conference authorizes and directs the \*Continuing Committee to take such action as it may deem desirable to make effective our resolution calling upon the Government of the United States to accept immediate responsibility for the relief and employment of transients.

The Continuing Committee is further authorized and directed to communicate with the following individuals and organizations throughout the nation urging them to press the Federal authorities to take such action.

- (a) The President of the United States
- (b) The Federal Works Progress Administrator
- (c) State Legislatures now in session
- (d) Governors
- (e) State Relief and Welfare Departments
- (f) Chairman of House and Senate Appropriations Committee
- (g) Private agencies particularly interested

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

The delegates present at this conference be requested to take similar action immediately with their Governors and Legislatures, and with the delegations from these States in the Congress of the United States."

I move the adoption of the resolution.

(Motion duly seconded)

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the FIRST RESOLUTION be adopted. All those in favor say "Aye".

(Unanimously carried)

It is so ordered.

MR. OSTERTAG: The SECOND RESOLUTION for your consideration is as follows; in confirmation of action already taken:

"In view of the social, economic and legal problems involved in any attempt to modernize the existing State Laws concerning settlement and relief of the poor, and in view of the fact that it is desirable that in spite of these difficulties we should adjust our laws and practices in order to meet adequately the needs of our citizens whether residents or transients and of the several States,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that there be appointed by the authorities calling this conference, a special committee for study of these problems with instructions to report back from time to time with recommendations as to appropriate modifications of our existing laws and practices in matters relating to settlement and relief of the poor, which recommendations may become the basis of interstate agreements in this field of public welfare."

I move the adoption of the resolution.

(Motion duly seconded)

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the SECOND RESOLUTION be adopted. All those in favor say "Aye".

(Unanimously carried)

It is so ordered.

MR. OSTERTAG: The THIRD RESOLUTION for your consideration is as follows:

"WHEREAS the resolution already adopted by this conference has pointed out that transiency is a deep-seated, interstate problem, that it is a reflection of the same conditions as give rise to general relief needs and that its treatment requires the cooperation of Federal, State and local governments;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT;

This conference recommends that the several States be urged to liberalize their laws so as to make possible their cooperation with the Federal government in the financing and administration of relief to transients on the proposed grants-in-aid principle;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

This conference commend Governor Dave Sholtz and the State of Florida for the pioneering effort made by the Special Florida Committee in developing an experimental plan for a permanent mechanism for dealing with the transient problem in a constructive manner, embodying these general principles of Federal and State participation, of humane treatment for transients and of preventive measures for its administration and control,

We recognize the sovereignty of the States, subject to the powers they are willing to delegate to the Federal Government.

We are fully aware of the differences between the States in the manifestations of the Federal relief and transient problems, and the impracticability of this conference attempting to formulate a detailed and specific program of State action.

However, there are certain general principles which should be embodied in State legislation and which, if adopted in the several States as part of their general relief program, would substantially reduce the volume of transiency. We conceive these principles to include

- (1) A uniform period of residence, preferably brief - for acquiring a legal settlement.
- (2) A reorganization of the relief laws to provide care for persons not having local settlement.
- (3) Adequate standards of relief for all persons in need, regardless of settlement status.

Therefore, we wish to affirm the importance of the States taking prompt action in formulating permanent program for general relief, and for transients; such action, in our judgment, might very well represent the major contribution by the States to the solution of the transiency problem".

I move the adoption of the resolution.

(Motion duly seconded)

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the THIRD RESOLUTION be adopted. All those in favor say "Aye".

(Unanimously carried)

It is so ordered.

MR. OSTERTAG: The next is the FOURTH RESOLUTION.

"WHEREAS, the existing legal settlement and residence laws of the various States are of fundamental concern in dealing with any program involving the transient person; and

WHEREAS, these laws are entirely lacking in uniformity and varying in standard and in degree; and

WHEREAS, this utter diversification has lent itself to undue hardships to the transient persons and unfairness to the States; and

WHEREAS, any constructive program for the future, involving any and all persons not having a legal settlement at the place of application for relief, will necessitate a radical change in our existing philosophy of legal settlement; and

WHEREAS, this fundamental readjustment cannot be achieved within a reasonable period of time;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

This conference approve and encourage all efforts being made and to be

made to bring about uniformity of legal settlement laws between the several States.

That for immediate action this conference approve the principle of reciprocal agreements between groups of two or more States which shall encourage uniformity of practice by agreement as between the cooperating States, and further,

That this conference bring to the attention of all State legislatures the need for, and the advisability of, enacting legislation to authorize and empower an appropriate State department to enter into these reciprocal agreements, and further,

That the general problem of the study of reciprocal agreements, including the suggested possibilities for the agreements themselves, and the problems arising in the negotiations and practices between the States, be referred to the Continuing Committee for further study and for report from time to time."

I move the adoption of the resolution.

(Motion duly seconded)

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: It has been regularly moved and seconded that the FOURTH RESOLUTION be adopted. All those in favor say "Aye".

(Unanimously carried)

It is so ordered.

MR. OSTERTAG: The last resolution, but not the least, as amended:

"WHEREAS, this interstate conference has been admirably organized and splendidly conducted;

WHEREAS, the physical arrangements in the State Capitol have been most comfortable and agreeable; and

WHEREAS, we all have derived immense stimulation and benefit from this conference

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT:

We express our deep appreciation to our host, the New Jersey Commission on Interstate Cooperation, the Commissions of New York and Pennsylvania, and their Committee on Arrangements, for all that they have done, and pledge our continued cooperation in the task in which they have exercised such happy leadership and that we reaffirm our belief in the extension of the principle of interstate compacts for the care of transients which has been expressed throughout this conference."

I move the adoption of the resolution.

(Motion duly seconded)

MR. REDKEY: I would suggest that in passing on this resolution the conference vote by a rising vote.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: The conference will vote by a rising vote on the adoption of this resolution. All those in favor please rise.

(Unanimously carried)

MR. OSTERTAG: That concludes the report of your Resolutions Committee, Mr. Chairman.

JUDGE HARTSHORNE: Mr. Chairman, now that the Resolutions Committee has reported, may we not ask the Continuing Committee to immediately continue by meeting in the room in the rear of the speaker's dais. I will remind you that the Continuing Committee consists of the following:

C. L. Allen, W. Va.  
Karl de Schweinitz, Pa.  
James Donn, Fla.  
Frank W. Ellis, Miss.  
Hubert R. Gallagher, N.Y.  
Paul D. Grady, N.C.  
Harry Greenstein, Md.  
Fred K. Hoehler, Ill.  
Haskell C. Jacobs, N.Y.  
Lawrence C. Jones, Vt.  
Charles Margiotto, Pa.  
Harold C. Ostertag, N. Y.  
Ellen C. Potter, N. J.  
Elwood J. Street, D.C.  
Ruth W. Streeter, N.J.

DOCTOR SCHEEHLE: The business of this conference has progressed so rapidly that apparently we have some time on our hands. Is it the wish of the conference to proceed with discussions of the problems or wait until the afternoon session?

MR. McELVEEN: I move that the conference continue the business and discussions through this afternoon.

(This was voted down by the conference and a motion to adjourn was passed)

Conference adjourned.

W H A T   S O C I A L   W O R K   T H I N K S  
O F   T H E   T R A N S I E N T   S I T U A T I O N

AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK, MONTREAL, JUNE 1935,  
THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON CARE OF TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS STATED:

"The investment in the Federal Transient Program to date has more than justified itself:

- (1) in the fact of the subsistence on approximately decent levels which it has made possible for what is, after all, a substantial proportion of our population;
- (2) for its elimination of the anti-social media (petty larcenies induced by the jungles) which by their haphazardness and casualness were enhancing the seriousness of the problem and demoralizing such positive values as remained within the individuals;
- (3) the program has forcibly demonstrated that transiency in itself is not an anti-social phenomenon and that a substantial proportion of the people who have come into the Federal Bureau appear to have the normal characteristics of any cross section of the population, looked at sociologically."

- - - - -

THE LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL TRANSIENT PROGRAM RESULTED  
IN - - -

Nationwide protest being registered in Washington from civic and social work groups, such as State Relief Commissions, City Councils of Social Agencies, Chambers of Commerce, State Conferences of Social Work, State Legislatures, Mayors, police and other public officials. These protests demonstrated the need for continued Federal acceptance of responsibility for the nationwide problem of transiency. There was a general feeling that liquidation was not justified, particularly at the beginning of winter and pending stabilization of industry. Resources of private social agencies, secured principally through Community Chests, were inadequate to assume the total relief burden, including the transient problem. Local governmental resources were required for the care of local resident unemployed in line with the new Federal policies.

- - - - -

THE CURRENT PLATFORM\* OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON CARE OF  
TRANSIENT AND HOMELESS INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING PLANKS - - -

\*This platform may be read in the January issue of the Transient published by the National Association for Travelers Aid and Transient Service and in the January issue of the Public Welfare News published by the American Public Welfare Association.

"That the prolonged depression has magnified a labor problem, interstate in character, which existed previous to 1929, namely, the need in this country of a fluid labor reserve in order that the needs of seasonal industries might be met; which industries, however, had exploited the labor of men, and incidentally of women and children, paying a less than living wage which ultimately left these employees in need of public charity.

"We, therefore, affirm that the 'problem of the transient' is primarily one of employment and the wise use of labor at an adequate wage, rather than a problem of relief.

"That its solution as a labor problem is fundamentally a Federal responsibility, because of its interstate character, in cooperation with the States and their subdivisions.

"That, pending such solution, the relief needs of the transient, whether direct or through work, are a primary charge upon Federal funds administered through State agencies in accordance with established standards.

"That the problems of the transient and homeless are bound up with the general problems of unemployment, general relief limitations as influenced by human psychology, and the laws of legal settlement. The problems do not exist in a vacuum.

"The establishment of or utilization of existing permanent State public welfare agencies for the administration of the regular and special functions of public welfare and relief, whose functions shall cover the acceptance of and distribution of all Federal grants in aid made to States for the purposes of public welfare and relief, general and special, as well as State grants to local units of administration.

"The development of State standards, in harmony with Federal standards, of personnel, accounting, etc.; and to establish the necessary field staff to assist, to supervise, to train the executive and field staff of the local administrative agencies; and the right to appoint or to approve the appointment of the members of county or district boards of public welfare as hereafter specified."

- - - - -

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSOCIATION RECOMMENDS PROVISIONS FOR  
TRANSIENTS IN STATE AND COUNTY DIVISIONS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE - - -

The American Public Welfare Association's pamphlet "Suggested State Legislation for Social Security" gives a suggested plan for a State Department of Public Welfare. The January issue of the Public Welfare News the A.P.W.A. referred to this pamphlet, saying "it was assumed that a service to transients would be included in both State and county divisions of public assistance . . . . . In some cities the unattached persons are provided for in the existing family departments, and from many points of view this is a desirable plan whether in a separate department or in the program for transients is a function which should be considered."

- - - - -

THE DELEGATE CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS HELD IN WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 14, 15, 16, CONSIDERED THE PROBLEM OF TRANSIENCY AS PART OF ITS PROGRAM LOOKING TOWARD A SYSTEM OF FEDERAL GRANTS IN AID TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.

In "the testimony of the Conference" a summary of the proceedings prepared by the Report Committee and published in the February issue of the Compass, the following statement is made:

"The plight of the transient, referred to frequently by previous speakers, received a comprehensive discussion by Dr. Ellen C. Potter.

"Briefly examining the causes of transiency, the development and later abandonment of the Federal Transient Program, and mobilization of protest when "the unthinkable had happened," by the National Committee on Care of Transients and Homeless, she stressed the Committee's conviction that transients did not constitute a category for relief purposes, although for convenience they had been thus segregated. A continuing transients program, she said, could not possibly exist outside an integrated Federal, State and local system of public welfare".

As a result of this conference the A.A.S.W. agreed on "an outline for Federal assistance program". This was drafted by the Associations Division on government and social work.

This reference to the transient problem is made in this outline\*:

"Local and State governments are unprepared to assume the whole relief burden left with them by the Federal government. Many are financially unable to do so, because of constitutional and fiscal limitations. Because of limitations in the laws governing settlement, they are particularly unprepared to deal with the transient and homeless, who in large numbers are adrift as a result of the depression. The funds available through

private charity are so infinitesimal as to offer no substantial solution to the problem. Therefore, the Federal government's present program, while offering the opportunity of work for a large proportion of those in need, in effect abandons the remaining families and persons to a precarious and deplorable existence dependent upon inadequate and often non-existent local resources.

"For the current fiscal year it is proposed that Federal grants to States for general relief and care of transients be made for the remaining four months of the present fiscal year." This Program is in addition to the present program under the WPA and other forms of assistance.

"Congress should, therefore, set up a plan by which grants-in-aid to States should be made for general assistance to families and persons in need, and for transient care."

---

\*This Outline may be read in full in the February issue of the Compass or may be secured as a reprint from the A.A.S.W., 130 East 22nd Street, New York.

## 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.