



E9791
1937
V. 2

E9791 1937 21

E9791
1937
21

Spec.
Coll.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA LIBRARY
3 9001 04926 9759

111754

THE TRANSIENT RELIEF PROBLEM IN PIMA COUNTY WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO NON-RESIDENT HEALTH-SEEKERS

by

Josephine Barclay

A Thesis

submitted to the faculty of the

Department of Economics, Sociology and Business Administration

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in the Graduate College

University of Arizona

1 9 3 7

Approved: Frederick A. Conrad May 24 1937
Major Professor Date

FOREWORD

This study was undertaken in Tucson, Arizona, in the spring of 1937. The purpose of the investigation was to determine, if possible, the nature of the transient relief problem confronting Pima County, in view of its special characteristics as a health center.

Acknowledgments are due to Mr. C. Edgar Goyette, Chairman of the Pima County Welfare Board, through whose generous assistance and interest the files of the Pima County Welfare Board were made available for the investigation; and to Miss Elizabeth Beach, Supervisor of Intake Department, Pima County Welfare Board, for her invaluable assistance in the selection of the cases studied, and for her unflinching help at all times in providing information regarding the policies and problems of the Pima County Welfare Board in its contact with transient applicants.

Acknowledgments and thanks are due to Dr. Frederick Allen Conrad, Professor of Sociology at the University of Arizona, whose interest in the problem suggested the investigation, for his guidance and direction throughout the progress of the study.

Josephine Barclay
April 19, 1937

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	i
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING SETTLEMENT LAWS AND TRANSIENT RELIEF	6
a. Settlement Law History	6
b. The Present Status of Settlement Laws in the United States	13
c. The Transportation Agreement	22
d. The Federal Transient Program	24
e. The Transient Problem in Pima County	27
II. APPLICANTS SENT TO PIMA COUNTY BY RELIEF OR OTHER OFFICIALS	34
a. Applicants Sent by Relief Officials	34
b. Applicants Sent to Pima County by Of- ficials not Charged with Relief Administration	58
c. Cases Showing Vacillating Policy of Relief Officials Who Sent Clients to Pima County	63
d. Applicants Sent to Pima County by Of- ficials Who Carried Out Their Responsibility	74
III. APPLICANTS WHO MIGRATED TO PIMA COUNTY AGAINST ADVICE	78
IV. APPLICANTS WHO MIGRATED TO PIMA COUNTY ON THE ADVICE OF PRIVATE PHYSICIANS	86
a. Applicants Who Were on Relief in Their Own Counties Before Departure	87
b. Applicants Who Were not on Relief in Their Home Counties Before Departure	91

Chapter	Page
V. APPLICANTS WHOSE MIGRATION TO TUCSON WAS NOT TRACED TO SPECIFIC OFFICIAL OR MEDICAL ADVICE	99
a. Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Health Reasons	100
b. Applicants Who Were Mentally Unadjusted	102
c. Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Employment	106
d. Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Miscellaneous Reasons	118
VI. CONCLUSION	123
a. Methods of Transient Relief in Use in Other States	123
b. Remedial Measures	132
1. General Conditions	132
2. Proposed Plans	135
APPENDIX	144
Table I. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter II	144
Table II. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter III	145
Table III. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter IV	146
Table IV. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Health Reasons	147
Table V. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants Who Were Mentally Unadjusted	148
Table VI. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Employment	149
Table VII. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Miscellaneous Reasons	150
Table VIII. Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapters II, III, IV, and V	151
Table IX. Distributions of all Transient Applicants Handled by the Pima County Welfare Board from March 1st, 1936, to March 1st, 1937, According to State of Legal Residence, and According to Disabilities	152
BIBLIOGRAPHY	153

INTRODUCTION

The situation which at the present time is commonly referred to as the Transient Problem in relief administration, is one of the most complicated and perplexing matters for relief officials to handle, one of the most expensive for taxpayers, and one of the most distressing and bewildering for those persons who fall into the "transient" category of relief. It is a universal problem of poor relief administration at present, existing in an intensified form all over the United States, and it is also a very old problem, for which a truly satisfactory solution has apparently never yet been found.

The general causes of transiency are fairly well understood. Perhaps the most fundamental of these is the fact that there are certain individuals in all societies who prefer to live a wandering life, even at the expense of economic security, and who are not willing to settle down in one locality under any circumstances. This is the group which is referred to as tramps, professional hobos, or by the older term of vagrant. The stigma of vagrancy is attached in popular thinking to almost any non-resident who is without means of support, even if the non-resident has a definite plan and purpose in going to a strange community,

and this stigma persists even in times like the present when the people "on the road" comprise a very diversified group of individuals.¹

In addition to the true chronic wanderers, who wander by choice, there is a much larger group who move and travel about with the idea that something definite is to be gained by doing so. For most of this group the true purpose of their travels is to find work, nor is this in any way a new phenomenon. Transiency as a search for better economic adjustment has existed from the earliest times,² and its nature is well summed up in the following statement:

"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."³

Furthermore, transiency, when looked upon as mobility of population, is and will continue to be necessary in present day society, with new cities and new industries constantly growing up, and with the exhaustion of agricultural land areas.⁴ Thus it is at least a national phenomenon, and not at all local in character.

1. Massoth, Leona E., "Some Current Misconceptions Concern-
Non-Residents," Social Service Review, Vol. X, No. 2,
June 1936, p. 291.

2. Hoehler, Fred K., Minutes of Interstate Conference on
Transients and Settlement Laws, Trenton, N. J.,
March 6 and 7, 1936, p. 11.

3. Loc. cit.

4. Loc. cit.

The present difficulty in regard to the handling of this problem is obviously due to the fact that economic changes and maladjustment have caused such widespread dependency in the transient group. For

"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."⁵

The initiative and personal effort to solve individual economic problems shown by these people have not brought them the desired results.

The transient relief problem involves a quarter of a million persons and has grown 700 per cent in the seven years between 1929 and 1936.⁶ This has given rise to a situation that is highly complicated, unmanageable, and potentially dangerous.

"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 peril.--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."⁷

Furthermore, the individual situations and problems within

5. Blakeslee, Ruth O., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 17.

6. Hartshorne, Judge Richard, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 7.

7. Lane, Winthrop D., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 28.

the transient groups are extremely varied and diversified, falling into every category of the Social Security provisions, but complicated and intensified by non-residence.⁸

In addition to the general problem thus briefly discussed, there is a particular factor which exists in southern Arizona, especially in Pima County, which renders the situation even more acute, more complex, and more difficult of solution. This is the fact that this area is considered a health center and draws great numbers of health seekers from all over the United States. There appears to be a widespread belief among this group that their mere presence in southern Arizona even in circumstances of the utmost destitution, will work miraculous cures, and that this remedial effort must be tried as a last resort, even when all other things fail. This attitude will appear repeatedly in the discussion of relief cases of the Pima County Welfare Board which follows. There has apparently been no concerted effort as yet on the part of relief agencies in areas such as this to meet in conference over this matter, and to devise ways and means of meeting it which would be helpful wherever this special problem exists. It would seem that Arizona, Colorado, Florida, New Mexico, and to some extent California would be the states chiefly affected. The State of Florida did

8. Hoehler, Fred K., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 12.

make a very constructive attempt on its own initiative to suggest a remedy which would be nationwide as well as local in its benefits. This plan will be discussed later.

In this paper the attempt will be made to show through discussion of one hundred transient cases selected from the files of the Pima County Welfare Board what the nature of the problem is in this county, what features of it are peculiar to this locality as a health center, and what features are characteristic of the national problem. The cost to this community of the hundred cases chosen will also be discussed. The cases were selected as illustrating the methods of handling non-resident relief applicants, and the nationwide confusion in residence requirements and settlement laws. The selection, made on this basis, illustrates many different types of case problems, among which the non-resident health-seeker occupies a prominent position.

The very word "transient" as applied to applicants for relief, is based on the existence of settlement laws in determining relief eligibility, and on the concept of residence versus non-residence in community responsibility. It is therefore necessary to consider first the history of this concept, the reasons for its existence, and the present status of settlement laws in the United States.

CHAPTER I

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING SETTLEMENT LAWS AND TRANSIENT RELIEF

Settlement Law History

"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."¹

This definition of the legal term "settlement" is applicable from the earliest time when the term was first used, up to and including its use at present.

"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. --It is when this inference became a guiding principle and was crystalized into law that our problem began."²

Settlement laws as they exist at present in the United States are the direct descendants of similar laws in England, and in fact settlement laws and regulations have not varied greatly since their first inception in that country. T. W. Fowle, in his discussion of English Poor Law, distinguishes four periods in Poor Law history, the first of which ends with the Act of 1601 in the reign of Elizabeth. Dur-

1. Lowe, Robert C., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 20.

2. Hoehler, Fred K., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 10.

ing this first period a man who wandered from his place of birth, which was considered his place of legal residence, was subject to all sorts of punishment including whipping, branding, the pillory, and even hanging, if he became dependent elsewhere.³ In addition to the punishments thus inflicted, a letter V was fastened to the vagrant's chest, and, except where he suffered the death penalty, he was driven out of town by an officer called the "Master and Chief Avoyder and Keeper Oute of this Citie."⁴ As early as 1405 in the reign of Henry IV, a law was passed forbidding the apprenticing of the children of country people in the towns, unless their parents also owned town property, since this would result in a scarcity of field labor. This was not, of course, a settlement law, but represented an attempt to force the laborers, or "the poor," to remain in the localities where they were born.⁵ The further development of the situation is illustrated in the following statement:

"The Reformation was marked in some respects by a return to the old primitive notion of village government, and it seems to have been thought that each parish was an independent community, capable of maintaining its own indigents. But as society advanced, and men, hitherto chained to their own parishes, began to move about in the world, a second principle,--the principle, as it

3. Fowle, T. W., The Poor Law, MacMillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1898, p. 56.

4. Massoth, Leona E., op. cit., p. 291.

5. Fowle, op. cit., p. 56.

may be called, of universal selfishness, by which every other nation, class, city, or even village is regarded as a kind of rival, if not enemy, against which 'protective' measures have to be taken,--began to come into operation. The larger and wealthier parishes, on the one hand, the land-owners on the other, reaped the advantage of the labor of work people, and then devised the law of settlement as an excuse for passing them back to their own parishes in age or sickness."6

The striking parallel between the state of affairs thus described and the state of affairs existing at the present time in the United States will become apparent in this study.

The poor law Act of 1601 whose provisions are now considered so entirely inadequate for meeting our present situation, was an effort to handle the relief problem of the time. With regard to the problem of settlement, however,

"it was taken for granted that a person's right to relief would arise in his birthplace.--Vagabonds were left to the criminal law."7

This state of affairs continued, with some modifications, through the second period of English poor law history, extending to approximately 1760. In 1662 an act was passed which empowered local overseers of the poor and justices to remove any stranger in a parish to his place of legal settlement, within 40 days of his arrival, unless he could give some proof that he would not become a public charge.

"From the very first it was the fruitful parent of fraud, injustice, lavish expenditure, ill-

6. Fowle, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 58.

will, and endless litigation."⁸

This statement could, with equal justice, be applied to our present day county and state settlement laws. In 1685 the above Act was amended so that the 40 days power of removal should start only from the day the non-resident gave notice of his arrival to the Overseer of the Poor, and so this law remained for 110 years, until 1795, when it was again changed so that the 40 days power of removal should start only from the day the non-resident became a public charge, and should take effect then only if he was physically able to travel.⁹ In 1691 an Act was passed permitting "derivative settlement" for the first time, that is, settlement based on certain conditions other than birth. These were the payment of taxes for one year, or serving in an elective office for one year, or employing labor for one year, or apprenticeship.¹⁰

From 1760 to 1834, which may be considered the third period of English poor law history, there took place a great expansion of relief giving, coupled with serious abuses of an endless variety, which were extremely expensive in terms of the taxpayers' pocket books, and in terms of the character and stamina of the relief recipients. The period coincides with the social and economic changes of the Industrial

8. Fowle, op. cit., p. 64.

9. Loc. cit.

10. Loc. cit.

Revolution, and it is the time which is most frequently cited as being similar to our own, in factors of social and economic maladjustment, and of migratory, unemployed labor. It was also the time when the workhouse, as a method of relief giving, reached its peak in English history, and was applied indiscriminately to all indigents, resident and vagrant. An act passed in 1782, providing that Overseers of the Poor should attempt to find work for able-bodied indigents in the vicinity of their own homes, represented a rather feeble attempt to stop transiency.¹¹ But for the transient the workhouse was a measure of temporary relief only, since permanent relief was never given to non-residents, nor was relief ever given by a parish to its own residents after they had moved elsewhere. The transient was expected either to find work or to move on, after one or two nights stay in the local workhouse.¹²

1834 marked the beginning of the fourth period of Poor Law history, with a sweeping reform of the poor laws and of Poor Law Administration. Provision was made for a central Board of Control, with authority over the whole of England, in matters of transient relief as well as all other forms of relief, and the standards of assistance for transients were purposely made so low "as to be such as only the

11. Fowle, op. cit., p. 71.

12. Ibid., p. 84.

destitute will accept."¹³ It was thus hoped that the professional hobo would be discouraged. The provisions for derivative settlement were altered to include residence of one year, if the individual paid the poor taxes; or ownership of real estate, if the individual lived within ten miles of such property. Also children under 16 were to take the residence of their parents, and married women of their husbands.¹⁴ In 1865 a further change was made, which provided that one year of residence in a "Union of Parishes," with no other conditions attached, was all that was necessary to establish residence, and to entitle a person to poor relief.¹⁵ By the end of the Nineteenth Century it was the opinion of English authorities that the area in which relief could be received "should be as large as possible."¹⁶ The basis of this opinion was the conviction that restrictive settlement laws applied to small districts defeated their own purpose, in that they did not help to equalize relief burdens, since some communities avoided responsibility at the expense of others. It also seemed evident that these restrictive laws caused unnecessary hardship to destitute persons who travelled in a sincere attempt to make an economic adjustment. With regard to chronic tramps, it appeared that rigid settlement

13. Fowle, op. cit., p. 97.

14. Loc. cit.

15. Ibid., p. 151.

16. Ibid., p. 150.

laws were no deterrent to continual wandering.

"The difficulty of discrimination between the honest wayfarer and the professional tramp remains as it was and always has been and the warfare of some 600 years between the vagrant and society continues still to be waged to the advantage of the former."¹⁷

This statement may be applied with equal accuracy to the transient relief problem of the present day. Professional beggars reap the benefits of the efforts made to care for those who have a legitimate reason to travel, but settlement restrictions do not serve to check the movement of either group. This seems to have been the opinion on the continent, as well as in England, as at this time the period required for establishing legal settlement in a given locality was one year in France and Belgium, and two years in Germany. In Holland all local residence requirements were abolished and in Sweden a man's residence was considered the place where he last paid the Poll Tax.¹⁸

Meanwhile the old English concept of settlement laws had been carried over to the American colonies. Each colony modified the rule in a slightly different manner to suit its own needs. As new areas were settled and state after state was added to the Union, this process of modification and divergence in settlement laws continued, resulting in the

17. Fowle, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 45-48.

present lack of uniformity. In the early days of American history, before the closing of the Frontier, this situation made no very great difference to the development of the country.

"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."¹⁹

It is easily understood that so long as there was a frontier, and so long as there was, generally speaking, work to be found and land to be had, little attention should be paid to poor laws in general, and settlement laws in particular. The matter was brought up for discussion for the first time in this country by the National Association of Commissioners of Charities and Corrections, now the National Conference of Social Work, in 1870.²⁰

The Present Status of Settlement Laws in the United States

Many pages, and in fact volumes, could be written on the subject of our present laws of legal settlement. However an attempt will be made here simply to point out the

19. Potter, Dr. Ellen C., Minutes of Interstate Conference,
p. 13.
20. Loc. cit.

most outstanding features of the situation. Some states have no settlement laws even now.²¹ Arizona, which used to be in this group, has just joined the ranks of those states which believe in restrictive legislation, with the passage of a three year residence law, to take effect on June 12, 1937. This is the first law ever enacted by the legislature of the State of Arizona imposing residence requirements in the granting of public relief.²²

The chief provisions of the law are as follows:

"Section 1. RESIDENCE OF THREE YEARS.

(a) No Person shall be entitled to direct relief or aid, or to receive employment relief, from any agency supported in whole or in part by the state or any political subdivision thereof, who has not resided continuously in the state for a period of at least three years immediately preceding the date of application for such relief, and in the county in which such application is made for a period of at least six months, provided that nothing herein shall prevent the granting of relief or aid in emergency cases.

"(b) Temporary absence or absences from the state for a total of not to exceed one year during the said three-year period shall not affect the right of any applicant for relief.

"(c) Any person applying to any county board of public welfare or to the board of supervisors for relief shall be required to furnish satisfactory proof of residence in accordance with the requirements of this section.

21. Heisterman, Carl A., "Statutory Provisions Relating to Legal Settlement for Purposes of Poor-Relief," Social Service Review, Vol. VII, No. 1, March, 1933, p. 98, footnote 10.

22. This information was supplied by Mr. Carl R. Tisor, Assistant Secretary to the Pima County Welfare Board.

"Section 2. NOT TO APPLY TO BENEFICIARIES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT. This act shall not apply to persons entitled under any provision of the act of Congress approved August 14, 1935, as amended, known as the social security act, to the benefits or privileges of such act, nor to any law of this state adopted in conformity with the provisions of such act.

"Approved Feb. 25, 1937--(Effective June 12, 1937).²³

It is impossible to foretell what affect this law may have on the number of transient applicants coming into Arizona in the future. The policy here adopted is more liberal than that of some states, in that it allows one year's total absence during the three year period required for establishing residence. Also, the statement that the law is not intended to prevent the granting of relief in emergencies, permits a wide discretion to relief administrators regarding what constitutes an emergency. The question should be considered, however, as to whether any restrictive measures concerning legal settlement will be effective in halting the travel of dependent transients into the state, since the great number and variety of settlement restrictions now in force throughout the United States has not resulted in a cessation of such travel.

The following statement will illustrate the diversity

23. State of Arizona, Thirteenth Legislature, House of Representatives, Regular Session, Chapter 18, House Bill No. 75.

of existing residence rules:

"Some states specify that when a person applies for poor-relief he must have had residence for the prescribed length of time: continuously; or prior to the application; or consecutively; or during successive years; or next preceding the day when he became a public charge or the date of his application for relief; or without interruption."²⁴

Some states have rules as to obtaining settlement, but no rules as to how settlement is lost. In this case, in the event of litigation, the courts do not consider a settlement lost until another has been gained somewhere else, although sometimes they allow two settlements.²⁵

In 1933 the following laws were in effect. In New Jersey settlement could be gained by five years continuous residence, but would be lost by one years continuous absence. In Massachusetts settlement could be gained in five years of continuous residence, and lost by five years of continuous absence. In Minnesota settlement could be gained by one year of continuous residence, and lost by one year of absence with intent to abandon residence in the State of Minnesota. In Indiana willful and uninterrupted absence for one year or more from the place of legal settlement constituted loss of settlement. In South Dakota willful absence from the county of residence for 30 days constituted loss of settlement. In all these instances it was provided that

24. Heisterman, Carl A., op. cit., p. 99.

25. Ibid., p. 95.

settlement could not be gained if relief were accepted during the period prescribed for this purpose.²⁶

Rhode Island had perhaps the most restrictive laws of all. Settlement could be gained in one of three ways: by 10 years residence without public or private aid; by 5 years residence if taxes were paid throughout the entire period; or by 3 years residence if certain income from real estate was obtained throughout the entire period.²⁷ In most eastern states legal settlement actually means settlement within a local political unit rather than within the state. New York and Connecticut, however, provide for "state settlement," that is, certain persons may have settlement in the state without obtaining settlement in any county, or town, and state funds are provided for their relief. In New York, these are persons who have not resided in any county for 60 days during the year preceding application for relief. These persons are called the "State Poor."²⁸ In Connecticut, aliens can never obtain legal settlement in any county or town; therefore, indigent aliens are always "State Poor" and are handled through special state funds. The same applies to American citizens who have been unable to establish local residence prior to application for relief, but in this case such persons always have the opportunity of establish-

26. Heisterman, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

27. Ibid., p. 98.

28. Jacobs, Haskell, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 68.

ing residence if they become self-supporting for a sufficient length of time, whereas aliens never can do so.²⁹

In some states there is more than one system of poor relief administration, and also more than one set of regulations for obtaining legal settlement. That is, in certain parts of a state settlement must be gained in a county, in others in a township, in others in a city.³⁰ In some states it is a "statutory misdemeanor" to bring unsettled indigents into the state.³¹

The California law of 1931 represents perhaps the most liberal attempt to grapple with the problem of providing for adequate settlement regulations. This law holds that one's place of residence is the place where one remains when not called elsewhere for special or temporary purposes, "and to which one returns in seasons of repose." It states that a residence in California cannot be lost until another has been gained elsewhere, and that residence can be changed only "by the union of act and intent."³²

With regard to derivative settlement it is the general rule in most states that a wife takes the settlement of her husband, a legitimate child of his father, and an illegitimate child of his mother.³³

29. Little, Eleanor H., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 60.

30. Lowe, Robert C., Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 21-22.

31. Loc. cit.

32. Heisterman, op. cit., p. 96.

33. Loc. cit.

Most states make provisions for the removal of non-resident indigents and for the recovery of the expenses involved. This latter point is usually no more than an empty statement, since it is unenforceable when the poor person is removed to some other state. But when the transient is travelling within his own state, it is enforceable, and it is generally held that the county of his legal residence is responsible for any relief given him by another county, and for the cost of his return. Thus it is necessary for his county of legal residence to be notified by the county in which the individual first applies for relief, and to authorize his return. In some instances, on the other hand, the financial burden is placed upon the county in which the individual is stranded, which must bear all expenses for temporary relief, and for cost of return. In Arkansas the law states that "each county is responsible for its own poor" without any precise statement as to how this responsibility is to be met. The opposite extreme is to be found in the state of Missouri, where there is a law permitting county courts to give relief at their discretion to any applicant regardless of residence.³⁴ It may be questioned how much they exercise this power.

This very brief description of the multiplicity of settlement laws and of their lack of uniformity may indicate

34. Heisterman, op. cit., pp. 102-107.

why the stranded transient meets with such incredible difficulty when he seeks to obtain relief, and why relief officials all over the country find the problem of non-resident dependents the most thorny and the most distressing of all.

"The transient poor are victims of an interstate and inter-community battle of jealousies and reprisals.--- If asked where they 'come from' they unhesitatingly name a town or a state, with full belief that this is their residence."³⁵

Many of them never heard of settlement laws before they started on the road.³⁶ Furthermore, most states make no provision for the relief of those persons who have lost legal settlement in some locality, and have never gained a new one. This group, which is numerous, has found all avenues of relief closed to them since, during the last eight years of economic depression, most of them have been unable to support themselves continuously by their own efforts for a long enough time to gain residence in any given state. Even in those states which have had no settlement laws on the statute books, the practice of relief officials has been to require one year's residence, or sometimes six months, on a self-supporting basis, as a rule of relief administration.

35. Bristol, Margaret Cochran, "Transients in Recent Reports," Social Service Review, Vol. X, No. 2, June, 1936, p. 311, quoted from Report of Interstate Conference on Transients and Settlement Laws, Trenton, New Jersey, March 6-7, 1936 (Introduction, p. 1).

36. Loc. cit.

"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 non-resident."³⁷

In most localities the public agencies have refused to recognize any responsibility on their part towards indigent transients.³⁸ The acute distress thus caused has been extremely serious.

"Respectable and sensitive human beings have been subjected to indignities which we do not permit our dumb animals to suffer."³⁹

It must be born in mind, however, that, in the absence of any provision for these persons on the part of the Federal Government or at least of State Governments, local welfare agencies are put in the position of being obliged to resist the demands of the migratory population at all costs, because the financial burden is too great for these local agencies to shoulder. This is especially true in Pima County, where the proportion of migrants is far greater than in most communities, due to the health features of the area. The terrific pressure placed upon the Pima County Welfare Board by this group will be apparent in the discussion of the transient cases which follows. Furthermore, in this

37. Greenstein, Harry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 75.

38. Massoth, Leona E., op. cit., p. 291.

39. Hoehler, Fred K., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 11.

county funds are available from the State relief appropriations for the temporary care and return to place of legal residence of sick and destitute transients. This is not the case in all counties in the United States.⁴⁰ Also, in Pima County, it is possible to extend temporary aid to persons who have no legal residence, if they are too ill to travel, or to work.

The Transportation Agreement

It is important to mention at this point the policy followed by private welfare agencies for years in the handling of transportation for dependents. This policy is embodied in the Transportation Agreement of the Society of Family Welfare Associations of America, which reads as follows:

"Before any transportation shall be provided, the agency considering it shall be satisfied by adequate and reliable evidence that:

- 1) The prospects of the applicant in opportunities for normal living are not decreased by sending him to the proposed destination.
- 2) The applicant
 - a) Will have such resources for maintenance at the point of destination as will save him from becoming dependent on relief from an agency, public or private, or
 - b) Is a proper charge upon the agencies there, or
 - c) Has legal residence there.
- 3) Reasonable effort has been made to obtain from an appropriate agency at the proposed destination a report as to the facts in Rules 1) and 2)."

40. See discussion of State of Virginia, p. 128.

This agreement provided a simple and on the whole satisfactory method for dealing with the transient problem before it assumed the proportions to which it has grown in the past eight years. Under this agreement, an agency would not send a dependent to any community without first finding out if he was a proper charge of the community, either on public or private funds, and also the welfare of the individual had to be considered in whatever plans were made. Most private agencies and many public agencies were parties to this agreement, and still are, but unfortunately it has been found that a mere agreement of this nature between agencies is not strong enough or binding enough to keep pace with the growth of the problem. Too many political units have become involved, both large and small, which are either ignorant of the usual welfare practices, or cannot afford the personnel necessary to carry out the investigations involved, though most individual relief workers are aware of the Agreement and its implications. Often the sheer numbers of people on the road have made it impossible to carry out the careful investigations and planning required. Nevertheless, a closer adherence to the transportation agreement on the part of agencies scattered all over the country would have spared Pima County some of its worst problems in the past year and a half, and would also have spared many non-resident health-seekers here very serious distress.

The Federal Transient Program

As previously stated, the cases selected for study in this paper are cases which became a responsibility of the Pima County Welfare Board after the close of the Federal Transient Service in August, 1935. The Federal Transient Service presented a unique attempt to grapple with the problem of the migratory population, and this specialized effort cannot be discussed at length here. A picture of the present situation would not be complete, however, without mention of this attempt to cut through all settlement laws by launching a relief system for transients entirely financed by the Federal Government. "During a two year period the 'man without a State' was not permitted to become 'a man without a country.'⁴¹ The Federal Transient Service had both strength and weakness from which knowledge was gained which might be used to advantage in the future, but with the complete cessation of Federal interest and the complete withdrawal of Federal funds almost nothing that had been learned could be put into effect.

"The objectives of the Federal Transient Program were threefold. They were first, to relieve the community of the immediate problem of care of the transients; second, to check the migration of dependent persons; third, to reestablish or to integrate the transient in whatever community it was believed he could most easily adjust."⁴²

41. Potter, Dr. Ellen C., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 14.

42. Greenstein, Harry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 76.

The first objective was obviously accomplished, since the Federal Government assumed the full cost of the program. The second was never attained, partly because of the confusion in settlement laws, partly because the Transient service proved to be a temptation to unemployed persons to wander over the country, since they were sure of adequate care at every transient service center. But if the complications of the settlement laws had not been such an obstacle to the quick return of those on the road to their legal residence, it is unlikely that the temptation to move about would have been so great. The third objective, that of rehabilitation of the transients, could not be accomplished because of depressed economic conditions and the lack of private employment.⁴³

In one respect the Transient Service did make a contribution, and this was its classification of sick transients into disease groups. The classification was not carried out into great detail, but it was especially beneficial in the Southwest where tuberculous patients in particular were given the best medical care available, as well as adequate facilities for rest and treatment. Dr. H. E. Kleinschmidt, Director of Health Education of the National Tuberculosis Association in New York, believes that the Federal Government

"should continue to assume responsibility for the

43. Greenstein, Harry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 76.

care of indigent tuberculous persons who are not residents of the states in which they are and who cannot well be returned to their point of origin."⁴⁴

It will be seen that the diversity of medical opinion on the treatment of tuberculous patients, the lack of funds to support an adequate public health program for such patients as are destitute, and the lack of responsible advice on the part of doctors, is the cause of the most difficult non-resident situation which Pima County has to meet.

It would seem, therefore, that the chief constructive contribution of the Federal Transient Program was in the field of public health. Its public health activities were distinctly beneficial and it also showed the necessity for additional, permanent health measures and for additional institutional care throughout the country.⁴⁵

When the service closed down the transients then under care were transferred to the local agencies with the understanding that those for whom any program of rehabilitation had been undertaken, based on their remaining in the new locality, were to be accepted as resident relief cases by the local agencies. In Pima County this group consisted chiefly of medical cases and a small number of persons who had had no residence anywhere before the Transient Service

44. Kleinschmidt, Dr. H. E., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 32.

45. Alspach, Charles H., Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 18-19.

established them in this county. All other cases could be returned to their place of legal residence by the county. In other words, the county took over the existing relief program of the Transient Service cases then under care, in such a way as to work the least possible hardship on the individuals concerned. As to what the local agencies should do for future transients, the Federal Government had no suggestions to make. Actually every state had added its quota to the number of individuals on the road, yet every state resented the transients from other states within its borders at that time. The Federal Transient Service had cared for as many as 300,460 cases in one month (February 1935), and the usual total monthly case load ran at about 200,000.⁴⁶

The Transient Problem in Pima County

Although the State of Arizona had no settlement law in August, 1935, when the Federal Transient Service closed, Pima County had a ruling as to settlement within the county. An ordinance was passed by the County Board of Supervisors on February 12, 1935, which stated that:

"Before any person or persons shall be entitled to receive any public aid from the Pima County Welfare Board by reason of funds allotted to it by the Board of Supervisors of Pima County, Arizona, or by private subscriptions, that such person or persons shall first have resided within the County

46. Potter, Dr. Ellen C., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 14.

of Pima for a period of two years prior to the time of making application for public aid or relief, and provided, further, that said person or persons shall not have received during said two years any public or private aid from any source or sources whatsoever."

In November, 1936, the Board of Supervisors raised the time requirement to three years. When the new state law takes effect on June 12, 1937,⁴⁷ the present Pima County Ordinance will cease to be effective, since the County will then function under the new statute. In August, 1935, however, with its policy thus determined by the existing county law, and with \$1000 a month allowed by the State Welfare Board for the temporary care and return of destitute non-residents, Pima County faced the transient problem, and the never-ending stream of non-resident health-seekers who applied for assistance. The number of applicants investigated during the year from March 1st, 1936, to March 1st, 1937, was 496.⁴⁸

The policies adopted by the Pima County Welfare Board were based chiefly on the principles of the Transportation Agreement and on the policies which had been followed by the Federal Transient Service. That is, after the application of a non-resident for relief, the agency proposed to verify residence if possible, and to return the applicant,

47. See pp. 14-15, supra.

48. Information obtained from monthly summaries of transient case load, Pima County Welfare Board. See Appendix, Table IX, p. 152, footnote.

if authorization were received, at its own expense. Non-residents whose transportation to this county had been paid by an agency elsewhere, without authorization from the Pima County Welfare Board, and for whom no regular allowance for maintenance was made, were to be returned without regard to authorization wherever such a situation could be proved, and request for re-imbusement was to be made for all expenses incurred.

The only applicants to be considered for relief were to be persons who were declared physically unable to travel by the county doctor. The result of this has been that from five to ten transient persons a day have applied to the county clinic for emergency medical assistance but have not become charges of the Pima County Welfare Board. The latter investigates a case only on the recommendation of the county doctor. Furthermore, no applicants were to be removed from the county unless they were declared physically able to travel by the county doctor.

When the transient applicants arrived in automobiles, these were to be turned over to the Pima County Welfare Board, this being a procedure which had been followed by the Federal Transient Service, for the purpose of preventing further casual migration of persons who had received emergency relief, and for whom plans for return to the place of legal settlement were being made. Whenever possible, the

personal possessions of non-resident applicants were to be turned over to the Pima County Welfare Board to help defray the cost of the assistance granted them. These policies have been adhered to since August, 1935.

The one hundred problem cases selected for this study illustrate the outstanding features of the situation in this county. These are the general confusion over settlement laws; the immense difficulties of relief giving under these circumstances; the impossibility of adequate investigation, especially in view of the lack of cooperation of many agencies all over the country; the pressure from all parts of the United States exerted upon this particular county to care for non-resident, destitute health seekers; and last but not least the great suffering endured by the applicants themselves because of this situation. The cases were selected by the local authorities in Pima County as illustrations of these problems, without specific regard to the proportionate relationship of these cases to the total Pima County transient load. The purpose of this was to show the nature and severity of the problems the county must deal with. Therefore, the 100 cases under discussion are not a sample, in numerical terms, of the Pima County transient load. They simply illustrate the difficulties faced by the county in its administration of transient relief.

The applicants will be grouped according to their reasons

for coming to Pima County. In most of the cases selected the applicant had a very definite objective in mind. But the point of emphasis for the present analysis is whether the applicants came with the specific advice and assistance of persons at their point of origin, or whether they came without any such advice, or pressure, or against advice. The purpose of this method of classification is to indicate the sources causing the migration of non-residents into Pima County. Thus the problems causing dependency in the cases studied, that is, ill health, unemployment, emotional maladjustment, etc., will be given secondary consideration, while primary emphasis will be laid upon the factors which brought about the decision to move to Pima County. Of the hundred cases under discussion, 15 were definitely sent by relief organizations or other officials, 5 came against advice, 21 came on the advice of doctors or friends, and 59 came without any specific or traceable stimulus of this nature.

In computing the cost of the cases to the community all expenses posted have been included. Also, in some cases where hospital bills were not assumed by the Pima County Welfare Board, such bills when they remained unpaid have nevertheless been included as costs to the community. Since the County does not analyze its free clinic care and free home visits by the county doctor, in terms of cost per pa-

tient, no figures could be obtained nor estimates made of the expense involved in extending these services to the cases studied. Where medical expenses are recorded, therefore, in this paper, they indicate medical relief granted in addition to these services. The cost of telegraphic service for non-resident applicants is not posted according to the individual cases, but the total monthly expenditure of county funds on this item for the non-resident group runs between \$30 and \$40 a month.⁴⁹ However, the amount of this expense cannot be estimated for the individual cases to be discussed here.

It is necessary to explain certain terms as they are used in this study. The words "applicant" and "case" refer to either individuals or family groups who have applied for relief, that is, to the unit, consisting of one or more persons, considered as one application by the Pima County Welfare Board. Applicants are classified as tuberculosis patients whenever it was stated in the case record that they or members of their families were suffering from this disease, regardless of what other illnesses they might also have had. The relief granted to applicants is listed as general or emergency relief, medical relief, and cost of transportation. General or emergency relief includes food, shelter, clothing,

49. This information was supplied by Miss Elizabeth Beach, Supervisor of Intake Department, Pima County Welfare Board.

and miscellaneous expenses of a case. Medical relief includes hospital care, rest home care, ambulance fees, where these are not mentioned separately, medicines, and laboratory services. In some of the case records, hospitalization has been mentioned of which no financial record was found. These instances are noted as they occur. County burial has been listed separately. Cost of transportation is self-explanatory.

CHAPTER II

APPLICANTS SENT TO PIMA COUNTY BY RELIEF OR OTHER OFFICIALS¹

Applicants Sent by Relief Officials

Of the fifteen cases in this group the first six illustrate situations in which officials charged with the administration of relief were directly responsible for the arrival of non-resident dependents in Pima County. Five of these will be discussed in detail.

The Jonathan L. family² arrived in Tucson October 30, 1936, and applied for relief on November 21, 1936. Mrs. L. called at the office with a note written in pencil on a small bit of paper which read as follows:

"Mrs. L, you will not receive more checks until after December 10 as the Board meets at that time. However I am asking the Board at that time to send you checks every month thereafter. Hope you are getting along and trust you will all improve."
Signed "M."³

Mr. L had tuberculosis. Mrs. L explained that "M" was both a county supervisor and also Superintendent of Relief in Carthage, Illinois, that the county doctor there had advised

-
1. See Appendix, p. 144, for table of miscellaneous data regarding this group.
 2. All names used in this study have been changed so as to prevent identification of the applicants.
 3. Quoted from case record.

the family to come to Arizona because of Mr. L's health, and that the Relief Superintendent had promised to send them a check of \$25 a month, beginning December 10th. The only means she had of proving this was the small pencilled note. "M" had made no inquiries as to the minimum funds necessary for the family to live on and for Mr. L to have necessary treatment after their arrival here, nor did he evidently consider how they were to subsist before December 10th. The Pima County Welfare Board telegraphed for verification of residence, and received the reply that the family were legal residents of Carthage, Illinois, but that the Board of Supervisors were sending a \$20 check at once. This was entirely inadequate for the family's needs. The Pima County doctor stated that

"Mr. L had a far advanced case of T.B. and has small chance of recovery. The children were underweight and ran temperatures daily. Dr. X requested that the family be given special attention."⁴

Since the county officials in Illinois sent no further funds, the family was returned to its place of origin on December 15, 1936. The cost to Pima County was \$56.06 for transportation, \$17.98 for general relief, and \$1.00 for medical relief, total \$75.04. The Pima County Welfare Board requested reimbursement of this expense from the home county of the family, but this was never received. In this case

4. Quoted from case record.

the entire expedition was worse than useless for the family.

The case of the George S family is an example of another type of problem of which there are quite a number because of the location of the Veterans' Hospital in Tucson. The Veterans' Administration makes no provision for the care of veterans' wives and families in the vicinity of the hospital, yet, not only veterans themselves, but also relief officials in other parts of the country often expect the Pima County Welfare Board to assume responsibility for these families.

Where the S family originally started from on their travels is unknown to the Pima County Welfare Board. In 1933, however, they arrived in Salt Lake City from Twin Falls, Idaho, where they had apparently not established legal residence before their departure. They had left Twin Falls with the determination to come to Tucson, where Mr. S hoped to be admitted to the Veterans' Hospital as he was suffering from tuberculosis. He had a disability pension of \$30 a month. In Salt Lake City, however, Mr. S became so ill that he had to be hospitalized there, in a veterans' hospital, and Mrs. S applied to the local agency for relief. There were five children in the family and the pension was insufficient for their needs. The local agency wrote to Twin Falls, requesting verification of residence, with the expectation of returning the family. The following passage

is quoted from the reply they received:

"THE AMERICAN RED CROSS
Twin Falls Chapter
Twin Falls, Idaho

December 26, 1933

Salt Lake County Chapter
American Red Cross
Salt Lake City, Utah

RE: S, George

Dear Madam:

Our personal opinion of this case is that it would be much better to send this family on to Tucson, as our hospital in Idaho is not equipped to care for tubercular cases, and according to the mother, Mrs. S has also contracted the disease. We understand that tubercular cases live in tents in Arizona, and here there would be the matter of rent. We would think it would be easier and cheaper for the family to live in Arizona on their thirty dollar pension than here.

Very truly yours,

TWIN FALLS CHAPTER AMERICAN RED CROSS"

From this it is evident that the Twin Falls agency did not consider the matter of legal residence, that they assumed the entire family could live on the \$30 pension in Tucson, without making inquiry in advance as to the cost of living here, and that they did not concern themselves as to whether the family was likely to become a public charge in Tucson.

The agency in Salt Lake City continued giving the family relief until July, 1935, and meanwhile Mr. S was transferred to the Tucson Veterans' Hospital. In the summer of 1935 he sent word to his family that he was much improved

and expected to be discharged shortly, whereupon Mrs. S requested the Salt Lake City agency to arrange for the transfer of herself and her children to Tucson and for their care by the Tucson agency. Salt Lake City made the necessary inquiries, and were told that Mr. S was not well enough for discharge from the hospital and that, because of the Pima County residence rule, and because of the lack of funds and the many demands, there was no way that the S family could receive relief in Tucson. Salt Lake City persisted in its effort with the following letter:

"SOCIAL SERVICE DIVISION
SALT LAKE COUNTY
EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION
2236 Highland Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah

September 25, 1935

Pima County Welfare Board
152 Church Street
Tucson, Arizona

RE: S, George

My Dear Miss ____:

Please refer to previous correspondence on this case. We are asking you to review your decision on this case, as we feel there is a social problem to be considered.

When informed of your reply to our letter, Mrs. S was discouraged, and feels that she should be permitted to be near her husband, as she needs his advice and assistance in caring for the children.

We believe it would greatly ease Mrs. S's mind if we could secure your permission to have her join Mr. S in Tucson. It is not our intention to have the children with Mr. S but it would be of great

value to them to secure their father's advice and friendship.

Mrs. S has no friends or relatives here on whom she can depend, and is suffering mentally due to this separation.

Mrs. S informed us that Mr. S had informed her in his last letter that he was planning to contact a Mrs. Greenway, (a Congress woman living in your community) in their behalf.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, and for an early reply, we are,

Very truly yours,

"

This letter illustrates in a very marked manner various misconceptions under which some public relief officials labor. The social problem presented by this family was undoubtedly very serious from the point of view of the family's welfare; nevertheless, no local relief funds are large enough in a small city such as this to undertake any problems of persons not already members of the community. Also the Salt Lake Agency had been caring for the family for nearly two years, which fact alone would indicate an acceptance of responsibility on their part. Lastly it was poor policy from every point of view, including that of the family's welfare, to attempt to force the burden upon the shoulders of the Tucson agency through threat of political influence, even if such influence could have been obtained.

The reply of the Pima County Welfare Board to this letter explains the position of the agency in a most convincing

way:

"PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD
152 N. Church Street
Tucson, Arizona

October 5, 1935

Emergency Relief Administration,
2236 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.

RE: S, George

My Dear Mrs. _____:

We have received your letter of September 25, 1935, regarding the S Family, and we thoroughly appreciate the social situation which is involved, and your desire that the children should have the privilege of some contact with their father as well as their mother, especially since he is in such questionable health, and may not live long.

If this were only one of half a dozen or a dozen such requests, we should be glad to cooperate with you in allowing this family to come to Tucson. Our agency, however, receives such requests almost every day of the month from all the States in the Union, and since our county cannot possibly afford to take over the relief in these families, we are forced to refuse. We are pressed for funds in giving adequate relief to our own resident families, and at present do not even see how we can assume the families which have been under Transient care so long that they have lost residence in other States.

Where a county or local relief organization of another state will assume the responsibility of relief for families or individuals which they wish to send here, we are able to offer the service needed in such cases, but when such local agencies or organizations have been unable to continue financing the relief necessary, we have been obligated to return the families to their own counties.

We trust that some day the Federal Government will be able to assist States in removing some of the legal settlement barriers which are now causing

hardship in so many cases. For the present, however, this county can not assume responsibility for the large number of families who wish to join their relatives who are ill in Tucson.

Very sincerely yours,

PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD"

The matter did not end here. In November, 1935, Salt Lake City wrote that Mrs. S had started for Oklahoma, where she hoped to make her home with her father, but was travelling via Tucson. She had undertaken the trip against all advice, in fact against "orders," and was using her own funds. As soon as she arrived in Tucson, with her children, she applied for relief, which was refused. It is not known how the family managed to live during the winter, but in June 1936 Mr. S received his bonus, and the family immediately invested all of it in real estate, still believing that Mr. S would get well and thinking they could establish themselves permanently in Tucson. On August 1st, 1936, Mr. S died. Private individuals in Tucson became interested in the case and requested the Pima County Welfare Board to care for the family, although the Pima County residence requirement had not yet been met by them. The Welfare Board therefore wrote to Oklahoma to see if Mrs. S's father could support her, and found this would be impossible, and that Mrs. S did not have legal residence in Oklahoma, so it was decided to send the family back to Twin Falls, even though Twin Falls sent word that the family had no legal residence

there, and that no aid would be obtainable, thus indicating that they would accept no responsibility for the family's presence in Tucson. Meanwhile, the Pima County Welfare Board gave temporary relief pending the settlement of Mr. S's estate, which consisted only of the property bought with his bonus. The case is not yet concluded, but the Pima County Welfare Board hopes to prevail upon Mrs. S to sell the property as soon as possible, after which she will have to live on the proceeds for two years, and on whatever work she may get, if she wishes to qualify for further relief in Pima County. Mrs. S has adopted a very resentful attitude and she feels that she is being hounded and interfered with by relief officials. Nevertheless, she has not hesitated to make use of welfare agencies whenever the necessity arose in accordance with her own opinion of what was best for her family, with complete disregard of welfare regulations. It is almost impossible in such a situation for the welfare agency to protect its funds and follow its established policies. The S case has cost the Pima County Welfare Board only \$15.49 in cash, but in terms of the case workers' time and effort the cost has been very great.

The case of Mr. Thomas G is an illustration of the extreme persistence with which relief officers have sometimes attempted to force the care of a tuberculous patient upon the Pima County Welfare Board. Mr. G was in the

Nogales Federal Transient camp under care for tuberculosis in 1934 and 1935 before the close of the Transient Service. He had been returned to his residence in Louisiana in February, 1935, but was re-admitted to the transient camp two months later. During the summer of that year he left the camp to take a job, which he found he was not well enough to hold. So in November, 1935, he applied to the Pima County Welfare Board for assistance, the Federal Transient Service then being closed. The Pima Agency returned him, for the second time, to his residence in Louisiana. In April, 1936, his home county in Louisiana wrote to the Pima County Welfare Board announcing that Mr. G was returning to Arizona for his health.

"ASSUMPTION WELFARE
Parish of Assumption
Napoleonville, La.

April 20, 1936

Organized Charities of Tucson, Inc.
and Pima Co. Welfare Board,
152 North Church Street,
Pima County, Arizona

RE: G, Thomas

Our client, Thomas G, is very anxious to return to Arizona. He has an active case of tuberculosis, and his condition is rapidly growing worse. After spending eleven months in the Charity Hospital in New Orleans without results, he tells us that in June, 1934, he was admitted to the Federal Emergency Hospital in Nogales. We have several communications from the hospital while he was undergoing treatment as his family resides here, in Assumption Parish.

.....

Our client and his brother are planning to

return to Arizona in a few days. Thomas's transportation will be provided, but Carl will hitchhike, so he will start a few days before Thomas so as to be there when he arrives.

Carl feels sure that he will be able to get some employment there so as to provide for his brother.

.....

In the event that Carl cannot secure employment immediately is there any agency that could help Thomas temporarily until they can become established, as their funds are very limited? Are there any transient camps where shelter can be provided? We are reluctant about having him leave without any definite place to go or definite plans made, but his health is so rapidly declining here that nothing we can do or say will make him change his plans. We have tried to persuade him to go to a hospital, but he feels that if he could only get to Arizona he will improve, as the climate alone, without treatment of any kind, makes him feel like a different person. Each time he has gone to Arizona he has gained weight, and as soon as he returns to Louisiana he loses everything he has gained. . . . If your rules and regulations do not permit you to give material assistance to our clients, any service you can otherwise render them will be greatly appreciated.

Please let us have an answer immediately as we would like to be able to have some plans for our clients before they leave.

Thanking you for your cooperation, I am,

Very truly yours,

"

It will be noted that although the Louisiana agency stated that they could not dissuade Mr. G from making the trip, nevertheless they also implied that they were providing his transportation, which is contrary to the Transportation

Agreement as well as being contrary to good relief practice. The telegram from the Tucson agency, which follows, presents a very clear statement of the problem, and points out the folly of sending destitute persons into the Arizona climate without provision for food and shelter.

"NIGHT LETTER

APRIL 25, 1936

ASSUMPTION WELFARE
PARISH OF ASSUMPTION
NAPOLEONVILLE, LA.

POSITIVELY NO POSSIBILITY OF ANY AID FOR THOMAS G
STOP ALL TRANSIENT CAMPS IN ARIZONA CLOSED NO
FURTHER AID AVAILABLE THROUGH ANY SOURCE STOP COUNTY
REQUIRES TWO YEARS CONTINUOUS RESIDENCE WITHOUT
RECEIVING RELIEF STOP URGE YOU KEEP THIS MAN HOME
AS HE WOULD UNDOUBTEDLY SUFFER FROM WANT STOP
NO WORK AVAILABLE FOR NON RESIDENTS OF ARIZONA
BECAUSE WPA CUTTING DOWN ROLLS THROWING SURPLUS
WORKERS ON MARKET SITUATION VERY BAD WE POSITIVELY
WILL NOT GIVE ANY RELIEF TO THOMAS G HAVING RE-
TURNED HIM PREVIOUSLY NO LOCAL AGENCIES IN THIS
PART OF COUNTRY GIVING RELIEF TO TRANSIENTS STOP
CLIMATE WILL NOT RESTORE HEALTH WITHOUT FOOD AND
SHELTER AND THIS IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR INDIGENT
SICK NON RESIDENTS

PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD"

Mr. G evidently did not make the trip at that time, but he applied in person to the Pima County Welfare Board in September, 1936, stating that his fare had been paid personally by two Louisiana Social Workers. This statement was never verified, but the outcome of the situation was that Mr. G was returned to Louisiana, again, although this time the Louisiana agency re-imbursed the Pima County Welfare Board for the cost of his transportation and relief to the

extent of \$50. The net cost of Mr. G's care, therefore, to the Tucson agency was \$54.89, including fourteen days of rest home care. It was undoubtedly the client himself who was most insistent upon residing in Arizona.

The fact that relief agencies often feel no financial responsibility for their clients whenever they send them away from their own localities is strikingly shown in the case of Mr. Paul A and his family, which consisted of his wife, and two grown sons, one of whom, Charles, was seriously ill with tuberculosis. It was because of this son's health that the family came to Arizona, in September, 1934, equipped with the following documents:

MOTLEY COUNTY)
STATE OF TEXAS)

TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN:

This is to certify that I have recommended to the Hon. _____, County Judge of Motley County, Texas, and the Honorable Commissioners Court of said county, that Charles A of Matador, Texas, an indigent case, pulmonary tubercular be sent to a more suitable climate, in view of the fact that the said Charles A, on account of his advanced tubercular conditions has been denied institutional treatment in our tubercular hospital.

The said Charles A underwent a drainage operation of the left plural cavity about two years ago. The Patient improved for about six months. The patient's condition has not improved in the past six months. In view of the fact that our climate is subject to such rapid and severe changes, I have advised a change to the southwest, namely southern New Mexico or Southern Arizona, and that his parents who have had constant care of him should accompany him for the reason that they are experienced in the proper manner of caring for said patient.

Witness my hand at Matador, Texas, this the 19th day of Sept., A.D., 1934.

Signed

County Health Officer
Motley County, Texas

Subscribed and sworn to before me, by _____,
this the 19th day of September, A. D., 1934.

Signed

Notary Public in and for
Motley County, Texas"

"Motley County Relief Board
Matador, Texas

TO WHOM THIS MAY CONCERN:

In regards to Paul A and family.

This family has been on the Motley County Relief Rolls at Matador, for the past two years. The father is unable to work, but the older boy is able to work.

This family has been advised to go to Arizona for their health and for their son Charles, who has been bedfast for the past few years. In order to save or try to save this boy's life they are on their way to Arizona.

We would like for you to assist this family in finding employment or helping in any way with their needs. If there is anything regarding this family you want to know do not fail to write this office.

Social Casework Supervisor
Matador, Texas"

Upon arrival in Tucson, the A's evidently made immediate application to the Federal Transient Service for relief. Although the Transient Service was established to extend relief to non-residents, nevertheless it was contrary to the

Federal policy to open the doors wide to persons who were shown to be the responsibility of regular relief agencies elsewhere. The Transient Department, therefore, sent the following telegram and received the following reply:

"MOTLEY COUNTY RELIEF BOARD
MATADOR, TEXAS

CANNOT ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY PAUL A AND FAMILY EXCEPT AS EMERGENCY MEASURE STOP OUR ONLY ALTERNATIVE TO RETURN TO PLACE OF LEGAL RESIDENCE UNLESS YOUR COUNTY WISHES TO ASSUME EXPENSES OF RELIEF PLAN WHILE HERE STOP WHY IS CHARLES DENIED INSTITUTIONAL TREATMENT YOUR TUBERCULAR HOSPITAL WIRE INSTRUCTIONS GOVT COLLECT.

ARIZONA WELFARE BOARD TRANSIENT DEPT"

10/4/34

"TRANSIENT BUREAU
TUCSON ARIZONA

10-6-1934

NO APPLICATION MADE FOR CHARLES A IN TEXAS HOSPITAL HEALTH OFFICER ADVISED SUCH ACTION USELESS DUE TO CONDITION OF PATIENT STOP COUNTY REFUSES TO PAY ANY EXPENSES.

MATADOR, TEXAS"

No relief was given the family, but one son obtained employment irregularly which evidently carried the family through the winter. In April, 1935, they re-applied to the Transient Service, and were accepted for reasons which are not stated in the record; therefore, they were transferred to the County when the Service closed in August of that year. The family have consistently refused to consider returning to Texas both at that time and ever since. Nevertheless, in November, 1935, the Pima County agency made an effort to

obtain authorization for their return through correspondence with the Texas State Relief office at Austin. The latter communicated with the local agency at Matador, Texas, by the following letter, a copy of which was sent to Pima County.

"November 26, 1935

Motley County Relief Board
Matador, Texas

RE: A. Paul

Dear _____:

The enclosed appears to indicate that a Motley County family was transported to Arizona on advice of the family physician and without contact with Arizona authorities. This seems to have been done with the knowledge of the county officials.

It is usual because of a transportation agreement among Social Workers that a family likely to become dependent will not be sent to another state or county unless permission is received from them or unless some provision is made for the maintenance of the family in their new surroundings.

(The Transportation Agreement was quoted here in full.)

In view of the above it does not appear to have been complied with. We ask that you look into this matter immediately and give Arizona the necessary authorization for the return of the family to Motley County.

We are aware that such mistakes are made because those dealing with the unfortunates, thinking mainly in terms of the family benefits, especially in regards to health, lose sight of the responsibility that is being placed upon those who have no call to assume it.

Assuring you of our cooperation at all times.

Yours very truly,

Texas Transient Bureau
Littlefield Building
Austin, Texas"

It appears that the Matador relief agency took no action whatever in spite of the attitude expressed by their own State Welfare office. No situation could show more clearly than this the lack of coordination, lack of central control, and absence of uniform policy which exists not only in Texas but in many other states in matters of relief. When a State department cannot direct the activities of counties the relief applicants are bound to be victimized, and sometimes, as in this case, other agencies as well.

In December, 1935, the Pima County Welfare Board tried once more, through the State Welfare Board at Phoenix, to obtain some action on this case. The State Welfare Board made the following comment about this case to the Pima County Welfare Board.

ARIZONA BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE
407 Heard Building
Phoenix, Arizona

December 4, 1935

Pima County Welfare Board
Tucson, Arizona

RE: A, Charles

My Dear _____:

I think you are absolutely right in your attitude towards this case. I am writing to . . . the Child Welfare Division of the State Board of Control, Austin, Texas, and presenting the case to them.

Of course I see no good reason for allowing these people to stay here. The only thing that the people of Motley County, Texas, would understand would be to return the family to them without their permission. I do not see that we are

obligated to obtain permission from any county that has done what this county has done.

Yours very sincerely,

"

Later the Phoenix office forwarded the reply they had received from Texas, which included the following passage:

"STATE BOARD OF CONTROL
Austin, Texas

December 10, 1935

Arizona Board of Public Welfare
Phoenix, Arizona

RE: Charles A
Motley County, Texas

My Dear _____:

I am referring your letter to the Secretary of the Board of Control for his attention. I assure you that we will do all we can to assume our own responsibility in this matter. We shall call the attention of the County Judge to this case immediately.

Very sincerely yours,

Division of Child Welfare
State Board of Control"

This again shows the extreme difficulty at the present time of enforcing statewide policies which would be in accordance with just and efficient relief practices.

Pima County would have returned this family to Texas, even though no formal authorization for return was ever received and no action ever resulted from the above correspondence, if the family had been willing to go. However,

the family repeatedly refused. Because of this very little relief has been given, and though both sons now have active tuberculosis, and neither Mr. nor Mrs. A is able to work, the son who is least ill has obtained irregular employment which appears to have kept the family going. In February, 1937, the family again applied to the Pima County Welfare Board and since they were still unwilling to return to Texas, and had not yet established residence in Pima County, nothing could be done for them. The total relief extended to this family by Pima County was \$12.05.

The case of the James B Family is another example of most astonishing failure on the part of local relief officers to recognize responsibility. This family, consisting of Mr. and Mrs. B and two children, four years and six months old respectively, arrived in Tucson in December, 1936, and applied for relief shortly afterwards. Mrs. B stated that

"on November 30, 1936, Miss X, caseworker of the relief office at Golconda, Illinois, purchased bus tickets for the family and sent them to Arizona. Mrs. B further states that Dr. Y of Harrisburg, Illinois; Dr. Z of Rosiclear, Illinois; Dr. S of Elizabethtown, Illinois; and Dr. P of Golconda 'ordered' the family to come to Arizona because Mr. B has tuberculosis."⁵

The Pima County Welfare Board verified the fact that the Pope County Relief Commission in Illinois had authorized the purchase of charity-rate bus tickets for the B family.

5. Quoted from case record.

"When Mrs. B applied for aid, she was almost ill from worry. She stated that the family must stay in Tucson since it was a matter of life and death to her husband. Emergency medical attention and groceries were given and the family was persuaded to return to their home."⁶

The Pima County Welfare Board corresponded with Phoenix regarding this case, and upon inquiry the Phoenix office received a letter from the Illinois state office, February 11, 1937, containing the following statement:

"Thank you for calling our attention to the fact that Illinois authorities sent this dependent family to Arizona, without proper regard to the Transportation Agreement."

Once again the difficulty of coordinating local policies into a uniform state policy is evident. The Pima County Welfare Board returned the family to their home county, at a cost of \$64.24, having given general relief to the amount of \$3.96 and medical relief to the amount of \$2.75, total \$70.95. In accordance with its policy of requesting reimbursement for expenses on cases where the home agency has thus sent the client to Arizona, the Pima County Welfare Board made such a request of Golconda and received the following reply:

"ILLINOIS AND POPE COUNTY RELIEF COMMISSION
Pope County Agency
GOLCONDA, ILLINOIS

March 29, 1937.

Pima County Welfare Board,
Emergency Relief Administration
Tucson, Arizona

RE: B. James

6. Quoted from case record.

In reply to your letter of February 24th, and March 24th, requesting reimbursement in amount of \$64.24, cost of transporting family back to Pope County.

We beg to advise that it is impossible for us to reimburse you on this case, as we did not authorize the return of this family, who assured us at the time they left Golconda that they would not return to Golconda.

We are sorry about this but our commission will not authorize payment of this account.

Yours truly,

Pope County Relief Commission"

The agency stated that they had not authorized return of the family, but the Pima County Welfare Board sent them home after having discovered that Pope County had bought their tickets to Arizona. It will be noted, however, that in the letter just quoted, no mention is made of the legal residence of this family, nor of Pope County's responsibility in the situation, nor of the Transportation Agreement. And for the relief officer to say that a dependant family had assured the agency when they left that they would not return is surely the most surprising statement of all, for it would seem that a relief officer should understand better than anyone, that dependant families are not in a position to give assurance regarding their future activities.

Mr. Vincent R of Allen County, Ohio, was employed in a steady job when he developed tuberculosis. His company sent him to a doctor who advised him that he must move to

Tucson, Arizona, at all costs as he could not expect recovery at home. He had a wife and five children. Mr. R was very reluctant to take this step as he felt it would involve a great sacrifice on his part and use up his savings. He did not want to leave home and evidently felt that some way out of his difficulty might be found there. However, he consulted the local welfare board, where he had previously received relief, and finally decided to follow the doctor's advice. He had an insurance policy on which he took a \$400 cash settlement, and he sold his furniture on the installment basis. These two items were sufficient to pay for the trip, made in a second hand automobile, and to support the family in Tucson from May, 1935, to March, 1936, when the last installment on the furniture was paid. Mr. R was then obliged to apply to the Pima County Welfare Board for help. The agency requested verification of residence and authorization for return from Allen County, Ohio, and received the following reply:

"Lima, Ohio
March 16, 1936

Intake Department
Pima County Welfare Board
Tucson, Arizona

RE: R. Vincent
and family

Dear _____:

We do verify the legal residence of the above-named family in Allen County, but we regret very much if it will be necessary for the family to return here. Mr. R was in the Tuberculosis Hospital for several months before the family finally went to Arizona. Shortly before they left town, they

had a fire in their home, which ruined quite a bit of their furniture and clothing. The family was receiving relief from the FERA at that time. Mrs. R was quite worried and discouraged over her husband's health, and the possibility of the children's potentiality to tuberculosis.

If the family were to return to Allen County, they apparently would have no alternative other than to receive relief from the County Welfare. The funds are so limited that the maximum amount they could receive would be approximately \$15.00 every two weeks for groceries and one-half ton of coal per month. The R's would have to find a house to live in and make arrangements to pay their rent; the Relief Agency has no money for rental allowance; no money for clothing, and a very limited amount for medical care.

If it is at all possible for you to keep the family out there, it would surely be the best plan for them. Even if the amount of relief they were to receive from you would be no more than our allowance here, the benefit derived by Mr. R from the climate would be of untold value.

It would certainly be a grave responsibility for you to return this particular family and we ask you to weigh the consequences very carefully before arriving at any decision. Their situation in Lima would be very insecure and a direct handicap to recovery for Mr. R. If we are to hope for any rehabilitation for this family, we must first recognize and then try to correct the health problem.

We have stated our opinion of this case very plainly in order that sufficient consideration be given to the problem. If we can be of further assistance, do not hesitate to call on us.

Very truly yours,

Allen County Welfare"

In view of the fact that the agency felt so strongly about the benefit of the Arizona climate to their client the question naturally arises as to why they did not con-

sider maintaining him themselves, by sending him the same allowance they would have given him at home, instead of expecting the Pima County Welfare Board to do this. It appears to be a frequent occurrence for agencies sending clients in this manner to attempt to retain the privilege of deciding what is medically best for the client, while expecting Pima County to pay the bills. Since residence had been verified, the Pima County Welfare Board returned the family on April 4, 1936, at a cost of \$92.44 with the exception of Mr. R who stayed two months longer alone until he became convinced that he could not make a recovery under the stringent circumstances in which he was obliged to live. He then obtained funds from a brother and made the return trip. General relief given to this family amounted to \$43.50, thus the total cost to Pima County was \$145.94. Excerpts from the case worker's interviews with this family follow:

"Mr. R ignored the advice about going to Arizona for months. Finally Dr. X went to their relatives and told them that it was his only chance of living. If he remained in Ohio he would surely die, but just a few months in the sunshine of Tucson and he would be well and able to support his family---- This family are in a desperate frame of mind. They had been told by the Welfare office in Lima that they would receive relief in Tucson.---- He said, 'and it didn't seem that they were tricking us.' The family will not return if there is any alternative. They will sell their car and all possessions they can part with for food---- The R's are northern Italians. They are not well educated but very intelligent."

Up to this point the cases discussed have been situations where relief officials, definitely charged with the responsibility of administering relief to dependents in their own localities, have sent such dependents to Pima County, without notification or authorization and without making provision for their maintenance in Arizona.

Applicants Sent to Pima County by Officials not
Charged with Relief Administration

There are four cases in the general group under discussion where applicants came to Pima County on the advice or with the assistance of local authorities who were not directly responsible for relief administration, but who acted without regard to settlement laws and the Transportation Agreement. Three of these will be discussed in detail.

The Fred J family consists of Mr. J and his wife and two children, 12 and 13 years old. The family are legal residents of Oneida County, Wisconsin, this having been verified by the Pima County Welfare Board, and they received assistance under the Resettlement Administration in that county. Mr. J suffered from arthritis and sinus and was advised to move to Tucson by his county doctor in Wisconsin. Mr. J sought the advice of Resettlement officials before taking so drastic a step, and was advised that he could simply move to Arizona and receive relief through the local agency here, which would be chargeable to the Reset-

tlement office in his home county. No machinery exists for such an arrangement as this, but Mr. J could not know this, and therefore moved to Arizona. Upon his application for relief here, the Pima County Welfare Board telegraphed the Resettlement office in his home county and received the following reply:

"RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION
Rhineland, Wisconsin
January 28, 1937

Pima County Welfare Board
Tucson, Arizona

Gentlemen:

Wire received and noted. I am taking this case up with the State Rural Rehabilitation Director and asking his aid and advice as to help for this family.

I was wrong in advising Mr. J to ask for aid and that it could be charged back to this County. I have had a talk with the local Relief Director and misunderstood the method in which a case of this kind could be handled. Here in Wisconsin they are taken care of through their Transient Department.

There must be some way in which this family can be taken care of by your State, at least temporarily.

Yours very truly,

"

It is indeed surprising that an officer in such a position of responsibility should give advice of this nature without first making sure that he was correctly informed. Also he could not have assumed that "there must be some way in which

this family can be taken care of by your state, at least temporarily," if he was conversant with relief conditions throughout the United States. The Tucson agency would have returned this family to Michigan, but they refused to leave. \$4.14 was spent on relief for the family. The case record states that Mr. J was sent to a hospital "critically ill" on February 1, 1937. No record of the hospital bill was found.

Mr. John C, who arrived in Tucson in February, 1936, and applied for relief at once, gave as reference the Social Service Department of a hospital in Nashville, Tennessee. Upon inquiry it was found that he was not a resident of Nashville, nor of Tennessee, and that as far as this hospital knew he had no residence. Nevertheless, he had been under care there for one week, after which a priest, with whom he had made contact, had provided him with a charity-rate ticket to Tucson. The priest

"had no funds for hospitalization had choice of seeing Mr. C start hitchhiking in zero weather or providing tickets to place where acquaintances would share with him Police aid invoked no authority to detain."⁷

It turned out that Mr. C had no friends or acquaintances here, but was simply anxious to reach a warm climate. Since he was so determined to get to Tucson, it would doubtless

7. Quoted from telegram, Nashville to Pima County, Feb. 5, 1936.

have been impossible to prevent him from travelling, but the mistake in this case was for the priest concerned to take the responsibility of purchasing half rate tickets for this client, without finding out whether Mr. C had the resources in Tucson that he claimed to have. Mr. C was ill when he arrived, and had to have medical attention. He was given hospital care costing \$10, other medical relief including rest home care amounting to \$17, general relief, \$2, and transportation back to Nashville of \$38.20, total \$67.20. He was returned to Nashville after 14 days in Tucson even though his residence had not been established there, because it was felt that Nashville had assumed responsibility for him in enabling him to travel on charity rate tickets, against all recognized relief agreements.

The case of Mr. Alfred M is an example of serious official irresponsibility in a transient situation and shows the need for adequate Federal Health regulations. Mr. M arrived in Tucson on December 17, 1936, and called at the county health department with the following note:

"Physician & Surgeon
Osteopath

Hatch, New Mexico

12-16-36

Health Department of Tucson:

The bearer, Alfred M, 32 years old, a transient from Penna., has had a positive Widal, and has a diagnosis of TYPHOID FEVER, AND is a CARRIER.

He has the tests made by the Health Department of Dona Ana County, New Mexico.

He is leaving tonight for Tucson, to take residence with his cousin at _____ Avenue.

Signed, Dr. X, D. O."

The client stated that the Police Department of Hatch, New Mexico, had bought a half rate charity ticket for him. No effort had been made by these authorities to notify the Pima County Health Department, in advance, of his arrival, nor to verify his statement that he had a cousin in Tucson. It was found after his arrival that the "cousin" was a half brother who had a large family to support and was unable to assist Mr. M at all. The Pima County Welfare Board was obliged to obtain verification of residence and authorization for his return from his home county in Pennsylvania. Meanwhile the client was placed in the contagious ward of a Tucson hospital. Two days after his arrival, authorization for his return was received, and as he was declared able to travel, he was sent home at a cost of \$32.20, railroad authorities having been notified of his condition. Other relief granted consisted of a \$5 ambulance fee and \$4 for hospitalization, total \$41.20.

If Mr. M had been hospitalized in New Mexico, while welfare authorities there took the necessary steps to find out whether he had a place of legal residence, not only would Pima County have been saved the expense of his care

and return, but the public health would not have been jeopardized by the extra trip involved. The correctness of medical opinion cannot be considered in this paper, but from the point of view of relief administration the action taken by the New Mexico doctor was ill-advised.

Cases Showing Vacillating Policy of Relief Officials Who Sent Clients to Pima County

The next three cases to be discussed are situations in which agencies responsible for the travel of relief clients to Tucson have shown a vacillating policy, or have through ill-advised action, encouraged the transiency of the individuals concerned, while at the same time they have assumed some responsibility for their welfare.

The case of Mr. Frank P illustrates a surprising right about face in the attitude of county relief officials. Mr. P, a resident of Howard County, Iowa, was sent by the relief agency of that county to Arizona in 1932, because he was suffering from tuberculosis. It was arranged that he should have an allowance of \$50 a month from Howard County, and this arrangement was carried out for some time. The contact of the Pima County Welfare Board with this client started in July, 1935, when the following letter was received from Howard County, Iowa.

"HOWARD COUNTY
EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION
Court House
Cresco, Iowa
July 17, 1935

Organized Charities of Tucson, Inc.
152 N. Church Street
Tucson, Arizona

RE: P, Frank

We are wondering if you would contact Mr. Frank P for us. Howard County has been sending Mr. P an allowance of fifty dollars a month for several years and we are wondering if this is still necessary.

We should like to know whether or not Mr. P is able to work and whether or not he does work. Does he need the fifty dollars per month?

Will it be possible for us to decrease his allowance? We have had no contact with Mr. P for about a year and have never had a complete report as to his financial needs while he is living in Arizona.

We would appreciate it very much if you could make this investigation for us and recommend what course we should follow for his future care.

Very truly yours,

"

On August 9, 1935, the Pima County Welfare Board replied enclosing a medical diagnosis and medical statement that Mr. P was not well enough to do any but the lightest work. In October, 1935, Howard County wrote again requesting certification of Mr. P for WPA, which was not possible due to WPA regulations. There was no further contact until the spring of 1936 when Mr. P came to the office with a letter from his home agency, saying that his allowance would be

stopped. This letter and the correspondence which followed are self-explanatory and indicate an effort on the part of the Iowa agency to seek excuses for a change of policy which could have no logical basis except in shortage of funds. It would have been far better for the agency to state this plainly. The correspondence follows:

"HOWARD COUNTY
EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION
Court House
Cresco, Iowa

May 19, 1936

Mr. Frank P
Tucson, Arizona

My Dear Mr. P:

We have discussed your case and condition with our Board of Supervisors, who feel that it should not be necessary to continue your allowance of fifty dollars per month.

According to a letter received from your doctor, you are able to do light work, and we feel that now that the winter is over and the weather is warm you should be able to find work similar to what you did before as a filling station attendant.

Also, because you have been out of the State for about three years, you have become a resident of Arizona, and it is our belief that any help you might need should come from your local place of residence, which would be Tucson.

For these reasons, we are discontinuing the allowance after this month. You will receive the allowance for May, but please do not expect or ask Howard County to furnish you any more help.

Very truly yours,

"

"PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD
152 N. Church St.
Tucson, Arizona

June 1st, 1936

AIR MAIL

Emergency Relief Administration
Cresco, Iowa

RE: P, Frank

Mr. P called at the office yesterday and was very much worried over a letter he received from you dated May 19th.

On October 30, 1935, you wrote us a letter requesting that we certify him for work on form #600. As you undoubtedly know, the rules governing WPA made it impossible for us to do this as Mr. P did not receive relief from this office during the period from May 1st to October 31st, 1935.

In your letter of May 19th to Mr. P you state "because you have been out of the State for about three years, you have become a resident of Arizona, and it is our belief that any help you might need should come from your local place of residence, which would be Tucson."

Pima County is operating under a two year residence law which states: (The County ordinance was quoted here).

If the County Commissioners do not elect to care for Mr. P in Tucson any longer, will you kindly arrange return transportation as soon as possible?

Yours very truly,

PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD

"

July 13, 1936

"EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION
CRESCO IOWA

RE FRANK P HAS NOT RECEIVED CHECK FOR JULY STOP
ADVISE BY RETURN WIRE

PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD"

"HOWARD COUNTY
EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION
Court House
Cresco, Iowa
July 18, 1936

Pima County Welfare Board
Tucson, Arizona

In RE: Frank P

Our Board of Supervisors decided about six weeks ago that they would discontinue Mr. P's allowance.

We have talked this case over with authorities here in Iowa. We have a ruling from the Attorney General to the effect that Howard County is not obligated to send Mr. P an allowance when he is out of the state, and we have the opinion of several of the doctors that Mr. P should be able to live in Iowa if he wishes to.

Add to the above, we have not been able to get a comprehensive statement of Mr. P's physical condition. We do have several letters from Dr. Y, which say that Mr. P should be able to do some light work and to take partial care of himself.

A letter was written to Mr. P in May telling him that he would receive \$50.00 the first of June but that would be the final amount sent to him.

We hope that he will, with your help, be able to make arrangements to take care of himself.

Very truly yours,

"

JULY 27, 1936

"EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION
COURT HOUSE
CRESCO IOWA

HAVE TWENTY FIVE DOLLARS SIXTY EIGHT CENTS FOR
TRANSPORTATION FOR FRANK P SENT TO ORGANIZED
CHARITIES THIS CITY AT ONCE

"PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD"

The money requested for transportation home of Mr. P was never received. On August 29, 1936, the Pima County Welfare Board sent him home at its own expense. The cost of the case to the Tucson agency was as follows: \$60.27 for medical care, including 60 days of rest home care; \$24.67 for transportation, total \$84.94.

The case of Mrs. Julia H and her two children, one of whom was ill with bronchiactesis, is another example of failure on the part of an organization to live up to its agreements. The following telegrams will indicate the very definite arrangement which was made regarding this family before they were sent to Arizona.

11-19-35

"ORGANIZED CHARITIES OF TUCSON
152 NORTH CHURCH STREET
TUCSON ARIZONA

MRS. JULIA H AND TWO YOUNG CHILDREN COMING TUCSON
FOR HEALTH STOP HUSBAND ABLE TO PROVIDE BUT BIKAR
CHOLUM CHARITY ORGANIZATION WILLING TO GUARANTRE
AGAINST THEIR BECOMING PUBLIC CHARGES IF YOU ALLOW
THEM TO COME ON CHARITY RATE TICKETS WIRE COLLECT

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN
625 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK NY"

NOVEMBER 19, 1935

"NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN
625 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK NY

RETEL H WE AUTHORIZE SENDING FAMILY HALF RATE WITH
UNDERSTANDING THAT IF PUBLIC AID BECOMES NECESSARY
THEY CAN BE RETURNED AT YOUR EXPENSE

PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD"

Nothing further was heard about the family until June 1936, when the New York City public relief agency inquired about them because Mr. H who had remained in New York, had applied for relief. The Pima County Welfare Board, upon investigation, found that Mrs. H and the children had been here for some months, and had been supported entirely during this period by Mr. H. The findings were reported to the New York relief bureau, but apparently this agency lost interest in the case, for reasons unknown. It is probable that Mr. H obtained work and continued to send the money to his family, and nothing further was heard about them until February, 1937, when Mrs. H requested the Pima County Welfare Board to hospitalize her child. The child was very ill and medical attention had to be given. The Tucson agency contacted the original guarantors of this family in New York, asking them to send funds in accordance with the agreement made in November, 1935. The agency replied saying that they had been acting on behalf of a small private Jewish organization who were interested in charity. There was one member of this organization who had actually promised to pay the

expenses of the family if they should become public charges, and this member had recently died. Therefore, neither the remaining members of the small organization, nor the National Council of Jewish Women, who had been acting for them, were willing to meet the expense. Furthermore, both organizations considered that the bills were too high, and believed cheaper care could be arranged in Tucson. It was thus evident that they had not found out in advance what the cost would be if the family did become a public charge. On March 3, 1937, the child died in the hospital, and the Pima County Welfare Board withdrew from the situation. The Pima County agency had not given any general relief in this case, but the hospital bill was \$426.35. Of this amount \$106 has been paid to date by the small Jewish organization in New York, leaving a balance of \$320.35. Whether this amount will be taken care of is uncertain. This is not a direct charge on the county, since the hospital is attempting to collect directly from the New York organization, but it may be considered an expense to the community, nevertheless, in that so long as the bill remains unpaid it constitutes charitable services rendered to the client.

The case of Mr. Alexander T is an example of action taken by an agency which was aware of the proper procedure in sending dependents into other communities and did some careful work on the case, but which failed in one important

particular.

The Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor, a private welfare agency in New York City, opened negotiations with the following letter:

"A. I. C. P.
LENOX HILL DISTRICT
331 East 70 St.
New York City

January 21, 1936
Re: T, Alexander

Organized Charities
152 North Church Street
Tucson, Arizona

We have known Mr. T and his family, which consists of his wife and the eight-year old son, Oswald, since October 14, 1935. Mr. T is a native of Hungary who came to the United States in 1923. He was a successful cabinet maker able to support his family and acquire some property. He lost the house which he had purchased during the depression. Since this time he has suffered from asthma. The attacks which he has have become increasingly severe. He has been incapacitated for work since 1933. The most skillful doctors in New York City have attempted to help Mr. T without any success. They now tell him that his only possibility for relief is to live in Arizona.

Mr. T is absolutely without resources. We have been giving the family food and shelter. Although it seemed out of the question to send a dependent man so far from his home and family when it was first mentioned, we are now giving it some consideration.

We are very interested in learning what we can of living expenses in Tucson. We would appreciate knowing your estimate of the minimum cost of room and board for a man alone. We would also be interested to know whether the employment possibilities in Tucson would be fair for a man who is intelligent, skilled at cabinet making and furniture repair who would be willing, health permitting, to work as a handy man or at any kind of work available.

Mr. T is a Roman Catholic. If there are any

Catholic organizations which have residence clubs reasonably priced or if the Y. M. C. A. has a residence with low rates and not restricted to transient guests in Tucson, information regarding them would be of interest to us.

If the A. I. C. P. should decide to stand behind arrangements for sending Mr. T to Tucson, would your organization be willing to act as go-between for the financial arrangement between the A. I. C. P. and Mr. T and to keep the A. I. C. P. in touch with his condition and situation there?

Very truly yours,

"

This document shows clearly the care with which this agency was considering the situation and the effort they made to ascertain what all the conditions would be before sending the client West, even though this had been declared his only hope by competent doctors. The Pima County Welfare Board replied to this inquiry giving the information desired. Nothing more was heard about Mr. T until one year later when he arrived in Tucson on a train from the West, too ill to walk. Mr. T had just come from Yuma, to which town he had gone less than a month previously from New York. He had with him a longhand note written on a prescription pad blank which read as follows: "This is to certify that Alexander T is ill with asthma and is on the way to Tucson, Arizona, for treatment," signed by a doctor at New York Hospital. The Pima County Welfare Board telegraphed this doctor immediately for funds and he referred the communication to the A. I. C. P. That agency sent the following explanation of Mr. T's trip

to Yuma. There had been other correspondence with Yuma, also, in which the A. I. C. P. had agreed to reimburse the local agency there for any expenses they might incur.

"THE A. I. C. P.
LENOX HILL DISTRICT
331 East 70th St.
New York City

January 19, 1937

Yuma County Board of Public Welfare
P. O. Box 1831
Yuma, Arizona

RE: T. Alexander

Mr. T sold his carpenter's tools for \$110, and said he was going to use this money to go to Arizona. He said he had made arrangements to stay with Mr. Y, a friend, at a low rate. A year ago Mr. T inquired about the possibility of coming out there and requested our support during what he expected to be his convalescence. At that time Mr. Y said he would keep Mr. T for \$5 a week. We refused this assistance because of the uncertainty of the benefit.

However, when Mr. T planned this and secured the funds for it himself, we could not have prevented it. We felt, since he seemed to be getting steadily worse here and we had no substitute for the doctor's recommendation which Mr. T would accept, we were justified in asking the special charity rate for the ticket Mr. T bought. He did have on hand enough money to keep him with Mr. Y for about three months and a promise of some employment on Mr. Y's farm as his strength increased. The fare Mr. T paid was \$49. He had tourist accommodations.

If, under the circumstances, you still feel that we are under obligation for Mr. T's return, provided he has exhausted his funds, we will be responsible for any expense you may incur in arranging this, assuming, of course, that you will take advantage of any special rate avail-

able.

Very truly yours,

"

The obvious mistake made by the agency, as shown in this letter, was in permitting Mr. T to buy a charity rate ticket. In this way the agency involved itself in responsibility for him, and also made it possible for him to make the trip, which according to their own statement, they felt was unwise. This action seems strangely inconsistent with their first careful letter regarding his case.

Mr. T explained to the Pima County Welfare Board that he had left Yuma to come to Tucson because he had a friend in the Health Seekers Club here, who had written him that that organization would undertake to care for him upon his arrival. The Pima County Welfare Board found that they were unable to do so, contrary to their expectation, and therefore Mr. T was completely without resources. The Pima County Welfare Board arranged for his return to New York, and three days after his arrival in Tucson he was sent home. The total cost of his care and transportation was \$73.80, and it must be noted that the A. I. C. P. reimbursed Pima County for the entire amount.

Applicants sent to Pima County by Officials Who
Carried Out Their Responsibility

The remaining two cases in the group of 15 under dis-

ussions are situations where officials responsible for the applicants did not attempt to withdraw from this obligation. Mr. Marvin K arrived in Tucson in October, 1936, and applied the next day for relief. He stated that he had been sent to Tucson by the County Commissioners of his home county in Minnesota, on the advice of the county physician, having previously spent two years in a Minneapolis tuberculosis hospital at his county's expense. He had been ordered west by his county doctor. Although the county concerned had made no arrangement in advance with the Pima County Welfare Board regarding this man, which would have been the most satisfactory procedure, they did pay his expenses, including rest home care, for the time he was in Tucson, which was from October 21, to November 24, 1936. Mr. K became extremely ill at the end of this period, and it was found that he would have to be hospitalized. At this point his home county decided that they would prefer to have him hospitalized at home, so they authorized his return. The Pima County Welfare Board paid \$22.90 for his transportation and a \$5 ambulance fee, total \$27.90. Although this amount was never paid back by the home county, the latter did not attempt to place obstacles in the way of Mr. K's return, and did follow a policy which entailed the minimum hardship to the client.

In the case of Mr. Ralph Z the Pima County Welfare Board

was not put to any expense. Mr. Z had been living in Tucson for five months at the expense of his home county in South Dakota. The agency there evidently decided it would be best for him to return and sent him funds for this purpose.

The only service the Pima County Welfare Board was called upon to render him was to authorize his purchase of a half-rate ticket for the trip. In this situation it may be seen that the client's home agency acted throughout in strict accordance with the limitations imposed by settlement laws, and with the Transportation Agreement.

Fifteen cases have been discussed up to this point, 14 of which have been described in considerable detail in order to bring out the extreme difficulty of handling transients when relief agencies and officials are either ignorant of laws, rules and agreements, or are unwilling to face their implications. In the first six cases authorities directly responsible for the welfare of the families urged them to go to Tucson, without notification, or authorization by the Tucson authorities, and without apparently, giving any consideration to means of subsistence after their arrival. In the three cases next described the same thing was done by authorities who were not relief administrators, or carrying the duties of relief administrators, but who advised the clients on the basis of insufficient or incorrect information. In the next two cases discussed the agen-

cies involved had assumed or promised to assume the care of the non-residents in question, and then failed to fulfill their obligation. In the next situation the private agency concerned had tried to plan with unusual care, but had made the mistake of authorizing transportation when the client insisted upon making the trip against their advice. In justice to the agency, however, it must again be pointed out that they paid the full bill incurred by the client. The last two cases mentioned illustrated the policies of agencies who recognized and carried out their proper share of the responsibility.

CHAPTER III

APPLICANTS WHO MIGRATED TO PIMA COUNTY AGAINST ADVICE¹

The situations in which public officials themselves were at fault, and the responsibility could be traced to them, are in the minority. The most numerous cases are those where no officials took an active part in placing families in a position of dependence upon the Pima County Welfare Board. Five of these, to be discussed in this chapter, show how strong the determination to come to Arizona may be, among persons so convinced of the curative powers of this climate that they will make the most persistent efforts to obtain relief from Pima County. These five families came to Tucson against advice, and in spite of the fact that they were informed in advance that they could not expect assistance. Two of the situations in this group show clearly the difficulty often experienced by health-seekers in understanding and accepting the limitations imposed by residence requirements in relief administration.

Mr. Tom E, who was on relief in Joplin, Missouri, was a victim of tuberculosis. On May 5, 1935, he wrote to the

1. See Appendix, p. 145, for table of miscellaneous data regarding this group.

Pima County Welfare Board asking if he would be eligible for relief if he should move to Tucson. The following passages are from his letter:

"The doctor has advised me to change climate as soon as I am able to travel. He said he knew of no better climate than Arizona and neither do I. ---- We are willing to make many sacrifices to regain my health and strength. We can live in a two room hut or anything to get lined out.---- We will try and be as little expense as possible. Mainly we will need the weekly allotment for food. As for clothing I believe we can get by the better part of a year with what we have.

We have an old car to drive out in and it is our intention to dispose of our furniture and all but our bedding and dishes. This should enable us to have about \$40 left to buy enough to get started out there.

I have tried to explain the situation the best I know how under the circumstances. If you can do anything at all toward getting us on relief, words cannot express our appreciation. For once well I intend to stay, and have hopes of making Arizona a good citizen."

This letter was answered by a Pima County Welfare Board case worker with an explanation of the Pima County residence requirements and of the agency's inability to care for the family. Mr. E nevertheless decided to make the trip and to take a chance on working out some way to get along or to obtain relief after his arrival. The family therefore came in September, 1935, and shortly afterwards applied in person at the Pima County Welfare Board office. They were, of course, met with refusal a second time, after which Mr. E wrote the following letter to the case worker who had interviewed his wife.

"Tucson, Arizona
October 1, 1935

Welfare Office
Tucson

Dear Mr. _____:

My wife explained to me the results of her interview with you, Monday. I'm sorry I can't get down to have a talk with you. Perhaps I could explain our predicament better than my wife.

I worked hard back in Missouri. Earning first or second place over about twenty investigators during C.W.A. When the New Deal started I was placed as foreman and Timekeeper over one of the large Projects but unfortunately my health went bad and I was forced to resign. Hence my reason for being here.

My residence has always been in the West. I lived in Pasadena, California for nine years. I made a mistake by ever going back in the middle-west.

I'm sure the office in Joplin would be willing to help cooperate in every way possible to help me get along out here since it is clear out of the question of me to ever return to Missouri. Say you should happen to have a family here, legal residents, who wanted to return to Missouri. I'm quite certain I could induce the authorities there to accept them in exchange for our residence here.

It's very difficult to put the exact words on paper but if you are ever out this way I'll be glad to talk to you.

One thing I will say we are born citizens of the United States and it is only because of ill health that I am forced to ask for relief and not because of the depression.

I hope after a few months here I will be able to go to work. Anything you can do to help us will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Tom E."

The suggestion made by Mr. E in this letter, that possibly an exchange of families could be made, that some dependent family who wished to live in Missouri and could not establish residence there should be sent there in return for permission from Pima County for himself and his wife to remain here, would seem a perfectly logical idea to anyone not versed in the intricacies of settlement laws and local relief rules. The question might well be asked as to why these non-residents could not be accepted in the localities in which they wish to live by a cancelling out process. From a practical point of view the policy would involve machinery that would be too elaborate and expensive, but Mr. E's suggestion emphasizes the unreasonableness, the injustice, and the folly of present policies in the opinion of destitute health seekers.

After two refusals of assistance by the Pima County Welfare Board, the family attempted to establish themselves in Tucson by their own efforts. They bought a house at \$25 down and \$8 a month. They rented a part of it at \$8 a month, thus covering the expense of shelter. Mrs. E obtained housework, and the venture might have succeeded if it had not been that Mrs. E developed tuberculosis herself. At this time a third application was made to the Pima County Welfare Board, which was obliged to refuse the family again. The agency had meanwhile verified residence

in Joplin and had offered to return them, but both Mr. and Mrs. E felt that this would be fatal to them both. The record does not state how the family managed until October 1936, when the agency secured a non-relief position for Mr. E with WPA. In January, 1937, he became ill with pneumonia and had to be hospitalized at county expense, at a cost of \$68.50. No other relief was given in this case. Upon Mr. E's discharge from the hospital he still refused to return to Missouri, and there has been no further contact with the family.

The case of Mr. and Mrs. Phillip L. is another example of most unusual persistence on the part of non-resident health-seekers to obtain relief in Tucson. The first application took place in January, 1932, approximately a year before the inauguration of the Federal Transient service. The family's legal residence in Pennsylvania was verified by the Pima County Welfare Board and they were returned. Mr. L had tuberculosis, and upon his return to Pennsylvania he was placed in a sanitorium in that state. It appeared, however, that the L's considered Tucson the best place for them to live because of the climate, and that they did not feel their return to Pennsylvania need be considered final. A long correspondence started, therefore, with numerous agencies to which Mr. L applied, stating that he was a Tucson resident. In every case the Pima County Welfare Board wrote

in reply explaining that Mr. L was not a resident, and giving the history of their contact. On several occasions Mr. L wrote to Tucson himself, stating that he could not understand the rigidity of the residence rule. In January, 1934, he wrote that the family had started to "walk" to Tucson, which doubtless meant that they were actually hitchhiking. By this time the Federal Transient Service was operating and they stopped for food and shelter at various transient centers they found on the way. From most of these centers letters came to Tucson asking for verification of residence, but in every case the family apparently moved on before replies were received from Tucson. Finally they reached Big Spring, Texas, where Mr. L had to be hospitalized for a short time. This meant that the Transient center there was able to make use of information they obtained from the Pima County Welfare Board regarding the family's residence in Pennsylvania. They prevailed upon the L's to return to their place of residence, and sent them home. Nothing more was heard about the case until October 5th, 1936, when the L's applied in person at the Pima County Welfare Office. They had been in Tucson since July, 1936, and the family now consisted of Mr. and Mrs. L and three children, all born since their departure from Tucson in 1932, and all victims of tuberculosis. The Pima County Welfare Board telegraphed the State Welfare office at Harrisburg, Pennsyl-

vania, as follows:

10-19-36

"STATE WELFARE DEPARTMENT
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

PHILLIP AND MARGARET L AND THREE CHILDREN HAVE LIVED BETHLEHEM PENNSYLVANIA FOR PAST YEAR BUT NOT WITHOUT ASSISTANCE STOP PRIOR TO THAT LIVED FOR EIGHT YEARS IN WASHINGTON PENNA MAN WAS BORN IN WASHINGTON PENNA AND CHILDREN IN ALLENTOWN PENNA KINDLY VERIFY STATE RESIDENCE AND AUTHORIZE RETURN WIRE REPLY COLLECT PLEASE RUSH

PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD"

They received the following reply:

10-20-36

"PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD
TUCSON ARIZONA

OUR STATE DEPARTMENT PROHIBITED BY LAW TO DECIDE LEGAL SETTLEMENT WE ADVISE THAT YOU COMMUNICATE WITH POOR DIRECTORS OF COUNTY WHERE CLIENTS WERE LAST REPORTED HAVING LEGAL RESIDENCE

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE
HARRISBURG PENN."

This condition placed the burden of investigation of local legal settlement, and of relief in the interim, upon the Pima County Welfare Board, and illustrates the obstacles raised by unusually restrictive settlement laws in some states. In this case the Pima County Welfare Board out the Gordian Knot by returning the family to the county in Pennsylvania in which they said they had last resided, and nothing has been heard from them since. Emergency relief was given to the amount of \$12.11 and the cost of transportation was \$68.40, total \$80.51. This includes only the

relief granted the second time the family was in Tucson, since no record was found of the amount granted the first time.

CHAPTER IV

APPLICANTS WHO MIGRATED TO PIMA COUNTY ON THE ADVICE OF PRIVATE PHYSICIANS¹

The next group of clients to be considered, all of them health-seekers, consists of those who came to Pima County on the advice of private physicians who, through unfamiliarity with relief regulations, recommended Tucson to their patients without any apparent thought of the problem of subsistence after arrival. Many of these applicants came through the financial help of friends or relatives, who because of their anxiety to secure the benefit of the climate for the families, failed to appreciate the necessity for long time provision for maintenance. There were 21 applicants in the group, including 8 families who were on relief before they left home, and 13 who were not. In three of the latter cases the patients were maintained in Tucson by relatives who did understand residence requirements, and who intended to care for them until such time as they would have lived long enough in Pima County to qualify for county relief. In each of these instances the relatives were unable financially to carry out their plan. In another case the patient

1. See Appendix, p. 146, for table of miscellaneous data regarding this group.

was sent with a promise of \$100 a month allowance from a friend at home, but the promise was not kept. Of the 21 applicants, 9 had their fare to Tucson paid by relatives, friends, or interested private groups, and 12 used savings or raised money for the trip through the sale of personal possessions.

In this chapter and in the one which follows it will be impossible to discuss many cases in each group in detail. Certain ones will be selected, however, for full description to emphasize the problem found in the entire group.

Applicants Who Were on Relief in Their Home Counties before Departure

Of the group of eight who were on relief before their departure from home, three detailed accounts will be given. The first is the case of Mr. and Mrs. Nathan O., who came to Tucson in August, 1936, on the advice of a private doctor, because Mr. O had tuberculosis. The family had lived for twenty years in Okeechobee, Florida, and had been on relief there for the past three years. Mr. O's brother and the latter's wife accompanied them to Tucson. Upon making application they told the case worker that "Before leaving Florida both families sold all their household goods, and have enough money now for food for this week only."² The Pima County Welfare Board telegraphed to Okeechobee for

2. Quoted from case record.

verification of residence and received the following reply:

AUGUST 29 1936

"PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD
TUCSON ARIZONA

NATHAN AND CATHERINE O ARE RESIDENTS OF OKEE-
CHOBEE FLA-----DID GO WEST ON ADVICE OF DOCTOR
Y OF LAKE PLACID RECOMMEND YOU MAKE HIM A SPECIAL
CASE AS THE NEED IS EVIDENT

OKEECHOBEE FLORIDA VISITOR
BOARD OF SOCIAL WELFARE"

It would seem from this telegram that the Florida agency was aware of the departure of their client, but there is no indication in the record that they either urged or assisted him. The Pima County Welfare Board offered to return the family to their place of legal residence, since they could not be permanently cared for in Tucson at the expense of Pima County, however great the need might be. The family refused to be returned, so the Pima County Welfare Board withdrew from the case. The only relief given was \$1 for medical care. The Pima County Welfare Board has recently received complaints, however, from private individuals in Tucson that the family is destitute, so they have apparently not been able to make a satisfactory adjustment by their own efforts.

The case of Mr. and Mrs. Otis W is another example of indigent patients uprooted from their homes on the advice of medical practitioners who do not understand the limitations of relief administration. This couple came from

Tulsa, Oklahoma, where Mr. W had worked on WPA. His wife was seriously ill with tuberculosis and their doctor told them they must move to Arizona. They therefore undertook the trip, in an old car, in November, 1936, accompanied by Mr. W's mother and his wife's brother. They had no resources when they arrived, and Mrs. W grew steadily worse. Mr. W and his brother-in-law obtained work, but Mrs. W became so ill that her husband was afraid to leave her to go to his job, so he applied to the Pima County Welfare Board for help. Mrs. W was found to be so seriously ill that the Pima County Welfare Board immediately placed her in a rest home, where she died two hours later. Excerpts from the case worker's report on her interview with Mr. W, after his wife's death, follow:

"Worker never talked with anyone who was quite as bitter as Mr. W after his wife's death. He explained that he believed it was only natural for a person to have confidence in his physician and to follow his advice. His wife died exactly ten days after their arrival in Tucson and he feels if she was that ill, the doctor should not have had him bring her here, as she could have died among her own people and been spared the hard trip and the suffering while en route and after arriving in Tucson."³

The cost of the W case to Pima County was \$5 for emergency relief and \$1 for medical aid. Mr. W and his relatives left the county immediately after the death of Mrs. W.

The case of Mr. Lewis B is another instance of a

3. Quoted from case record.

tuberculosis patient in a far advanced stage of the disease seeking relief in Arizona. Mr. B was in a tuberculosis sanatorium in Georgia for some time, as a relief patient, but was discharged in September, 1935, as a terminal case. Hospitalization was not provided in Georgia for terminal cases of the disease. After his discharge, Mr. B was advised by a private physician that his only hope of recovery lay in moving to Tucson. The Lions Club of Waycross, Georgia, Mr. B's home town, raised money for his fare, and Mr. B accordingly came to Pima County, where he applied for relief on November 4, 1935. He told the Pima County Welfare Board that he had thought the Lions Club would maintain him indefinitely in Tucson, but they had sent him no funds at all after his arrival. Thus Mr. B, whose illness was so serious that he was considered no longer eligible for public aid in his home state, and who, furthermore, had no resources whatever, was sent to Pima County where it was inevitable that he would become a charge upon local public funds. The State Relief Administration in Georgia verified his residence but stated that it was doubtful if his home county would accept him for relief, due to shortage of funds. Nevertheless, the Pima County Welfare Board was obliged to send him home, and he was returned on November 16, 1935. The cost of relief for Mr. B was \$30 for hospital care and \$42.35 for transportation, total \$72.35.

This concludes the discussion of cases who were on relief rolls when they left home because of medical advice.

Applicants Who Were Not on Relief in Their Home
Counties Before Departure

Very similar situations, however, are found among those families who were told by doctors to move to Tucson but who were not receiving relief at the time of their departure. In these situations also advice, which may have been medically correct, but which was based on insufficient information as to resources and means of subsistence, or on the expectation that the patient would "manage somehow," and would, in the course of such managing, recover his health, led to circumstances of the utmost distress and to the most bitter disappointment on the part of the patients, and caused unwarranted expense to this county and state. Among these, four cases may be mentioned in particular.

Mr. Bert K came to Arizona in January, 1934, because his wife was ill with tuberculosis, and was accepted for care at the Federal Transient Camp in Nogales. His wife did not do as well as he hoped and expected at the camp hospital, and he insisted upon removing her and setting up house-keeping in Tucson, against all doctors' orders. His home was in Illinois, and he tried living there for a short time after his first sojourn in Arizona, but felt that it was too risky for his wife. He proved to be a very difficult person

to handle, since he was unwilling to take advice, and in fact his own actions did much to prevent his wife's recovery. Nevertheless, from his point of view, it seemed unreasonable for the Transient Service to insist that relief would be given only on condition the family remain in Nogales, and for the Pima County Welfare Board to refuse relief in Tucson because the family were non-residents. Late in 1935 he interested some friends in Missouri in his situation and one of them wrote a letter to the Governor of Arizona as follows:

"Dear Sir:

I beg your pardon, and at the same time I know that you will accept it, knowing what this letter is about. I wish to ask you if you will interest yourself in the welfare of one resident of your state.

Mr. Bert K, Tucson, Arizona, until 2 years ago, he was a law abiding, god fearing, farmer of the state of Ill.

His wife developed T. B. and the doctor said the best and only way for her to live was to go to Arizona.

He therefore sold everything he had and by good luck and the grace of God he got to your state O. K.

At first he was living in Nogales but it was too high for his wife and they moved to Tucson.

As he has not had a steady job he applied for relief, and was informed he would have to live there two years.

Knowing how bad off she is and what she needs in order to live and care for her child, I know she will have to have better care.

Won't you please see what you can do in the way of putting him on WPA Job, as the man is an upright law abiding man and it will be impossible for him to stay like that in the present condition.

We in St. Louis do not say to a man you must live here so long before we can help him.

I belong to a society that ask no questions before aid is given, just recently a young man from the East had both legs cut off above the knee.

And we did not say you have not lived here long enough we gave him $\frac{1}{2}$ gallon of our Blood, and he blessed us, that is what Mr. K and his wife will do to you.

If you wish to know more about me or Mr. K, write to Dr. F. M. Z. of Markham church, in St. Louis.

Knowing that you would not have a woman die for want of food, am positive you will do what you can for Mr. K.

Yours truly,

It may be said that this letter represents the attitude of many lay persons when faced with the transient relief problem, when they are not well acquainted with settlement laws, nor in a position to understand the tremendous cost of transient clients. This letter, naturally, could not alter the Pima County residence rule. Mr. K had lost his residence in Illinois, and in March, 1936, Mrs. K died. Mr. K and his small son are still in Tucson, where Mr. K works as a casual laborer. Emergency relief was given in this case from time to time to the total amount of \$23.35, of which \$11.39 was rest home care for Mrs. K before she

died.

Mr. John C was a resident of Lawrenceberg, Tennessee, where he had farmed for many years, and had also been deputy sheriff. His doctor advised him to go to Southern Arizona because he was suffering from tuberculosis, and in August, 1936, his friends and neighbors took up a collection to obtain fare for himself and his four children. Mr. C did not apply for relief upon his arrival, although his funds had given out, but the County Probation Officer reported the case to the Pima County Welfare Board, as the family were living in an automobile, and the children appeared to be neglected. After interviewing Mr. C, the Pima County Welfare Board secured verification of his residence in Tennessee, but he refused to return and gave the following reasons:

"Miss I am a gentleman, a Baptist, and a Mason, and they have never failed me yet when I have asked for help, and I don't reckon they will now."⁴

Mr. C had not asked for aid from the public agency up to that point and did not do so thereafter. It would seem that neither gentlemen, Baptists, nor Masons were able to cope with the needs of himself and his four children, although there is no indication in the record that he appealed to any organization. In any case, complaints were soon received by the Pima County Welfare Board that the family were

4. Quoted from case record.

begging on the streets. Mr. C's health was failing rapidly, and finally, a month after their arrival in Tucson, the probation officer was obliged to take charge of the children, and Mr. C was placed in a rest home, where he died fifteen days later. Through negotiations with the Tennessee authorities it was possible to send the children to the Baptist Orphan's Home in Memphis. The cost of this case to Pima County was \$15 for rest home care for Mr. C, \$20 for County Burial, \$14.74 for general relief, and \$69.24 for transportation of the children back to Tennessee, total \$118.98.

Mr. Wade M, his wife and four children, came to Arizona from Henderson, Texas, in October, 1936, on the advice of a doctor there, because Mr. M had tuberculosis. He had had a job with an oil company, and had evidently never been on relief. Since he was a veteran he was able to gain admission to the Veterans' Hospital, but the problem of maintaining his wife and children remained unsolved. The Pima County Welfare Board inquired regarding the man's residence in Henderson, and received the following reply:

"HENDERSON COMMUNITY CHEST RUSK COUNTY RELIEF

Court House

Henderson, Texas

November 20, 1936

Pima County Welfare Board
Tucson, Arizona

As far as we are able to check the M family left 6 months prior to November 7, have tried to locate previous record. Went to Kilgore, Dr. L not there.

Two children had been in London school earlier in the year.

Don't see how we can accept this family as we have no charity funds with which to pay rent. If they have a place to live we can provide food, though I do not think they rightfully belong to us.

Yours truly,

The Pima County Welfare Board was thus left in the position of not knowing whether the family had residence in Henderson or not since the statement "If they have a place to live, we can provide food, though I do not think they rightfully belong to us" left the question unanswered. The Tucson agency, however, decided to interpret this letter as a verification of residence, and offered to return the family. The latter refused to leave, so the Pima County Welfare Board withdrew from the case, with which they have had no further contact. The total cost of this family was \$9.02 in general relief.

The case of Mrs. Charlotte Q is another illustration of the result of public ignorance of settlement laws and relief limitations. Mrs. Q was seriously ill with tuberculosis, and was living in Frankston, Texas. Her brother, Mr. Timothy F, was a private soldier at Fort Huachuca, earning \$30 a month. Mrs. Q's doctor urgently advised her to move to Arizona, and so her brother in Fort Huachuca proceeded to make arrangements to care for her as best he could. The

entire family were ignorant of settlement laws, so could not foresee the results of taking so drastic a step, without sufficient resources to carry it through. Mr. F obtained one month's advance on his pay, rented a house in Tucson, purchased equipment of various sorts, including heating stoves and bedding, and after all preparations were made to his satisfaction, he sent for his sister, her six young children and his father, in February, 1936. There was, of course, very little money left for their maintenance after they arrived. So ten days later, they were obliged to apply to the Pima County Welfare Board, who found Mrs. Q so ill that she could not even be interviewed. She was immediately placed in a rest home, and a telegram was sent to Frankston, Texas, for verification of residence. There was apparently no relief organization in the town since the manager of the Western Union office took upon himself the responsibility of verifying residence and wired as follows: "Retel known by R, bank, and D's Store is resident community." On the strength of this astonishing authorization the Pima County Welfare Board sent Mrs. Q's father and her children home, but Mrs. Q herself was too ill to travel. She died a month later in Tucson. The cost of relief in this family was \$36 for rest home care, \$20 for county burial, \$44.93 for transportation and \$7.24 for general emergency relief, total \$108.17. Mr. F turned over all of the articles he had

bought, with the exception of the bedding which was sent home with the family, to the Pima County Welfare Board, to be credited against the expense incurred. It need hardly be pointed out that all the people concerned in this unhappy situation would have been better off if they could have known ahead of time all the circumstances attendant upon non-resident dependency. The doctor who advised such a trip, involving such sacrifice and expense, could not have realized what a serious situation he was creating.

It would seem from the foregoing discussion that doctors, as much or perhaps more than any other group, need to be educated in the matter of settlement laws and residence regulations. It is apparent all through the case histories in the group just discussed that medical advice to dependent families to move from their homes should never be given without consideration of the limitations imposed by law on the distribution of relief. So long as such patients are unable to obtain the means of subsistence in the localities to which they are sent, it would seem impossible for the purpose of their migration to be accomplished. These patients would most certainly be better off if they were not called upon to make the sacrifices and to endure the hardships involved in a return trip to Arizona.

CHAPTER V

APPLICANTS WHOSE MIGRATION TO TUCSON WAS NOT TRACED TO SPECIFIC OFFICIAL OR MEDICAL ADVICE

The cases to be discussed next consist of a group of 59 applicants in whose records no evidence was found of direct pressure from medical or relief authorities which might have caused them to make the trip to Tucson. These applicants represent many different problems of transient relief in addition to that of the health-seekers. They show the difficulties of transient relief administration with limited funds as clearly as do the cases already discussed, but they also emphasize more definitely the general pressure of migratory dependents. In other words, they represent the general transient load of Pima County in addition to the special load which results from the health features of Southern Arizona. Since, however, the 100 cases studied in this paper have been classified, for purposes of discussion, according to the nature of the stimulus or inducement which caused them to leave their points of origin, there will be found among the 59 applicants in this group some who came as health-seekers, but whose migration was not traced to specific official or medical advice. The cases in this chapter thus include 12 health-seekers who

came to Arizona for the sake of the climate, but whose action in doing this was based, as far as could be ascertained, on general hearsay. Of these 12 applicants, 10 were victims of tuberculosis, one of asthma, and one of osteomyelitis of the spine. Of the remaining 45 applicants in the group, 8 were persons who appeared to be mentally unadjusted, and who came for reasons that could not be ascertained, or that were not necessarily rational; 14 stated as the purpose of their trip a search for employment; 7 came to live with relatives who proved unable or unwilling to support them; 10 were traveling through Tucson; 6 came to escape from particular circumstances at home, and had no very definite reason to give for having selected Tucson as their stopping place; 1 came for reasons unknown; and 1 became a charge of Pima County after his discharge from the regular army.

Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County
for Health Reasons¹

The group who came to Pima County because they or members of their families were victims of tuberculosis present situations very similar to those already discussed in detail. A description of one of these follows.

The fact that members of the public find it difficult to understand the rigid requirements of residence laws is

1. See Appendix, p. 147, for table of miscellaneous data regarding this group.

shown in the case of Mr. Robert V with a slightly different emphasis from that illustrated in preceding case histories. Mr. V came to Arizona in June of 1934. As he had no means of support, he applied for assistance to the Federal Transient Service. He was placed in the tuberculosis ward of the Federal Transient Camp at Nogales, where he remained for a year and a half. Then a church official in Arizona became interested in his case and took him out of the camp, placing him in a private hospital in Phoenix, operated by the church organization in question. Later he was transferred to a private hospital in Tucson, run by the same church, as a charity case. For reasons which are not clear from the record, the church officials either lost interest in his problem, or felt that they were unable to carry out a long time plan for his support, so they requested the Pima County Welfare Board to accept him as a county case, and to place him in the county hospital. From the point of view of the county, however, Mr. V had not attained the status of resident, which he possibly would have done if, instead of being removed from the Nogales Camp in December, 1935, he had remained there until the close of the Service, and had then been transferred to the county in the group which were accepted as residents at that time. The church organization, in this case, had made a mistake in taking charge of Mr. V at all, if they were not prepared to

carry the cost of his care for many years. He had actually lived in Arizona for nearly three years, and in Pima County for nearly one year at the time the request for transfer to the county rolls was made. The county was not in a position to accept him because of his non-resident status. He therefore remained a charge upon private charity, and has received no relief from the county.

Applicants Who Were Mentally Unadjusted²

Of the 8 applicants who are classified in this discussion as mentally unadjusted it must be understood that this classification is not based on medical diagnoses in every instance, since it was not always possible to obtain medical examinations. But the applicants in this group all exhibited irrational behavior in their contacts with the Pima County Welfare Board.

There are points in three of these eight situations which illustrate the difficulties for the local agency in handling transient problems of this nature.

Miss Mary G was hospitalized in Tucson in April, 1936, with a diagnosis of mental disease. As her bill was not being paid, the hospital appealed to the Pima County Welfare Board one month later. The client claimed to have a guardian in New York State, who was in charge of certain

2. See Appendix, p. 148, for table of miscellaneous data regarding this group.

funds for her, and she also gave the addresses of relatives in New York City. The hospital had communicated with the relatives and at their instruction had furnished two private nurses. They had failed, however, to pay the bill as they had agreed to do. The Pima County Welfare Board could do no more than verify residence and send Miss G home, which they did at a cost of \$59.25. The agency made every effort to obtain payment of the bill, as did the hospital also, but the amount outstanding, which was \$113.25, was never paid, nor was the doctor's bill, the amount of which does not appear in the records. In this case "Miss G had already been judged incompetent by the County Physicians and could have been sent to the State Insane Asylum at once."³ If this course had been followed the State of Arizona would have been put to considerable expense. Thus in a situation of this sort, where community agencies are forced to deal with persons who are financially irresponsible, as were the relatives of Miss G, the community is obliged to carry expense which it should not be required to shoulder, and has no recourse whatever.

Miss Laura F, aged 19, an unmarried mother, arrived in Tucson in December, 1936, with a small baby who was sick and had to be hospitalized temporarily. Miss F could give no

3. Quoted from letter written by Pima County Welfare Board to Miss G's guardian.

very definite history of herself, but said she had some relatives in Louisiana and others in California. From communication with agencies in both places, it was learned that she had a history of aimless wandering over the country for the past several years. She was diagnosed by the doctor in Tucson as "mentally depressed."⁴ Nevertheless, in spite of all this information, a resident of Tucson took an interest in the child and adopted it, and at the same time purchased a ticket for Miss F to a town in Colorado where she said she had another relative. This individual made no effort to find out if such a relative actually existed or not. Here is an example of ill-advised action in a transient situation in the very county which suffers so severely from irresponsible activities of this kind on the part of persons in other sections of the country. Miss F went to Colorado, but three weeks later a letter arrived from an agency in New York City, saying that Miss F was stranded there and had given references in Tucson. She was placed under observation in Bellevue, but was evidently released after a short time, as she is now in Tucson once more, attempting to recover her child from the individual who has adopted it. Relief granted on this case was as follows: \$9.70 for general relief, \$47.50 for hospital care, \$.60 for other medical care, total \$57.80.

4. Quoted from case record.

The case of Mrs. Genevieve W presents an example of unparalleled persistence in attempting to secure relief from the Pima County Welfare Board. It has been impossible to obtain any diagnosis in her case, because she refuses to be examined, and it is not clear whether or not she is mentally unstable. However, her behavior has led the Pima County Agency to believe that such is the case. She arrived in Tucson in November, 1935, and immediately began a campaign to obtain relief, by applying in person to the Pima County Welfare Board, and by writing letters to many individuals in positions of political authority. The Pima County Welfare Board attempted to verify her residence, but was unable to do so. She appeared to have no legal residence, but had lived principally in New York and in Mississippi. She claimed to have selected Tucson for health reasons, but consistently refused medical examination. She has continued for two years to write letters of complaint to officials all over the country, and claims to have had business connections with a number of prominent persons. The Pima County Welfare Board now finds itself in a position of being forced to extend aid to her, because it is impossible to prove that she has any resources whatever or to prove legal residence anywhere. This is a situation where the local agency has been victimized by an individual whose persistent refusal or inability to give necessary information has obliged the agency to grant relief. The cost of this case to Pima

County has been \$71.23 to date.

Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Employment⁵

The applicants who definitely came to Tucson or to Southern Arizona to look for work consist of 7 who were on relief in the county of origin at the time of their departure, and 7 who were not. Of these latter 7, 2 had definite plans for employment in Tucson before they undertook the trip and will be described in detail first.

Mr. James R was pastor of a church in Roswell, New Mexico, where he earned \$15 a week. He left there with his wife and three children, one of whom was feeble-minded, in July, 1935, and came to Tucson to take a similar position, which, however, paid only \$12.50 a week. The reason for his making this change is not clear, but about two months after his arrival he broke down with tuberculosis, and was obliged to give up his work. Since the climate of Southern New Mexico is so similar to that of Southern Arizona, it does not seem probable that he had moved to Tucson for health reasons, but whether he was ill when he left home or not, he did not become dependent until two months after his arrival in Arizona. The family applied to the Pima County Welfare Board for assistance, and the agency began at once to take steps for the verification of residence and

5. See Appendix, p. 149, for table of miscellaneous data regarding this group.

authorization of return. The authorization was received, but Mr. R requested that further details be obtained as to what plans would be made for the family after their arrival home, since he himself was so ill that he could make no provision for them. Since he was unwilling to leave Tucson until he secured this information, the Pima County Welfare Board wrote again asking these questions. In spite of the fact that the New Mexico agency had already authorized return, they sent the following letter to Tucson:

"NEW MEXICO EMERGENCY RELIEF ADMINISTRATION
Roswell, New Mexico
11-7-1935

RE: R, Mr. James

Pima County Welfare Board
Tucson, Arizona

We have your letter of November 6th, in regard to arranging hospitalization for Mr. R. The relief situation is extremely difficult in New Mexico at the present time. The FERA office is closing the 1st. of December and as yet the State and County have made no arrangements for assuming the relief load. We have verified the residence of this family but if they should be returned we could not put a member of the family on WPA because of the ruling that no people are to be certified who were not on relief before November 1st. As you know, we are not permitted to provide hospitalization from federal funds, so I met with the County Commissioners this afternoon and presented the case to them. I explained our ruling in regard to residence and responsibility. They, however, said that they did not feel that ruling applied to the County and the County's obligations. They then called in the District Attorney, who said that an intent to reside gives a man residence in New Mexico, and, also, if he leaves the State with an intent to reside elsewhere he loses his residence in this state, even if he has not been gone twelve months.

We have no State Hospital for the care of Tuberculosis. I recognize our responsibility in this matter and am sorry that we are not in a position to take care of this man. I will contact the Pastor of the _____ Church to-morrow and see if they can offer any assistance.

Very truly yours,

Social Service Division ERA"

The result of this complete reversal of policy was that Mr. R and his family were unwilling to take the trip back to Roswell. Meanwhile, Mr. R's physical condition was growing steadily worse. An effort was made to force Chavez County, New Mexico, to assume its responsibility through an appeal to the State Welfare Office in Santa Fe, which met with the following reply:

"We, as social workers, have felt that although New Mexico has no residence law, that a year should be considered as residence. Whether the County Commissioners will be willing to accept this family in New Mexico with further contact and pressure we cannot say."⁶

The County Commissioners were evidently unwilling to reconsider their position, and the State Office was evidently helpless. A month later the Pima County Welfare Board tried writing directly to the Commissioners of Chavez County, and sent the following letter:

6. Quoted from letter from New Mexico Relief Administration, Nov. 23, 1935, addressed to Pima County Welfare Board.

"PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD
152 N. Church St.
Tucson, Arizona

December 23rd, 1935

County Commissioners
Chavez County
Roswell, New Mexico

RE: R, James

Gentlemen:

We refer to the case of Mr. James R, whose legal residence is Roswell, New Mexico, and concerning whom this office has had correspondence with the New Mexico Emergency Relief Administration as well as your office, and advise that we are making plans to send him within the next few days to Roswell, and are, therefore, notifying you of our action in advance.

We have taken this matter up with the State Board of Public Welfare of Arizona and have been authorized by them to send this man at our expense to Roswell where he is a legal resident. The Board of Supervisors of Pima County refuses to accept anyone into this County as a public charge until he has established a two years residence without accepting either private or public charity, and this man has been both a private and a public charge on this community now for several weeks, and were it not for the fact that he has been desperately ill we would have returned him before this time.

While we regret very much indeed the position that you have taken in this matter, this County is not going to be a point to which other counties and states may ship the indigent sick and dependent poor, and we herewith serve notice that any more such indigent families shipped to Pima County or permitted to come here under such conditions will be promptly returned.

We respectfully call your attention to the fact that this County has not, and would not, refuse to acknowledge and accept one of its legal residents until he had established a legal residence in some other state, and certainly it is

one of the principles of social work and welfare work, that an individual, who after all is a human being, does not lose his legal residence until he has lawfully gained another.

We are quite sure that a careful review of this case will cause you to see our view point and realize that we have no other alternative.

Very truly yours,

PIMA COUNTY WELFARE BOARD"

No reply was ever received, and by February of 1936 the family were still in Tucson, afraid to undertake the trip home when there was no prospect for them after their arrival except that of starvation. The Church of which Mr. R had been pastor in Tucson, was paying his salary to Mrs. R for her services in the same capacity, although this was more in the nature of charity than employment, because her time was so occupied looking after Mr. R that she could not fulfill the duties. By this means, however, the family subsisted in Tucson. On February 29, 1936, Mr. R died. There remained the problem of the care of the feebleminded child who was sent to the Arizona state mental hospital with a view to transfer to the proper institution in New Mexico. By June of 1936, however, Mrs. R had decided that she would not return to New Mexico in any case, and her eldest son had secured a job in Tucson at \$14 a week. Since the child's parent was unwilling to return to New Mexico, that state would not accept the child in its institution for feebleminded, and the child was returned to her mother, since there

is no institution for the care of this type of case in Arizona. There has been no further contact with the family. The only relief granted by the Pima County Welfare Board to this case was \$13.31 for repair of the family's automobile, at the time when they still expected to return to New Mexico.

The other applicant who came to Tucson with a definite plan for work and maintenance in mind was Mrs. Esther J, who was a victim of tuberculosis but who nevertheless planned to engage in the rest home business in Tucson. Her capital consisted of \$300 which she invested in a house and its equipment. Her place of origin was Needles, California. Ten days after her arrival in November, 1936, she became so ill that she had to be hospitalized. As her money was spent and she could recover none of it, her care was a burden on the community. The Pima County Welfare Board could not undertake relief for Mrs. J, and a private organization in Tucson became interested in the case and contributed toward Mrs. J's future care. They were not able, however, to pay the hospital bill, a total of \$359.82. So the hospital was obliged to assume this cost itself, with the exception of \$25 paid by Mrs. J's relatives. No relief was granted by the county in this case.

The remaining 12 cases in this group of transients who came to Pima County for employment, both those who were on relief in their home counties and those who were not,

were problems of migratory seasonal labor, with the exception of the William S case to be described below. Since migratory labor presents a special problem in transiency, it may be well at this point to consider some of the broader aspects of the migratory labor situation before considering any of the cases in the group in detail.

The following quotation emphasizes the fact that the seasonal labor group constitutes a large factor in the problem of transiency, even though the proportion of cases accepted for temporary relief in this group is very much smaller in Pima County than among the non-resident health-seekers.

"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."⁷

The plans made by the Federal government to meet this condition on a constructive basis are described in the following paragraph:

"We have organized a Farm Placement Service with the hope of mitigating some of the unnecessary evils incident to such transient labor. . . . 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 trans-

7. Persons, W. Frank, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 44.

fer 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 near by 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 home."⁸

The more successfully this program works, the less need there will be for local welfare agencies to be involved or concerned with the transient labor problem. There is one circumstance, however, which will continue to throw the transient laborers upon local agencies unless some definite steps are taken to make other provision for them, and that is the circumstance of illness. When the migratory laborer becomes ill, he inevitably also becomes a county burden, since he seldom has sufficient wages or savings to meet this need. Since some of the migratory workers in this section are persons who were ill to start with, or persons in whose families there was illness, and who thought that by coming to this climate these health problems might improve, it can be seen that even an efficient program of farm placement like that described above, will not provide a full solution, or relieve the county of all expense. Frequently such families

8. Persons, W. Frank, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 44.

are unable to move on with the seasons to other states, and remain stranded in Southern Arizona after a few months of employment. In the last analysis the fact that Pima County is considered a health area is a factor which enters into nearly every aspect of its transient relief problem. Three cases of this nature were found, of which two will be described.

The case of Mr. and Mrs. Jack D is a striking illustration of the above statement. This family came from Oklahoma, where they had legal residence. Mrs. D was a victim of tuberculosis, and had been hospitalized for six months at Chickasha, Oklahoma.

"Mr. D saw an advertisement in a local newspaper in November, 1936, stating that there was plenty of work in the cotton fields around Phoenix and urging Oklahoma families to go to Phoenix. Mrs. D stated she never wanted to leave the hospital as she did not feel she was able to stand the trip, but Mr. D brought her against her wishes. They sold their household goods and purchased an old Model T Ford for \$20."⁹

Mr. D had not been able to find much work at home and felt that here was a means of getting more employment for himself and of securing better health conditions for his wife, so the family moved with their three children. They picked cotton at Coolidge for two months, then the season was over and they came to Tucson, without enough money to get back to Oklahoma, and with Mrs. D in a serious condition.

9. Quoted from case record.

They were returned to their place of legal residence by the Pima County Welfare Board, after due verification, at a cost of \$37.12. \$15.44 was spent on emergency relief making a total of \$52.56.

Mr. and Mrs. Edward A. and their two children came to Pima County from Texas in December, 1936, to pick cotton in Sahuarita, and because both of them had tuberculosis. They applied for assistance in March, 1937, because Mrs. A. felt very ill and desired medical attention. It was found that both were in a serious condition, and Mrs. A. was placed in a rest home at once. They refused to consider returning to Texas, in case their residence there could be verified, because they were afraid to leave the climate of Southern Arizona. The case was closed when Mrs. A. left the rest home without notice, and nothing further has been heard from the family. The cost of the case to Pima County was \$3.

The William S. family was not a member of the seasonal labor group; nevertheless, their case may be discussed at this point because they do appear to have come to Arizona to improve their economic condition. Mr. S. stated he hoped to do this through working on WPA at \$44 a month in Arizona, instead of holding a WPA job at \$13 a month in Arkansas. This case was described at length in the Arizona Daily Star on April 14, 1937. Mr. S., his wife, and ten children travelled to Tucson in an old car. They had arrived within five miles

of the city, on April 7, 1937, when they had an automobile accident and were taken to the hospital for emergency treatment.

It may be said that Mr. S should have known that WPA relief work is not "real work," and that therefore a WPA worker is not free to seek higher wages in places where the WPA pays more, as he would be if the WPA were a private enterprise. This circumstance, however, is something that many WPA workers do not understand, and Mr. S's belief is not exceptional. How earnestly Mr. S desired to work anywhere for any wage is perhaps questionable, in view of the demands he made on the Pima County Welfare Board, but nothing definite can be stated about his attitude in this respect since no test of it could be made. According to the newspaper account, it was not Mr. S himself who had the idea of moving to Tucson, but his county welfare board at home who suggested it. According to the case record this statement, evidently made by Mr. S, was not verified. The only communication received from the Franklin County Board in Arkansas was the telegram verifying residence, which read as follows:

"William S resident Franklin County stop nothing for family to return to stop direct aid not available stop authorize return at your expense only on condition that William S return here with his family to work for them on WPA."¹⁰

10. Quoted from telegram in case record from Franklin County, Arkansas, April 10, 1937.

Nothing could better illustrate the confusion arising over transient relief matters than this case. The confusion in the mind of Mr. S has already been mentioned. After his arrival in Tucson he was both resentful and bewildered because he was told that he would have to return to Arkansas. He and his wife expected and demanded service and assistance from the Pima County Welfare Board, in fact Mr. S returned home with his family only because they were threatened with arrest as vagrants. To this man it was apparently inconceivable that he should be prevented from living where he chose, when a good job like the local WPA employment, at \$44 a month, seemed available. The attitude of the Franklin County agency, that Mr. S could be returned only on condition that he would agree ahead of time to work for WPA there after his arrival, was based on an erroneous premise. The Tucson agency could not guarantee what the client was going to do, and, if he did not agree to go to work upon his return to Arkansas, this would not have constituted a reason for the Tucson agency to spend local relief funds for his benefits, or to certify him for local WPA employment. The attitude of Pima County, as shown in the newspaper account, indicated the antagonism of a community which felt imposed upon beyond the limits of endurance.

The cost of this family to Pima County was \$120.96 for transportation; \$9.20 for general relief; and \$10 for

emergency hospital treatment. St. Mary's hospital gave the family emergency care for \$10, which would normally have cost \$40, that is, the eight patients treated should have been charged \$5 apiece. The total relief was \$140.16.

Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for
Miscellaneous Reasons¹¹

Before concluding this chapter five additional types of cases must be briefly mentioned. They are: 1) 7 applicants who came to Pima County with the hope or expectation that relatives would support them; 2) 10 applicants who were simply travelling and needed medical attention when they reached Tucson; 3) 6 applicants who came to get away from personal problems at home; 4) 1 applicant who received medical care but died before he could be interviewed by the social worker; 5) 1 applicant who had recently been discharged from the regular army.

In the first group mentioned the applicants became dependent because their relatives proved either unable or unwilling to support them. One of these cases may be noted because it illustrates a special difficulty regarding legal residence.

Mr. Matthew T came to Tucson from Tennessee, to join his wife and three children in May, 1936. The latter had

11. See Appendix, p. 150, for table of miscellaneous data regarding this group.

preceded him by two years, and the cause of this separation is not clear. However, five months after the arrival of Mr. T they applied for relief. The Pima County Welfare Board attempted to obtain verification of residence from Murfreesboro, Tennessee, and were informed that Mr. T had residence there but that his wife did not. In other words, Mrs. T could not take the residence of her husband, which is the usual practice, and she had lost residence in her own right because of her two years' absence. In Arizona, however, where the wife does take the residence of her husband, except in cases of separation, Mrs. T could not obtain relief either, because Mr. T had legal residence elsewhere. Mrs. T was thus ineligible for relief in either state, even though her husband had an established legal residence. The family solved the dilemma themselves, as Mr. T decided to return to Tennessee alone, and his wife secured a job in Tucson. The cost of the case to the Pima County Welfare Board was \$20.35 for the transportation of Mr. T.

Of the 10 applicants who were travelling through Tucson when they applied to the Pima County Welfare Board, three were en route to definite destinations, while 7 appeared to be chronic transients. Four of the latter group were old men between 75 and 80 years of age, who, according to their own statement, had taken to the road after they reached old age, having previously spent many years of their lives in

activities which enabled them to be self-supporting.

Of the seven chronic transients studied, one may be mentioned in particular.

The Frank K family, consisting of Mr. K, his wife, and three small children, applied for temporary relief in December, 1936, and said that they were residents of Los Angeles County, California. The residence could not be verified, whereupon the family stated that they had no legal residence, but wished to continue their journey to California. General relief to the amount of \$17.25 had been given them. The following closing entry appeared in the record: "Since it is very unlikely that a residence verification can be received, they were given their car and allowed to continue on their way."¹² This is the only instance found where the Pima County Welfare Board adopted the practice often referred to as "passing on," that is, of making it possible for a transient on the move to go on to some other locality, where he will be bound to ask for more relief, from some agency no more responsible for him than the one which passed him on. There was, on the other hand, no reason why Mr. K should not have been allowed to move on, since the Pima County Welfare Board could do nothing for him, except that the general policy among welfare workers is to prevent transiency whenever possible.

12. Quoted from case record.

Of the 6 cases who came to Tucson to escape from special circumstances at home, two were attempted suicides. In all six cases there seemed to have been no particular reason why Tucson was selected as the destination. These applicants might have chosen any town which was far enough from their own homes to be satisfactory for the purpose. None of this group will be discussed in detail.

The client who received county medical attention and died before he could even be interviewed represents a type of situation which occurs from time to time in Pima County, and doubtless also in numerous towns along the routes of heaviest transient travel. Such clients must of course be buried at county expense.

The client who applied for assistance after his discharge from the regular army represents a special type of non-resident case which, though not a problem of large proportions, constitutes a demand on the county funds. The history of this case follows.

Mr. Harry Z was a soldier at Fort Huachuca, discharged, after nearly 20 years of service in the regular army, because of disabilities caused by venereal disease. He had a pension of \$15 a month, insufficient to support his family. His wife had tuberculosis, and there were two children. The family had no legal settlement. The following entry quoted from the case record indicates the position of the

Pima County Welfare Board in situations of this type.

"Due to Fort Huachuca and the Government Hospital being located near Tucson the local Welfare Office are being asked to assume cases of this type. This represents a type of case with no residence, but they selected Tucson in which to live on account of the T. B. situation, and the nearness to the army post. Certainly the Federal Government should . . . not permit a family in this condition to be . . . thrown on some small local community."¹²

Eight months after his discharge from the army Mr. Z's pension was increased to \$18 a month, with an extra cash payment of \$100, but this allowance was still insufficient for the needs of his family. Later Mr. Z had to be committed to the State Mental Hospital. It seems regrettable that the Federal Government cannot care for non-residents of this type, even if the number of such cases remains small.¹³

12. Quoted from case record.

13. See Appendix, p. 151, for table of miscellaneous data regarding all cases in Chapters II, III, IV, and V. Also see Appendix, p. 152, for distributions of all transient applicants handled by the Pima County Welfare Board from March 1st, 1936, to March 1st, 1937, according to State of legal residence, and according to disabilities.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In the course of the analysis of the hundred cases studied, the emphasis has tended to set Pima County in a category of its own as a particularly victimized district, continually imposed upon by other localities. This is partly true in that Pima County, as mentioned so often before, is a health center, and is therefore subject to special conditions to a considerable extent. But the widespread incidence of the problem of transient relief and the general inability to cope with it, should not be lost sight of in the discussion of this particular area. This is particularly so because any remedy for the present situation must be a remedy based on nationwide policies adopted to meet the problem. Pima County cannot expect to find a satisfactory solution for its own plight unless such a solution is also applicable to all counties, townships, and other subdivisions in the United States.

Methods of Transient Relief in Use in Other States

Before considering suggestions which have been made for remedial action it is necessary to review briefly some present methods of handling the transient situation in states other

than Arizona, methods, that is, which have been in use since the close of the Federal program in 1935. This discussion is based on the status of transient relief in March of 1936, since no later material has been available. A few states have been selected for illustration. State policies seem to range all the way from rather careful and expensive transient programs to no programs at all.

In Michigan an interesting distinction is made between domiciled and undomiciled persons, rather than between residents and non-residents, in methods of administering relief. This seems to be unique in state policies. \$35,000 a month is allocated from state relief funds for homeless persons, to be used for transients as well as for persons who have never left their own counties. The purpose of this is to "prevent the migration of undomiciled persons,"¹ and one relief official is employed in each county to administer this fund only, under state supervision. Domiciled non-residents are the responsibility of the regular county welfare organizations, that is, as far as administration is concerned. But the state provides the funds for this group also, which it allocates to the separate county units. For purposes of administration the separation of domiciled and undomiciled clients is very useful, as the two groups present

1. Schafer, Philip, Minutes of Interstate Conference,
p. 65.

different kinds of problems. Whether the state of Michigan cares for its undomiciled persons in camps, or community shelters, or in other ways could not be ascertained. But the point of greatest interest, perhaps, is that the state does make a definite provision for those persons who are not legal residents and who need relief while within its borders.²

New York State has, as previously mentioned,³ a program for the relief of the "State Poor" who consist of persons with no legal settlement within the state, and who have not resided for 60 days in any one county during the year preceding application for relief. New York State prides itself on the care with which investigations and plans for transients are made prior to removal.

"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."⁴

New York also undertakes to transfer the furniture and personal belongings of the persons and families who are thus removed. In 1934, 90 per cent of the persons removed remained in the localities to which they were sent, and 38

2. Schafer, Philip, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 65.

3. See Chapter I, p. 17.

4. Jacobs, Haskell, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 68.

per cent were self supporting within a year. In 1935, a total of 4,100 cases were removed.⁵ This policy shows a definite attempt to stop transiency among the cases which come under care of the New York authorities. It is undoubtedly a far-sighted plan, but only a wealthy state could undertake a policy requiring the amount of relief and the expensive and careful investigation involved.

In New York City there is a special situation because the city requires two years of self-support to establish residence, whereas the state law requires only one year. Thus there are always thousands of persons in New York City who do not qualify for local relief, but who may have established state settlement. In spite of this technical difficulty regarding residence, special funds have been set aside by both city and state for the care of this group, the administration of which is in the hands of the private welfare agencies. In March, 1936, there were 8,000 single persons being cared for in this manner in shelters, 24,000 single persons in domiciles, and 625 families in domiciles.⁶

In Ohio relief officials were particularly anxious not to lose the benefits of the medical program established by the Federal Transient Service. State authorities brought pressure upon county governments and civic groups to carry

5. Jacobs, Haskell, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 68.

6. Buffington, Adeline A., Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 66-67.

on this program, but only the larger counties did so.⁷

These three states appear to have been particularly fortunate in their transient programs. Other states have not fared so well. In Connecticut, where there is also a plan for the relief of "State Poor," such non-resident persons are cared for by local communities on a basis of reimbursement from the state, thus the local communities have the authority to accept or reject transient applications for relief.

"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. We are convinced that the conditions as they now exist represent very serious health hazards."⁸

In 1936 state commissions were set up to study the transient problem and to propose revisions of the settlement laws.⁹

In Illinois there seem to be two separate plans, one used in Chicago, and one in the rest of the state, as is the case in New York City and New York State. Chicago provides two nights' food and lodging for unattached transients, whereas non-resident families are turned over to the private agencies. The two nights care for the single transients does not provide any real solution to the problem, since it would seem to be based on the expectation that these people

7. Hixenbaugh, Walter A., Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 69-70.

8. Little, Eleanor H., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 60.

9. Loc. cit.

will either find work or move on.¹⁰ However, the situation in Chicago seems to be somewhat better than in the rest of Illinois.

"It is true that local administrators are authorized to give relief to transients but it is also true that they hold their jobs by satisfying their county committees 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."¹¹

Mr. Sands's forecast in the above statement is doubtless true, but the difficulty is that local communities cannot afford to pay the medical bills now.

In Virginia, which is an example of those states in which transient care is at a very low ebb, there is not only no provision for even the temporary relief of transients, but there are also no funds with which to send them to their place of legal settlement when they have one. Nothing can be done for them. Furthermore this state seems to have a good deal of trouble with intra-state transients. "We have just about as much trouble getting a county to take back a resident as we have to persuade them to take care of a transient."¹² There certainly seems to be an attitude

10. Sands, Daniel, Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 61-62.

11. Ibid., p. 61.

12. Woll, Margaret, Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 71-72.

among county relief boards that when any indigent family leaves home, whatever responsibility the county board may have once had for their care need never be assumed again. The necessity for cooperation with other counties and welfare organizations does not seem to be realized. County boards do not generally appreciate the fact that residents of theirs may be transient dependents somewhere else, and that all local communities resent the problem of transient relief just as they do themselves.

In Maine as in Virginia, there is no state program at all. The police and not the welfare agencies are called upon to take care of the transients, and the police departments give them a night's lodging, food, and the suggestion that they move on the next day.¹³

In California the border patrol system adopted by the city of Los Angeles, and in use at various towns along the state borders, has become notorious. The following paragraphs emphasize the undesirable situation in that state.

"The State has chosen the road which temporarily protects the resident population and state finances, and thus joins the caravan of states which are now competing for the lefthanded honor of seeing which can most quickly mistreat migrants, that such groups may leave inhospitable borders and seek kindlier places. Inevitably, awareness of inhospitality and its general prevalence throughout the United States forces the choice of starving more easily where the climate is less severe.

13. Leadbetter, George W., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 62.

Hence, Florida and California become the Meccas of the disinherited."¹⁴

"California has been held up to ridicule resulting from an action taken by the city of Los Angeles in instituting the border patrol, and communities within the state are hosts to misleading information regarding the transients and their problem. The immediate result is acute human suffering. This is further complicated by the defeat of even the primary purpose intended by the establishment of the 'bum blockade,' since workers in the special survey report influx of persons at many points and by many subterfuges."¹⁵

This represents the latest information which was obtainable about California. The State of Arizona might well be added to the number of those states which have become "the Meccas of the disinherited."

In Colorado a border patrol was also instituted.

"Governor Ed. C. Johnson ordered out the Colorado national guardsmen to enforce his edict of martial law against indigent and alien laborers crossing the southern border of the state. He further stated that he would order other guards stationed along other borders if the 'itinerants' still sought to enter the state. Johnson said that his decision was caused by reports that beet-sugar firms and the railroads planned heavy importations of 'cheap labor,' which would cause trying conditions in caring for the residents of the state who were unemployed."¹⁶

-
14. Bristol, Margaret Cochran, op. cit., p. 313, quoted from Lewis, M. H., Special Surveys and Studies: Progress Report No. 3, p. 1. California State Relief Commission, December 28, 1935.
 15. Ibid., p. 313, quoted from Lewis M. H., Special Surveys and Studies: Progress Report No. 7, p. 9, California State Relief Commission, December 28, 1935.
 16. Ibid., p. 313, footnote, based on report in the Chicago Daily News of April 20, 1936.

Whether Governor Johnson was successful in this attempt to close the state to migratory labor would seem doubtful, in view of Mr. Person's statement previously mentioned¹⁷ as to the large number of such workers who follow seasonal employment through Western states.

The situation in Florida is similar to that in Arizona in three important respects. Florida, like Arizona, attracts many health seekers, as well as many people who merely drift with the seasons to warm climates. In Florida also, as in Arizona, there is only a small permanent population and extremely limited funds with which to meet the needs and demands of dependent visitors. In both states, furthermore, there is a seasonal migration of a different nature from the seasonal migration of migratory labor. That is, there is an element of the floating population which moves away in the period of summer heat and drifts back again with the coming of winter. Florida had as many transients during the winter of 1935-1936, after the close of the Federal Transient Service, as it had had before, but evidently no state program was established for their care.¹⁸ In Miami there is a device called the "hobo express," which is a police truck used to take transients to the city limits, where they are merely dumped. Miami provides one night's

17. See Chapter V, p. 112.

18. Redkey, Henry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 64.

shelter for unattached men and boys, but no food. After these people are removed in this manner from the city of Miami, they are, of course, still in the State of Florida, but the city does not concern itself about this, and the "hobo express" simply waits for another load the next day.¹⁹

The problem for the poorer states is briefly and bluntly put in the following statement from Mississippi: "Our State is broke. We don't have any money in our State and we feel that the transient program is a national program."²⁰ This, indeed, is the bald truth of the matter in most localities. Small relief units, and even many of the state relief units, simply cannot undertake the expense of transient relief in the absence of national cooperation and coordinated planning.

Remedial Measures

General Considerations: The general opinion of persons familiar with transient conditions would seem to be that the present state of chaos and of passing on of non-resident dependents from one locality to another is a serious condition, and that something can and must be done about it.

"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

19. Bristol, Margaret Cochran, op. cit., p. 321.

20. Ellis, Frank W., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 69.

it can no longer be considered as a temporary proposition."²¹

The need for Federal aid and Federal coordination of any adequate program for transient relief appears to be essential.

"The tax base and administrative base for public assistance must be broader than the community in which a citizen resides."²²

This statement is similar to that made by T. W. Fowle²³ years ago that the basis for relief must be as broad as possible. The resumption of Federal aid, however, in transient relief should be on a different basis from the old Federal Transient Program, which did have some very unsatisfactory features. These features are explained in the following paragraphs.

"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. . . . On the other hand, I do not think the care of transients should become a national undertaking, controlled, 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 interest of all concerned.

"So long as the states do not have any

-
21. Jenny, William A., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 70.
 22. Ellis, William J., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 50.
 23. See Chapter I, p. 11.

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 administration of transient relief has just as significant a place and is just as important a part of a total state program, as any other welfare activity!"²⁴

This statement brings out clearly the major weakness of the Federal Transient program. By relieving the states of all cost and all activity in the administration of transient relief, it would seem that the Federal Government had actually accentuated the general prejudice against migratory dependents, and in fact had helped to create a false cleavage between the migratory and the more stable portions of the population. A perusal of the foregoing case analyses brings this factor out very clearly. The transient is considered a pariah by a great many people who are non-transient.

One method of simplifying the problem, with or without Federal aid, would be to secure legislation creating uniform settlement laws in all the states. The fundamental purpose of settlement laws, to provide some way of equalizing the costs of relief so that no one community shall be called upon disproportionately, has clearly not been accomplished, partly because of the great variation in the

24. Greenstein, Harry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 78.

settlement laws. But to obtain uniformity would involve so much pressure upon legislatures, so much organization and expense, and so long a period of time, that it would seem a futile undertaking if a better way could be found of securing the desired objectives.

To abolish settlement laws entirely would be difficult for the same reasons, and impossible without an additional positive program of cooperation.

"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."²⁵

Proposed Plans: A number of suggestions have been made by various groups for definite programs in the field of transient relief. Some would appear to have better chances of solving the problem than others, and two may be mentioned here.

One is based on the principle of reciprocal interstate agreements for the care of non-resident poor persons. Such agreements already exist among a number of states for the transfer of insane and delinquent persons to their places of legal residence. Seven states east of the Mississippi have extended these agreements to include the removal of non-resident poor persons, who may not necessarily fall into the above two categories.²⁶ The National Conference of Com-

25. Hoehler, Fred K., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 10.

26. Lowe, Robert C., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 22.

missioners on Uniform State Laws, meeting in 1935 at Los Angeles, drew up a "Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act" to suggest a form of legislation which might be adopted by any state wishing to enter into such agreements. This suggested act was later approved by the American Bar Association.²⁷ The following summary of its provisions will indicate the nature of the remedy contemplated.

"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."²⁸

The blanks in the above clause are, of course, to be filled in by individual states according to the requirements of their own state laws. The provision that indigent persons shall not be considered to have "interrupted" their residence by the acceptance of relief is interesting in that it is contrary to general practice at present. If, however, the states were protected by reciprocal agreements, it might be expected that after the residence of dependent persons had once been straightened out on this new basis, the states could safely discard their present rules on this point.

27. Goodhue, Frank W., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 46.
28. Ibid., p. 48.

The Uniform Transfer of Dependents Act, among other provisions, requires that persons must be shown to be chronic relief cases before they are sent back to the state of residence. Those in need of temporary aid only are not to be so removed. No definition is given of where temporary dependency ends and chronic dependency begins, however. A person's household goods are to be sent back to his place of residence with him, and the entire expense is to be borne by the sending state. No person is to be sent if there is any danger to the client's health or to the public health. Both states are to make an accurate and detailed investigation of each situation.²⁹

This plan, while it would provide a method of caring for transients far superior to those in use at present, has the disadvantage that it would not necessarily include financial participation or coordination on the part of the Federal Government, and that, like any agreement, it could be broken without legal penalty. If one state should fail to abide by it there would be no inducement for the others to continue. Each state, in order to obtain full protection, would have to enter into forty-seven separate agreements with the forty-seven other states, which might cause much confusion.

Also, it would be necessary for all states entering into

29. Goodhue, Frank W., Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 48-49.

such agreements to authorize local support of persons within their borders, who, at the time the agreements went into effect, had no legal residence anywhere. Otherwise, the care of this group of transients would remain as haphazard as at present, and the agreements could not be fully effective.³⁰ This consideration applies also, however, to any plan for Federal grants in aid to the States, and in fact, to any interstate program for transient relief.

The plan proposed by the State of Florida, after a careful survey of conditions in that state, made in 1935 by The Florida Transient Coordinating Committee, a commission appointed by the Governor, is perhaps the most constructive and most promising suggestion yet made. The program calls for Federal participation in a national transient relief program on a basis of matching appropriations with the states, in the manner of the present Social Security Acts. The extent to which such matching will be required by the various states is the point of major interest in this plan, especially for a State like Arizona, where the proportion of migratory travelers to the permanent population is so large. The proposal is described in the following statement by Henry Redkey, who was Secretary of the Florida investigating commission:

30. Goodhue, Frank W., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 45.

"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."³¹

It can readily be seen that if the proportionate matching basis described above were adopted, states like Florida and Arizona, with their load of non-resident health-seekers, and of transients seeking mild winter climates, would carry their just share of the national transient load, but no more. With this plan in effect, the Federal Government would then be called upon to decide whether or not to discourage the migration of health-seekers to warm and dry climates. No single state, least of all a state located in the desirable climate, is in a position to take any action in this respect. The Federal Government might, as suggested by Dr. Kleinschmidt of the National Tuberculosis Association, maintain treatment centers for tuberculous patients in areas

31. Redkey, Henry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 36.

such as Southern Arizona.³² The tuberculosis problem would then become a problem to be solved on medical grounds, and by medical opinion, which it should be in any case, instead of a problem which is actually solved, as at present, by the laws of legal settlement, and by the relative poverty or prosperity of given localities.

The Florida plan suggests thirteen standards to be met by the states before Federal grants in aid should be given. Among them are the following: Identification of the transient applicants according to standards to be prescribed by the National Security Board;³³ central registration of applicants through state exchanges; employment of transients on public work when private employment is not available; transportation to place of legal settlement only on the basis provided in the present inter-agency Transportation Agreement; and the requirement that it be mandatory for public officials to authorize the return of their own legal residents.³⁴ The Florida Committee also proposes that all states amend their laws so as to provide that no person shall lose his legal settlement before he has acquired another.³⁵ They also recommend that the U. S. De-

32. Kleinschmidt, Dr. H. E., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 33.

33. The mechanics for carrying out such a system of identification were not described in the material available.

34. Bristol, Margaret Cochran, op. cit., p. 327.

35. Redkey, Henry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 37.

partment of Labor be required to provide state relief organizations with information regarding seasonal labor demands.³⁶ Finally they urge decentralized administration of transient relief, with local participation, as well as state and Federal, both financially and in policy formation,³⁷ which would make it imperative for all local agencies within a state to be coordinated under a strong state welfare department. Thus the circumstance found in several of the case histories studied in this paper, of state and local authorities working at cross purposes, and of state welfare departments having insufficient authority to require cooperation from local units, could no longer exist. The situation is well summed up in the following statement:

"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 security legislation. Nothing else will satisfy the requirements of our modern industrialized society."³⁸

The Interstate Conference on Transient and Settlement laws, which has provided much of the information presented in this paper,³⁹ adopted a number of resolutions on the

36. Redkey, Henry, Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 38.

37. Ibid., p. 36.

38. Ellis, William J., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 51.

39. This Conference, which met in Trenton, New Jersey, on March 6 and 7, 1936, represented twenty-one states east of the Mississippi, and the District of

problem under discussion, embodying the following main points: The conference indorsed the principle of Federal grants in aid to the states for programs of both relief and employment for transients, and also the principle of interstate agreements; it recommended the liberalizing of settlement laws with a view to establishing uniform periods of residence for all the states; and it urged adequate standards of relief for all persons in need, regardless of settlement status.⁴⁰

Meanwhile the situation remains virtually out of control, and in fact may be growing worse as the months pass.

"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 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.

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

Columbia. It was sponsored by the State of New Jersey Commission on Interstate Co-operation, and by the State of Pennsylvania Commission on Interstate Co-operation, and by the State of New York Joint Legislative Committee on Interstate Co-operation.

40. Minutes of Interstate Conference, pp. 91-93.

"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."⁴¹

It is to be hoped that the economic improvement which has taken place since this statement was made in March, 1936, may have resulted in a change for the better in some of these conditions. The Pima County problem, however, remains to a large extent as it was during the worst years of the depression because of its character as a health problem primarily, and it may be said in closing that the Florida Plan suggests the best solution yet proposed for the situation in Pima County.

41. Potter, Dr. Ellen C., Minutes of Interstate Conference, p. 16.

APPENDIX

Table I

Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter II

<u>Legal Residence</u>		<u>Dependent Status Before Departure</u>	
Illinois	2	On Relief	10
Texas	2	Not on Relief	5
New York	2		
Iowa	1		
Michigan	1		
Minnesota	1		
Ohio	1		
Pennsylvania	1		
South Dakota	1		
Wisconsin	1		
None	2		
		<u>Number of Dependents</u>	<u>No. of Cases</u>
		No. of Dependents	
		6	2
		4	1
		3	5
		2	1
		0	6
<u>Number of Health Seekers - 14</u>			
	T. B.	12	
	Others	2	
	<u>Disposition</u>		
Returned	8		
Remained or made other adjustment	6	Died	1
<u>No Relief Given - 1</u>			
<u>Cost to Pima County</u>			
General	\$122.24		
Medical	440.87		
Transportation	385.45	(7 cases returned at expense of Pima County; 1 at expense of home agency.)	
County Burial	- - -		
Total	<u>\$948.56</u>		

Table II

Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter III

Total - 5

Legal Residence

Illinois	1
Iowa	1
Missouri	1
Ohio	1
Pennsylvania	1

Dependent Status Before Departure

On Relief	5
Not on Relief	0

Number of Dependents

No. of Dependents	No. of Cases
4	2
2	1
1	2

Number of Health Seekers - 5

T. B.	5
Others	0

Disposition

Returned	3	Died	0
Remained or made other adjustment	2		

No Relief Given - 1

Cost to Pima County

General	\$ 17.91
Medical	68.50
Transportation	200.43
County Burial	- - -
Total	<u>\$286.84</u>

Table IV

Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter V, Section a - Applicants Who Migrated to Pima County for Health Reasons

Total - 12

Legal Residence

Texas	2
Illinois	1
Indiana	1
Missouri	1
Oklahoma	1
Tennessee	1
None	5

Dependent Status Before Departure

On Relief	2
Not on Relief	10

Number of Dependents

No. of Dependents	No. of Cases
0	10
2	1
5	1

Number of Health Seekers - 12

T. B.	10
Others	2

Disposition

Returned	5	Died	3
Remained or made other adjustment	4		

No Relief Given - 2

Cost to Pima County

General	\$ 23.21
Medical	251.54
Transportation	86.58
County Burial	40.00
Total	<u>\$401.33</u>

Table V

Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter V,
Section b - Applicants Who Were Mentally Unadjusted

Total - 8

Legal Residence

Florida	1
Kansas	1
Missouri	1
New York	1
Ohio	1
None	3

Dependent Status Before Departure

On Relief	1
Not on Relief	7

Number of Dependents

No. of De- pendents	No. of Cases
1	4
0	4

Number of Health Seekers - 2

T. B.	1
Others	1

Disposition

Returned	3	Died	1
Remained or made other adjust- ment	4		

No Relief Given - 1

Cost to Pima County

General	\$ 93.18
Medical	188.35
Transportation	160.56
County Burial	- - -
Total	<u>\$442.09</u>

Table VI

Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter V,
Section c - Applicants Who Migrated to
Pima County for Employment

Total - 14

<u>Legal Residence</u>		<u>Dependent Status Before Departure</u>	
Oklahoma	3	On Relief	7
Texas	3	Not on Relief	7
Missouri	2		
Arkansas	1		
California	1		
New Mexico	1		
None	3		
		<u>Number of Dependents</u>	
		No. of De- pendents	No. of Cases
		11	1
		9	1
		5	3
		4	4
		3	1
		1	2
		0	2

Number of Health Seekers - 3

T. B.	3
Others	0

Disposition

Returned	6	Died	1
Remained or made other adjustment	7		

No Relief Given - 2

Cost to Pima County

General	\$ 59.20
Medical	124.30
Transportation	276.85
County Burial	- - -
Total	<u>\$460.35</u>

Table VII

Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapter V.
Section d - Applicants Who Migrated to Pima
County for Miscellaneous Reasons

Total - 25

<u>Legal Residence</u>		<u>Dependent Status Before Departure</u>	
Arizona: Cochise County	1		
Gila County	1	On Relief	3
Maricopa County	1	Not on Relief	22
Texas	3		
Colorado	2	<u>Number of Dependents</u>	
Ohio	2	<u>No. of De-</u>	<u>No. of</u>
Oklahoma	2	<u>pendents</u>	<u>Cases</u>
Arkansas	1	4	2
Kentucky	1	3	5
Pennsylvania	1	2	2
Tennessee	1	1	1
None	9	0	15

Number of Health Seekers - 2

T. B.	2
Others	0

Disposition

Returned	11	Died	3
Remained or made other adjustment	11		

No Relief Given - 2

Cost to Pima County

General	\$ 235.87
Medical	684.35
Transportation	476.14
County Burial	60.00
Total	<u>\$1456.36</u>

Table VIII

Miscellaneous Data Regarding Applicants in Chapters II, III, IV, and V

Total - 100

Legal Residence

Texas	12	Florida	3	Georgia	1
Oklahoma	9	Michigan	3	Indiana	1
Missouri	7	New York	3	Kansas	1
Illinois	6	Arkansas	2	Minnesota	1
Ohio	6	Colorado	2	New Mexico	1
Pennsylvania	4	Iowa	2	So. Dakota	1
Tennessee	4	Kentucky	2	Washington (St.)	1
Arizona	3	California	1	Wisconsin	1
				None	23

Dependent Status Before Departure

On Relief 36
Not on Relief 64

Number of Dependents

No. of Dependents	No. of Cases	No. of Dependents	No. of Cases
11	1	4	11
9	1	3	13
7	2	2	7
6	3	1	10
5	6	0	46

Number of Health Seekers - 59

Disposition

T. B.	49	Returned	43
Others	10	Remained or made other adjustment	44
		Died	13

No Relief Given - 14

Cost to Pima County

General	\$ 641.88
Medical	1988.76
Transportation	2035.17
County Burial	160.00
Total	<u>\$4825.81</u>

Table IX

Distributions of all Transient Applicants Handled by the Pima County Welfare Board from March 1st, 1936, to March 1st, 1937, According to State of Legal Residence and According to Disabilities¹

<u>Legal Residence</u>					
Texas	66	Indiana	8	Georgia	2
Oklahoma	57	Kentucky	7	Nevada	2
California	45	Louisiana	7	Oregon	2
Illinois	28	Utah	7	West Virginia	2
Tennessee	19	Iowa	6	Maryland	1
Ohio	18	Kansas	6	Massachusetts	1
New York	17	Minnesota	5	Nebraska	1
Montana	16	Washington (St.)	5	North Carolina	1
New Mexico	13	Alabama	4	South Dakota	1
Pennsylvania	13	Colorado	4	Virginia	1
Arizona	12	Florida	4	Wyoming	1
Arkansas	12	Wisconsin	4	Indian Reser-	
Michigan	12	Mississippi	3	vation	1
Missouri	11	Washington, D.C.	3	None	68
Total - 496					
<u>Disabilities</u>					
Tuberculosis	255	Appendectomy	5	Hernia	2
Accident	56	Bronchiectasis	5	Low Blood Pres-	
Pneumonia	28	Heart Trouble	5	sure	2
Mental Malad-		Suicide (at-		Malnutrition	2
justment	24	tempted)	5	Cancer	1
Influenza	17	Infection	4	Gall Bladder	
Asthma	14	Sinus	4	Trouble	1
Pregnancy	11	Old Age	4	Hemorrhoids	1
Arthritis	9	Kidney Trouble	3	Infantile Paraly-	
Injuries	9	Osteomyelitis of		sis	1
Paralysis	9	Jaw	3	Measles	1
Venereal		Rheumatism	3	Meningitis	1
Disease	9	Blood Poisoning	2	Suicide	1
				Sunstroke	1
				Typhoid Carrier	1
Total - 496					

1. This information was obtained from monthly summaries of transient case load, Pima County Welfare Board. The figures may not be entirely accurate, but are approximately so, as far as the present writer can ascertain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

References

- Bristol, Margaret Cochran. "Transients in Recent Reports." Social Service Review, Vol. X, No. 2, June, 1936.
- Fowle, T. W. The Poor Law. London, Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1898.
- Heisterman, Carl A. "Statutory Provisions Relating to Legal Settlement for Purposes of Poor-Relief." Social Service Review, Vol. VII, No. 1, March, 1933.
- Massoth, Leona E. "Some Current Misconceptions Concerning Non-Residents." Social Service Review, Vol. X, No. 2, June, 1936.
- Minutes of Interstate Conference on Transients and Settlement Laws. Trenton, New Jersey, March 6-7, 1936. Statements made by authorities quoted below.

Authorities Quoted

- Alspach, Charles H., Director, Transient Division, W. P. A., Washington, D. C.
- Blakeslee, Ruth O., Regional Social Worker, W. P. A., Washington, D. C.
- Buffington, Adeline A., Welfare Council, Secretary, Family Welfare Division, New York City.
- Ellis, Frank W., State Director, E. R. A., Transient Division, Jackson, Mississippi
- Ellis, William J., Commissioner, Department of Institutions and Agencies, Trenton, New Jersey.
- Goodhue, Frank W., Director of Aid and Relief, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Greenstein, Harry, State Relief Administrator, Baltimore, Maryland.

Hartshorne, Richard, Chairman, Commission on Interstate Cooperation,
Newark, New Jersey.

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

Hoehler, Fred K., Director, American Public Welfare Association,
Chicago, Illinois.

Jacobs, Haskell, Consultant on Settlement, F. E. R. A.
New York City.

Jenny, William A., Assistant Director, Relief Division,
Pennsylvania, S. E. R. A.
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania.

Kleinschmidt, H. E., M. D., National Tuberculosis Association,
Director, Health Education,
New York City.

Lane, Winthrop D., Director, Division of Parole, Department of Institutions and Agencies,
Trenton, New Jersey.

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

Little, Eleanor H., Secretary, Emergency Relief Commission,
Hartford, Connecticut.

Lowe, Robert C., Legal Research Section, W. P. A.,
Washington, D. C.

Potter, Ellen C., M. D., Director of Medicine, Department of Institutions and Agencies, and Chairman, National Committee on Care of Transient and Homeless,
Trenton, New Jersey.

Redkey, Henry, Director, Department of Transient and Unattached, State Board of Social Welfare, and Secretary, Governor's Transient Commission,
Jacksonville, Florida.

Sands, Daniel, Chairman, Transient Committee
Chicago, Illinois.

Schafer, Philip, Director, Transient Division, S. E. R. A.,
Lansing, Michigan.

Woll, Margaret, Assistant State Relief Administrator,
V. E. R. A.,
Richmond, Virginia.