

20
109

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JAMES J. DAVIS, Secretary

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

GRACE ABBOTT, Chief

PROCEEDINGS OF CONFERENCE

ON

MOTHERS' PENSIONS

Held under the Auspices of the Mothers' Pension Committee
Family Division of the National Conference of Social Work
and the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

JUNE 28, 1922

Bureau Publication No. 109



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1922

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE

ON THE

OWING TO LIMITED APPROPRIATIONS FOR PRINTING, IT IS
NOT POSSIBLE TO DISTRIBUTE THIS BULLETIN IN LARGE
QUANTITIES. ADDITIONAL COPIES MAY BE PROCURED
FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

AT

5 CENTS PER COPY



2027
4-5
109-14

msg: III

CONTENTS.

	Page
Letter of transmittal.....	v
The Mothers' Pension Committee: Mary F. Bogue.....	1
Analysis of budget questionnaire returns: Frank W. Goodhue.....	2-9
Budget schedules used.....	3
Application of budget schedules by 30 agencies.....	3
Deviations from the schedule.....	4, 5
Nationality.....	4
Former standard of living.....	4
Health of family.....	4
Families living in the country.....	5
Adequacy of grants.....	5
Use of expense accounts.....	6
Employment of dietitians.....	6
Standards of living.....	6-8
Housing.....	7
Food.....	7
Clothing.....	7
Fuel.....	7
Household equipment.....	7
Education.....	7
Recreation.....	8
Health.....	8
Analysis of grants.....	8
Conclusions.....	9
Study of standards of aid: Florence Nesbitt.....	9
Recommendations of the committee: Mary F. Bogue.....	13
General discussion (led by Mrs. Daniel Ancona).....	16
State supervision:	
Massachusetts: Mrs. Elizabeth F. Moloney.....	19
Pennsylvania: Mary F. Bogue.....	21
Minnesota: William Hodson.....	23
Ohio: Lucia B. Johnson.....	25
Maine: Dr. Gertrude Hall.....	26
New York: Mary A. Steer.....	26
Discussion.....	28
Minutes of the meeting of the Mothers' Pension Committee.....	31

and by TEXAS BOOKBINDER, DALLAS, TEXAS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
CHILDREN'S BUREAU,
Washington, August 30, 1922.

SIR: I transmit herewith a report of the Proceedings of Conference on Mothers' Pensions held under the auspices of the Mothers' Pension Committee, Family Division of the National Conference of Social Work, and the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, in Providence, R. I., June 28, 1922.

Respectfully submitted.

GRACE ABBOTT, *Chief.*

HON. JAMES J. DAVIS,
Secretary of Labor.

v

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

The following report of the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Missouri, for the year ending June 30, 1914, is hereby transmitted to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, as required by the Act of October 3, 1917, (40 Stat. 1000).

PROCEEDINGS OF CONFERENCE ON MOTHERS' PENSIONS

Held Under the Auspices of the Mothers' Pension Committee, Family Division of the National Conference of Social Work, and the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor.

Wednesday, June 28, 1922.

The conference convened at 3.30 p. m. in the ballroom of the Providence-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R. I., Mr. Frank Bruno, chairman of the Family Division of the National Conference of Social Work, presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. A year ago, at the National Conference of Social Work, the Division on the Family was asked to appoint a committee to cooperate with the Children's Bureau of the National Government in a study of mothers' allowances. That committee was appointed, with Miss Mary F. Bogue, State supervisor of the mothers' assistance fund of Pennsylvania, as chairman. I will ask Miss Bogue to outline the purpose of this meeting and the business which will come before it.

THE MOTHERS' PENSION COMMITTEE.

MISS BOGUE. Those of you who were present at the National Conference at Milwaukee last year, and who attended the round-table discussion on mothers' allowances, will remember that the group of 20 or 30 officials, men and women, who were gathered there authorized the appointment of a committee of three, who were to call a meeting here this year and plan a definite program. It was the thought of that group that the small committee would be incorporated in a larger committee to be appointed by the chairman of the family division, and this action was taken.

The personnel of the committee is as follows:

Chairman, MARY F. BOGUE, State Supervisor, Mothers' Assistance Fund, Department of Public Welfare, Harrisburg, Pa.

MARY STEER, Supervisor, Boards of Child Welfare, State Board of Charities, Albany, N. Y.

FLORENCE NESBITT, District Superintendent, United Charities, 102 East Oak Street, Chicago, Ill.

AMY STEINHART, Chief, Bureau of Children's Aid, Department of Finance, Sacramento, Calif.

FLORENCE HUTSINPILLAR, Executive Secretary, Bureau of Charity, Department of Health and Charity, Denver, Colo.

FRANK W. GOODHUE, Director, Division of Aid and Relief, Department of Public Welfare, Boston, Mass.

MRS. ALICE READ SAXBY, Chief Probation Officer, Shelby County Probate Court, Memphis, Tenn.

The round-table conference in Milwaukee discussed a number of phases of the mothers' allowance work and showed by far the greatest interest in the use of a standard budget schedule. In fact, so much interest was manifested in that subject that it was chosen by the committee for its first study.

The committee immediately drafted a questionnaire on the use of the standard budget, and I presume that a great many of you here to-day answered those questions. The questionnaires were sent in February to 125 mothers' allowance and other public agencies throughout the country, and we have received 45 well-considered replies. They were made with great care and form the basis of a study that we feel is going to be of real help to us.

The purpose of the committee was, perhaps, first of all that we might "find ourselves" in this particular branch of public welfare, get acquainted with each other, and know what we are doing; and, second, that we might gather information from the various fields of activity pertaining to mothers' allowances and their administration, and make available to all of us the very best that is being done by mothers' allowance agencies throughout the country.

Mr. Frank W. Goodhue, director of aid and relief of the Department of Public Welfare of Massachusetts, has spent a great amount of time in studying these questionnaires, and his report will follow.

ANALYSIS OF BUDGET QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS.

Mr. GOODHUE. The analysis that I will present to you is of 45 returns that were received in answer to the budget questionnaires submitted by the committee to 125 selected public agencies throughout the United States. Replies came in from agencies in the States of California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, and Wisconsin. They covered 22,140 families, in which there were 68,210 children who were receiving assistance in February, 1922. One important agency in Minneapolis is not represented in these statistics.

Fifteen of the 45 agencies are not using standard budget schedules, but at least 5 of these indicated that they appreciate their value and importance. Thirty agencies are using a standard budget schedule.

The items considered in the questionnaire were as follows: Food, clothing, fuel, rent, light, insurance, car fare for working members of the family, health, spending money for children of working age, recreation, education, household supplies, and incidentals.

BUDGET SCHEDULES USED.

In general, the agencies in the different States appear to have adopted schedules compiled by local authorities. The food schedule compiled by Professor Jaffa, of the University of California, was used by 2 agencies; that of the Chicago Standard Budget by 5; Miss Emma Winslow's guide by 4; and that of the New York Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor by 3. One agency in each case used the schedules of the New York Charity Organization Society, United States Department of Agriculture, Michigan Agricultural College, Visiting Housekeepers' Association of Detroit, home economics department of the Associated Charities of Cleveland, Ohio, and Massachusetts Department of Public Welfare. The remaining 10 agencies had adopted schedules which had been established from their own experience after consultation with specially formed groups of interested individuals and study of some of the above-named schedules and various governmental reports. The methods used in computing amounts necessary to provide sufficient food varied considerably; they include the caloric, unit, percentage, and quantitative bases.

APPLICATION OF BUDGET SCHEDULES BY 30 AGENCIES.

As the cost of food varies so materially in the different States, and the standards and methods of computation are so different, any attempt to analyze the adequacy of the aid granted would be futile.

All the agencies had schedules for food and clothing, and 29 provided for fuel, or for fuel and light combined.

Rents were generally included as an item of the budget, but the standards of allowance varied. Some schedules established a maximum that might be allowed for rent; others allowed rent "as paid," or "according to needs of the family."

Thirteen agencies made allowance for insurance, and undoubtedly this item was considered in some instances in the allowance for incidentals.

Fourteen agencies included car fare for working members of the family.

Nine agencies included health in the schedule. The replies on this subject were somewhat disappointing, since they did not indicate the scope of consideration.

Fourteen agencies allowed children of working age to retain a certain amount of their wages.

Maine allowed 50 cents to \$1 per week.

In *Grand Rapids, Mich.*, the allowance depended upon the standard of living.

Granite Falls, Minn., allowed one-fourth of the earnings to be used for clothing and spending money.

Cincinnati, Ohio, allowed one-third of the earnings.

Denver, Colo., allowed an amount decided upon by the investigator, in conference with the mother, to be used for recreation, books, etc.

New York City had a set scale dependent upon wages.

Eight agencies made allowance for recreation and seven for education.

Eleven agencies provided for household supplies.

Twenty-three agencies allowed for incidentals.

DEVIATIONS FROM THE SCHEDULE.

Nationality.

Eleven agencies made deviations from the schedule on account of nationality. One agency had a Mexican problem which affected the use of the schedule. Another agency figured a low estimate for food and clothing for foreign families. A third agency granted lower allowances for Italian and Czechoslovakian families.

Former standard of living.

Fifteen agencies took into consideration the former standard of living. One agency added 10 per cent to the food budget for high-type families. Another agency did not reduce the widow of a clerical worker or skilled mechanic to the same standard as the widow of a laborer.

Health of family.

Twenty-five agencies made some deviation from the budget schedule on account of the health needs of the family.

Oakland, Calif., in some instances increased the food allowance 25 per cent for a child with tubercular tendencies.

San Francisco, Calif., increased the food allowance 20 per cent for a tubercular family.

Detroit, Mich., added 10 per cent to the food allowance for families having tubercular tendencies.

New York City added 20 per cent to the food budget in tuberculosis cases, and milk, medicine, etc., were regular items of the budget.

Westchester County, N. Y., increased the food allowance 10 per cent when extra nourishment was required, or in tubercular families, or in families consisting of a mother with only one or two children.

Denver, Colo., reported that the allowance was not usually changed, but that expenditures were more carefully directed in cases where

tubercular tendencies were present. Three agencies made special allowances when they were needed, and four reported free treatment by dispensaries and hospitals.

Families living in the country.

In considering allowances for families living in the country the agencies in general took into consideration the value of, or income received from, garden products or poultry.

One agency reported a low estimate for food, clothing, recreation, etc., in rural regions, and another agency indicated in the following statement how closely the budget problem is affiliated with the social problem: "There are opportunities open to families in rural regions where mothers can live on farms and secure rent, food, and fuel by keeping house for single men, widowers, etc." I think most agencies would undoubtedly agree that this is not in accordance with present-day policies in social work.

It appears to be the general practice of most agencies to make deviations from their schedules according to individual considerations rather than by a set scale.

ADEQUACY OF GRANTS.

In reply to the question as to whether it was the policy to grant an allowance sufficient to cover the difference between the actual income and the actual needs so far as the maximum grant under the laws permits, nearly all of the agencies answered in the affirmative. The analysis of the replies to this question, however, indicate in a large number of instances either that the maximum grants are inadequate, especially in the case of the small family, or that the appropriations are insufficient to provide adequate grants even for those families for whom the administrative body has already assumed responsibility.

Ten agencies reported that public agencies supplemented grants.

Twenty-seven agencies reported that private agencies supplemented grants.

The replies of seven agencies implied that grants were supplemented only through the natural resources of the family.

One agency reported that one-ninth of the families received outside aid.

Another agency reported that the poor board contributed heavily in several cases.

A third agency reported that one-tenth of the families were aided from outside sources.

A fourth agency reported that 85 per cent of the families were aided by the associated charities.

USE OF EXPENSE ACCOUNTS.

Twenty of the 30 agencies using a standard budget schedule required the families to submit regularly an account of their household expenses, and provided special forms for this purpose.

Eight additional agencies required such accounts to be kept when it appeared that the family was not spending the allowance wisely or was unable to meet expenses.

The accounts were itemized for 13 agencies and grouped for the remaining 7. Fourteen agencies required the accounts to be submitted on a monthly basis; 2, semimonthly; 3, quarterly; and 1, semiannually. These accounts were studied by the agencies for various purposes—as a basis for estimating future allowances, for statistical purposes, to ascertain whether allowances were wisely expended and whether sufficient food or a proper variety was being used, and for budget study.

EMPLOYMENT OF DIETITIANS.

A dietitian was employed by only one agency, the Erie County Board of Public Welfare, New York. Five agencies reported cooperation with such agencies as the home economics department of the public schools, dietetic bureau, Visiting Housekeepers' Association, and county home demonstrator.

STANDARDS OF LIVING.

The general question of standards of living is one regarding which we hoped to secure more specific information, but for the most part general statements only were made. Judging from the replies it would appear that comparatively little thought has been given to such matters as the formulation of policies in relation to education, recreation, health, household equipment, etc. The emphasis has naturally been placed, at first, upon the more urgent necessities of life—such as food, clothing, and shelter.

In this connection we should clearly distinguish between a standard of living and the application of such a standard in computing family budgets. It is, of course, not always necessary to make an allowance in the budget for a specific item, such as recreation, if the community resources are adequate in this respect.

Even though many agencies are not now in a position to live up to even a reasonably ideal standard, it does seem of the utmost importance for us to determine and define certain fundamental principles of living which are essential to the proper development of child life.

Fifteen of the 45 agencies failed to reply to any of the questions relating to standards; 4 referred to the standards outlined in the

Chicago Standard Budget; 13 made only the most general statements; 4 referred to living costs without defining principles; 9 made specific replies to some or all of the questions, as follows:

Housing.

This appears to have been a difficult problem during the last few years, and several agencies reported that families had to take what they could get. One agency limited allowance for rent to \$20 a month; others reported the following standards: "Sufficient accommodation to insure privacy and comfort"; "well ventilated"; "good neighborhood"; "sanitary, clean"; "living room and bedrooms"; etc.

Food.

It seems fair to assume that the food standard depends largely upon the adequacy of the schedule adopted, as the specific answers were of little use for the purpose of analysis. Seven agencies replied in general terms, such as "nourishment, no extras"; "occasional meat, lots of milk"; "sufficient for health"; "proper regard to balanced diet"; etc.

Clothing.

Six agencies replied in the following terms: "Warm clothes, not fancy"; enough for warmth and to prevent the family from being conspicuous among its neighbors"; "decent, neat, clean, comfortable"; etc.

Fuel.

Seven agencies replied as follows: "One fire in winter, two if house very cold"; "live in one room during winter"; "enough for cooking and heating during winter"; etc.

Household equipment.

Five agencies replied as follows: "Decent and plain"; "sufficient for ordinary needs of a laborer's family"; "necessities"; etc.

Education.

In general the agencies appear to be conforming to the educational and child-labor laws. The eight agencies which replied to the question on educational standards in more specific terms than by referring to the compulsory education laws of their States, reported as follows:

Oakland, Calif..—The majority of State aid children finish the eight grade, and a large number continue in high school long enough to receive training in commercial and vocational fields.

Fort Dodge, Iowa.—Eighth grade at least. Usually high school.

Maine.—To the age of 16, and sometimes high school.

Minneapolis.—Parents must learn English, children finish grades.

Westchester County, N. Y.—Children between 15 and 16 years of age not allowed to continue in school if eligible for working papers, unless scholarship to cover cost of maintenance is obtained. If child is to continue in school after 16, private funds must be raised, in addition to scholarship, to cover child's possible contribution to the family.

Columbus, Ohio.—Children must be in school until they are 16, and past the seventh grade.

Spokane County, Wash.—Compulsory to 16 years.

Denver, Colo.—Provide for eighth grade education for each child; allow a newspaper and one household magazine.

Recreation.

Five agencies replied as follows: "Membership in scouts and kindred organizations"; "books and vacations"; "encourage family picnics to parks, paid outings through Y. M. C. A. or other sources for working members of family, and summer visits to friends for mothers and children if possible"; etc.

Health.

Six agencies replied as follows: "Medical examination and follow-up where necessary"; "teeth filled and cared for, adenoids removed, false teeth for mothers who need them, etc."; "actual need and prevention."

ANALYSIS OF GRANTS.

	Among 30 agencies using budget schedule.	Among 15 agencies not using budget schedule.
Average family grant per month:		
\$20 per month or less.....	1	8
\$21 through \$35.....	10	3
\$36 through \$45.....	9	1
\$46 and over.....	8	1
Not replying.....	2	2
	30	15
Average monthly grant per child:		
\$4 or under.....	0	1
\$5 through \$8.....	6	8
\$9 through \$11.....	10	2
\$12 and over.....	13	1
Not replying.....	1	3
	30	15

A comparison of the foregoing tabulation of average monthly grants indicates that the agencies using a standard budget schedule grant allowances more commensurate with the needs of dependent families than do other agencies.

CONCLUSIONS.

A review of all the information contained in the questionnaires leads to the following conclusions:

1. A standard budget schedule is indispensable if public agencies are to maintain the highest efficiency.
2. The preparation and distribution of a food standard setting forth the health advantages to be gained from the use of a properly balanced dietary will be of great value where a dietitian is not employed.
3. It is desirable for agencies to require families to render itemized accounts of their expenditures, provided the administrative or supervising agencies are adequately equipped to give them detailed study.
4. There is need of adopting certain standards of living for families receiving assistance, as a basis for action in the individual case.
5. Differences in the policies adopted and results secured by various administrative agencies in the same State show clearly the value of some form of State supervision in the interests of the standardization and stimulation necessary for effective administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Miss Florence Nesbitt, whose name we naturally connect with budgets, has made for the Federal Children's Bureau an extensive study of their use in connection with mothers' pensions, and she will now give the results of this study.

STUDY OF STANDARDS OF AID.

MISS NESBITT. I should like, first, to explain the object of this study and how it was conducted. The Children's Bureau wished to collect and analyze material that would be helpful to the people who are still working out their plans for administration of mothers' pensions. With that purpose in mind nine places were selected. They were chosen, first, because the information that the Children's Bureau already had in hand indicated that good work was being done. The second consideration in choosing localities was to secure a variety of methods of administration and types of communities. The following were selected: Northampton County, Pa.; Montgomery and Westchester Counties, N. Y.; Denver, Colo.; St. Louis, Mo.; Hennepin and Yellow Medicine Counties, Minn.; Haverhill and Boston, Mass. These places range in population from Boston, with nearly a million inhabitants, to Yellow Medicine County, Minn., which is one of the rural counties of the State, the total population being about 16,000 and that of the largest town 1,754.

Various types of administration were represented. Northampton and Montgomery Counties have independent county boards for the

administration of this aid to children. In Denver, Boston, and Haverhill the work is done in the same department which administers public outdoor relief. In St. Louis and in Westchester County it is done in connection with the other child-welfare work, being administered by the board of children's guardians in St. Louis and by the department of child welfare in Westchester County. The juvenile court has jurisdiction in Denver and in the counties of Hennepin and Yellow Medicine. In Hennepin County the judge usually accepts the recommendation of an advisory committee composed of case workers who go over each case in detail before it comes to him. In Denver the judge accepts the recommendation, almost without question, of the bureau of charities, which makes the investigation and does all the administrative work.

The object was to get together material which would show the good points of these different methods. Records and the time of workers were placed generously at our disposal. You will not find set forth in the report many of the errors of your neighbors. What were believed to be errors, of course, were found but it was not considered necessary to run the risk of perpetuating them by recording them. It was feared that, if they were described incorrectly according to our light on the subject, some one might copy them, thinking: "This must be a good plan because it is being followed in Boston or Westchester County or Northampton County, where splendid work is being done, so that this must surely be the way to do it."

One aspect of the inquiry was the standard on which families receiving aid could live and the adequacy of the estimated budget. A number of homes in each place were visited and the actual standards of living observed.

The homes, I am glad to say, were usually comfortable homes of the sort you would like to see children growing up in. The houses were well kept. The mothers were not too tired out by work to give reasonably good care to their children. The children were adequately clothed and apparently well fed. Of course, there were exceptions, more in some places than in others. One of the chief reasons for the exceptions was inability to give adequate relief.

In some of the places where the persons administering the aid had the very highest ideals of work, they were unable to make sufficient grants because of the restrictions under which they were working. For example, of the six States represented only two were free from restrictions on the amount of aid that could be given to the family; the others were working under the handicap of being able to give only a certain amount per child, so that in many instances they could not give adequate relief.

Of the States which set a limit to the amount of aid given, New York State has the most liberal allowance, but taking as an example the mother with three children (the most common size of family), the maximum grant that could be made under the New York law was \$65 a month. In Montgomery County one family of this size needed \$86 according to the budget estimated for it. The estimate was high because of illness, which made it impossible for the mother to earn. No matter what the circumstances might be which made its need imperative, this family could not receive within \$20 a month of the amount it required. In the other States it would have fared still worse. Pennsylvania had the lowest maximum allowance, and in Northampton County there were a great many cases where the board was unable to give adequate aid according to its own calculations.

In some of the places free from the restriction of a maximum amount of aid per family it was impossible to get enough money appropriated for the work. Denver was the worst sufferer from that cause. The amount of money appropriated there was not more than half enough to take care of the families eligible under the law for mothers' allowances. The board courageously refused to spread the money thinly over the needs of all the families eligible, but was giving adequate help to as many as the money would care for. Seventy-three families were receiving an allowance, while there were 82 others on the waiting list.

The estimated budget in use in all the places was fairly adequate, as checked up with the cost of living in the community. The difficulty came with bringing the income up to the estimate. The highest proportion of cases in which the income was equal to or slightly over the estimated budget was in Denver, where 73 per cent of the families were up to the estimate and a further 20 per cent were within 10 per cent of it.

The question of earnings by the mothers is closely related to the amount of aid they receive. Several places had made rulings similar to the recommendation of the State supervisor of Pennsylvania—that the mothers should not work away from home more than three days a week. There were, however, some instances where the women were being overworked, and others where they were away from their families too much, or where the children were not being properly cared for during the mother's absence. The percentage of mothers working varied. In Boston, only 20 per cent were reported as earning; in Yellow Medicine County, Minn., 75 per cent were working.

In Boston the case workers—both the local visitors and the State supervisors—were carrying such an enormous load of work that it was not possible for them to see the families very frequently. It seems probable that some mothers were working without the knowledge of the visitors.

In all the places work in the care of health was found carried out as well as was possible with existing local facilities. In St. Louis a medical examination of every child was a routine part of the work. A physician from the board of education made the examination at the office of the board of children's guardians and left there the medical record of the child's condition, including recommendations as to the treatment needed. In Westchester County the board had the enormous advantage of a mental clinic, which had been established in its own department, where any child who appeared to need it could have a mental examination. Decisions as to what treatment would be best for the child were reached by conference between the clinic staff and the visitors. Securing dental care was a serious problem in many places, particularly in the country. In Northampton County, the board had secured the volunteer service of private dentists.

The benefit of State supervision is one of the things which came out most clearly in the course of our study. It is the only hope of the rural communities where social work is still undeveloped. It seemed very wonderful to find work of the grade being done in Northampton, Montgomery, and Yellow Medicine Counties, and in the small towns of Massachusetts. Under the stimulus and leadership of the State visitors the local administrations had worked out plans for giving adequate relief and excellent service to the families receiving aid. There were well-cared-for children in comfortable homes, instead of mothers overburdened by work and worry and children ill-nourished and poorly trained, such as are so often found among those receiving public aid in rural counties where there is no such outside assistance.

In Massachusetts I was fortunate in being present at a conference held by the State supervisor of mothers' aid and the State visitor with the local overseers of the poor of a small town on Cape Cod. Among the matters discussed was the desirability of having fresh milk for the children in families receiving aid. According to the overseers, fresh milk was practically unknown on the Cape, and children there have been brought up from time immemorial on canned milk. The conference ended with the promise of the overseers that they would display posters illustrating the importance of fresh milk for children and in other ways encourage the mothers to buy it.

I was impressed during the study by the difficulties arising from inability to keep complete case records. The staff in many places was handicapped by lack of sufficient clerical help. Westchester County, where the department of public welfare is supported partly by public and partly by private funds, furnishes an example of the attitude of public departments toward paying for clerical service in social-service work. Of 16 field agents in the department of public welfare 11 were paid from the public fund, but of 6 stenographers there was public

pay for only 2. In general, the public departments were willing to pay for workers who made visits and investigated applications for relief, but they could not see the importance of keeping adequate records. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to give adequate service to a family if the important facts about it are not recorded. In some of the places there was so little clerical service that the case workers had to write their records in longhand; in other places the records were adequate. In Denver and in Westchester County the case records contain a carefully written history of each family so that this information may be available at any time in working out plans for their benefit. In the Denver records the physical condition of each child was recorded on a separate sheet. His weight, measurement, and other data were recorded at intervals, and also the habits of the child which had an influence upon his physical development. All this became a part of the permanent record, which could be referred to year after year.

The CHAIRMAN. I should like to call your attention to the fact that there will be two opportunities for discussion from the floor. This is not a cut-and-dried program, but we are running close to schedule in order that you may all have the time allotted for the discussion.

Miss Bogue, to whom great credit is due for the initiative and leadership of the study, will now make a report for the committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Miss BOGUE. It does not seem right that this study on which so much time has been spent should pass out of our minds without some definite crystallization of its results. And so Mr. Goodhue's report was presented to the full committee, and the committee made certain tentative recommendations with regard to the whole subject of the use of standard household budgets.

We are submitting them now to you with the hope that you will criticize and discuss them.

The group of mothers' pension officials which gathered at Milwaukee were unanimous in their desire that the committee make their first study a budget study; it was the hope of the conference and of the committee that the report would incorporate certain recommendations which might serve as a guide in the field of budgets. The recommendations refer to minimum standards only. Many of the agencies which responded to the questionnaire are doing far more comprehensive and intensive budget work than these recommendations contemplate. The latter cover only what the committee considers to be the minimum requirements of a sound administrative policy. The committee believes—

(1) That constructive work with families is conditional upon adequate relief.

(2) That adequate aid can be determined only by accurate knowledge of the necessary expenses and income.

(3) That the expenditures necessary to health and wholesome living can be determined, especially at the outset, only by the use of a standard budget schedule subject to individual and family variations and other variables.

(4) That even when the relief is not adequate the agency should know *how inadequate* it is.

(5) That itemized household expense accounts should be required from families receiving assistance. The advantages of the household account are:

(a) They provide detailed and complete knowledge regarding actual living expenses of the family. Moreover, as Miss Nesbitt says, such accounts often tell a quite different story from that gained through conversation with the mother. "They bring to light not only ways in which the money can be laid out to better advantage, but the pitiful makeshifts by which the family is making an inadequate income do."

(b) They provide a test of the adequacy of the budget estimates and of the grants, and when the latter are inadequate offer unanswerable arguments for the raising of the standard of relief.

(c) They offer opportunity for instruction in food values, buying, and household management and may thus be made the basis of educational work.

(d) They can be a real contribution to our knowledge of budgets, particularly rural budgets. In Berks County, Pa., the board of trustees administering the law tabulates each month under various heads the expenditures of all families. A valuable body of material is being built up which will be useful in a variety of ways for comparative purposes, for legislative and publicity work, and as a contribution to our knowledge of living expenses in Pennsylvania.

(e) They provide helpful information as to methods of management which can be passed on to other families.

However, household expense accounts should not be required primarily for the purpose of statistics, nor even for the purpose of investigation, but because they offer unusual opportunities for service to the families under care. They should not be required as a mechanical routine, nor unless the workers are prepared to give detailed study to them. Their value is dependent upon the adequacy

of the administrative staff. It is exceedingly desirable that the mothers themselves see the value of the accounts in helping them to plan their household expenditures more efficiently, and in making a contribution to the general knowledge of living costs which will enable the administration to be of greater service to other families. Care should be taken that the mothers themselves understand that the desire of the agency is not to reduce all standards to sameness, but to assure the fundamental essentials of physical and mental health.

(6) That some form of State supervision is essential for the effective administration of mothers' pension laws.

The committee, therefore, makes the following recommendations:

1. That mothers' pension agencies make it their policy to grant aid sufficient to meet the deficit in the family budget, so far as the maximum grant under the law permits.

2. That as an aid in determining what the family budget should be, not only should the mother's estimate be considered, but a standard budget schedule should be used as a guide.

3. That the principal items of a reasonable budget should include—

- (a) Housing.
- (b) Food.
- (c) Fuel and light.
- (d) Household supplies.
- (e) Health.
- (f) Incidentals:
 - 1. Recreation.
 - 2. Education.
 - 3. Emergencies.
 - 4. Car fare.
 - 5. Insurance.
 - 6. Spending money.

Expenditures for health and household supplies may for convenience be included under incidentals, if the necessary allowance is made for them.

4. That all mothers' pension agencies require at intervals itemized household expense accounts from families receiving assistance.

5. That mothers' pension agencies either directly distribute, or have distributed through other sources, literature on health, food values, menus, school lunches, etc., such as are put out by the extension departments of the State colleges, the United States Bureau of Education, the Child Health Organization of America, etc.

6. That some form of State supervision be adopted in those States not yet having it, for the accomplishment of effective administration of the mothers' pension laws.

7. That careful consideration be given to the formulation of general minimum standards of living, including housing, food, clothing, heat and light, education, recreation, health, household equipment, etc. In this connection this committee would like to call the attention of the mothers' pension agencies to the Chicago Standard Budget, which outlines in specific terms the standards which the social agencies of Chicago have accepted as fundamental to wholesome living, and also to "Household Management," by Florence Nesbitt, published by the Russell Sage Foundation.

In view of the vital importance of this subject the committee further recommends that continued study be given the question of standards next year.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN. Opportunity will now be given to discuss these recommendations or reports from the floor. This discussion will be led by Mrs. Daniel Ancona, vice president of the Berks County board of trustees of the Pennsylvania Mothers' Fund.

Mrs. ANCONA. The mothers' pension board of Berks County, Pa., began its work about three years ago. Six months later, under the guidance of Miss Bogue, an expense sheet was introduced which the board felt very skeptical over, or rather reluctant to use. Only those mothers were selected who were able to keep to the expense account adopted.

We heard nothing about it for about six months, when an accident showed us that the expense sheets were being stored in a drawer. I explained to the board that we must get something out of these expense sheets or that we must give them up, for it was a great waste of paper. We had an enormous sheet. It took 8 cents postage to send out a month's supply. Of course, it took considerable time on the part of the mothers. And so, since I complained most of all, they asked me to see whether these expense sheets were worth anything or not.

The only thing I could do was to tabulate the results, and I took an evening off and reduced them to a per capita unit, in order to get comparative figures. And then we had a most interesting time.

We had all sorts of revelations and some of our most puzzling cases became intelligible to us. We had one family that took up the greater part of every one of our meetings. The children were forever being taken to the hospital. My sheet showed that their daily per capita expense for food was lower than that of any other family we had, and that they were trying to live on bologna, bread, and candy. Of course we knew then what to do for that family. We had one revelation after another. We could now correct extravagant and indiscreet purchases; and as a taxpayer, as well as a

trustee of the mothers' assistance fund, I am much interested in seeing that justice is done to the State as well as relief given to the mother.

So the board found that the expense sheet enabled it to give intelligent aid. The mothers objected a little at first, but very soon objection ceased. Within a short period it was taking up very little of their time, and the use of these sheets was decidedly educational.

Every now and then something very funny happens. A mother had just been given a grant, and we used Miss Nesbitt's schedule in estimating her budget. We gave her our limit, which together with the earnings in the family should have met her needs. However, she claimed that she couldn't get along. The natural thing to do was to examine her expense sheet more closely, and it was found that she was quite extravagant in the way of buying. She bought coal by the bucket, and so on. The investigator took the trouble to talk to her and help her and teach her what she could do. The next time the investigator called she welcomed her and said: "I have saved \$4.79 on my grocery order." And then she turned proudly to her girl and said: "Maybe yet we get some brains, too, ain't we, Mary?"

Now, we have a little by-product of our work. It is sometimes charged that it is on account of that by-product that we are such earnest advocates of expense sheets. That is not so; we feel that we couldn't do intelligent supervising without them. Nevertheless, this by-product is very interesting to social workers, and also a part of it is very interesting to mothers' pension workers as propaganda material for increased appropriations.

Our budget for the State year ran from June 1, 1921, to May 31, 1922, and from a partial analysis I find that there were 257 children under 16 years of age who were truly wards of the State. Counting the pension received by those families and the proportion of administration expenses for the county and the State, the cost to the public for maintaining these children per person per day was 34½ cents.

In the same county, for almost exactly the same period, the expense per person per day in the county poor home was 68 cents, or \$4.76 a week. In one orphans' home it was \$4.15 per week; in the home for friendless children it was \$4.13 a week; in another orphans' home, \$2.87 a week; and in still another, \$2.45. But for mothers' assistance it was \$2.41 a week.

So we can go out and tell the people that they will have more money in their pockets if they will support these children through the mothers' pension bureau instead of through public institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone else who wishes to participate in the discussion? If so, please give the name and speak where you are standing. We have five minutes more for discussion on the use of the budget.

Mr. HARDY, Boston, Mass. I have been listening to the various statements made by Mr. Goodhue and Miss Bogue and the others. They seem to be generally satisfactory, but I should like to know if it is possible to have a budget that would be standard, so that we shall all understand just what is considered in various parts of the country a sufficient amount of aid for adequate relief and good living; and whether we can agree on the percentage in regard to food, clothing, rent, light and heat, and incidentals.

I find in my city that we have varying situations, and I can't get any two organizations to send me a list that will agree on the things which I have mentioned. It seems as though a study made by members of the State Board of Public Welfare of Massachusetts comes near to what we could consider reasonable percentages for these different items. That allows about 45 per cent of the income of the family for food, about 20 per cent for rent, about 16 per cent for clothing, perhaps 10 per cent for fuel and light, and the rest for incidentals, if there is any left. Of course, you understand, I am giving these figures approximately. It strikes me that here we are getting the nearest to a budget that can be understood.

It is well enough to say that the children must have nourishing food, but how much food do they need? That is what we want to find out. If we have a definite standard of food and follow it as closely as we can, if some one else recommends something else, are we to follow that? Perhaps the family needs more nourishing food, but we can't tell what kind of food they want.

Mr. Rice made a study of caloric quantities, to find out how much food the child would need, and we are now working it out on that basis in Boston. I hope that the State will eventually take the matter up and study it very thoroughly, and then perhaps we may get a budget that will be satisfactory to those engaged in the work.

Miss BRADSHAW, Reading, Pa. In the study that Mr. Goodhue made of the questionnaires, I should like to know if the question of inducing the foreign people to learn English was taken into consideration?

Mr. GOODHUE. I am not prepared to say that it was. Miss Nesbitt's study is more valuable, because she was actually on the ground and could follow out all the conditions.

Mr. WILLIAM HODSON, Director of the Minnesota Children's Bureau, State Board of Control. In Minnesota the statute provides that the juvenile court may require the mother, as a condition of receiving the allowance, to use the English language in her home. I don't know of any place in Minnesota where that condition has been met except Minneapolis. I am not aware that it has been required in any other places in the State.

STATE SUPERVISION.

The CHAIRMAN. The schedule as arranged by our "steering committee" now calls for a shifting of the discussion from the subject of budgets to the subject of State supervision of the administration of mothers' allowances.

Your committee has suggested that a certain number of people from different parts of the country each give in five minutes or less their opinion in respect to this subject.

Mrs. Elizabeth F. Moloney, State supervisor of mothers' aid in Massachusetts, will now contribute to that part of the discussion.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Mrs. MOLONEY. The Massachusetts mothers' aid law was enacted in 1913. It is 9 years old this month. It has remained unchanged to date.

Those who framed the law had in mind two distinct purposes: First, to prevent the breaking up of the homes of fatherless families; and, second, to raise the level of public relief. Of the two purposes, that of raising the level of public relief was the more important and far-reaching.

The mothers' aid law proposed direct benefits to comparatively few of the large number of applicants for public relief, but it was to serve as an entering wedge.

Prior to 1912, public aid in Massachusetts (as in other States) was a mere dole, limited by statute in State cases to \$2 a week per family from May to September and to \$3 a week for the remaining months of the year. The fact that the State reimbursement of cities and towns in State cases was limited to \$2 in the summer and \$3 in the winter served to establish these small sums of money as standards of relief for all public aid.

Chapter 331, Acts of 1912, amended the statute by adding that more money might be given "if so ordered by the State board of charity." But comparatively few overseers made use of their enlarged powers for some time after this amendment was added to the temporary aid law.

The mothers' aid law (ch. 763, Acts of 1913) was a new departure in public relief in that it not only permitted but specifically required overseers of the poor to grant adequate aid in their homes to mothers with dependent children. The amount of aid per capita or per family was neither prescribed nor limited, the law stating: "The aid furnished shall be sufficient to enable the mother to bring up the children properly in her own home."

Here for the first time we find expressed in a relief statute the belief that home life under the care of the mother is the best kind

of child care. Here, also, we find it stated that the mother and her dependent children aided under this law shall not be pauperized thereby. Moreover, for the first time in the history of public relief in Massachusetts, the primary emphasis was placed upon relief, and legal settlement became a matter of secondary importance. No requirement as to citizenship nor as to legal settlement within the Commonwealth was made, three years' residence within the Commonwealth being the only residence requirement.

Before the passage of the Massachusetts mothers' aid law State supervision of aid in the homes was limited to State cases. Under that law the Commonwealth agreed to reimburse cities and towns for one-third of the amount of aid rendered in each and every Massachusetts aid case, as well as for the full amount in cases where the mother had no legal settlement. Where the State's money goes, there supervision must follow, and so it came to pass under the Massachusetts aid law that the State was granted supervision of all cases with local settlement, as well as of State cases.

This made for uniformity: No longer were the overseers of the poor relieved of their responsibility in State cases. They were expected to investigate and decide upon the amount of aid to be granted in State cases, and to use the same degree of interest and economy in relieving cases where there was no settlement or where there was a legal settlement in some other town as they were wont to use in aiding persons settled in their own towns.

The Massachusetts aid law recognized the right of local relief boards to initiate aid under this law and to place upon the overseers the responsibility of determining whether an applicant for Massachusetts aid was eligible—by requiring the overseer to make a careful and thorough investigation of each case before granting aid. Since reimbursement by the State, for its share of the expense depended upon approval by the State, the overseers ran the risk of having their bills disallowed if they aided cases that were not eligible.

The Massachusetts aid law allows the overseer of the poor to grant immediate aid without first awaiting the approval of the State department. This is a most valuable feature of the law, as it prevents long delays and possible suffering on the part of the applicant, such as is sometimes entailed in States where approval by the State or county board must be had before any aid can be granted. Though the Massachusetts law allows for necessary interim relief while the investigation is going forward, it does not relieve the overseers of the poor of their full responsibility for the aid granted.

The Massachusetts aid law provides long-continued aid if necessary, up to the time when the youngest child becomes 14 years of age. It requires the overseers of the poor to follow up the cases by visiting

the homes at least once every three months and by reconsidering each case once a year.

It requires the overseer of the poor to keep careful records not only of the first investigation but of the quarterly visits, so that the Massachusetts aid law case records are complete histories of the cases and are kept on file in the local overseer's office as well as at the state-house. The adoption of uniform application blanks and other forms tends to make these local records uniform throughout the State.

Formerly the case records of public relief were principally settlement histories and statements of amounts of aid granted or desired. The fact that family history records were required under the Massachusetts aid law gradually brought about the adoption of the case-history plan for all kinds of public aid.

In 1914, no such thing as a family budget was required. The Massachusetts aid budget adopted in that year was a first attempt. Now, in all forms of public relief, the overseers of the poor are thinking in terms of weekly expenses of the family for rent, fuel, food, and clothing and are comparing the sum total of expenses with the total income of the family from all sources. The law requires adjustment between the two columns, and the overseers of the poor are encouraged to increase the amount of aid in times of greater need, and to decrease it as the family becomes gradually more and more self-supporting. The duty of changing the aid to meet the changing needs of the family is placed squarely upon the shoulders of the local overseers, who are best able to check up the wages of earning members of the family and other data affecting its resources.

Very early the overseers of the poor asked the State department of public welfare to define its policies, and a number of so-called policies were drawn up. These have several times been revised and changed. They are not additions to the law but interpretations of it.

Summing up, I would say that State supervision makes for uniformity and efficiency in the granting of aid to mothers with dependent children.

The CHAIRMAN. A report on the Pennsylvania system will be made by Miss Mary F. Bogue, State supervisor, mothers' assistance fund.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Miss BOGUE. The Pennsylvania law gives the administration of the mothers' assistance fund exclusively to unpaid county boards of women trustees, five to seven, generally seven, in number. The State legislature at its biennial session makes the appropriation, which is apportioned among the counties of the State and is matched by them on a 50-50 basis.

There are two points which I should like to make: First, through this system we are trying to build up in the State a body of lay

workers, experienced in handling the problems of child welfare, understanding something of the technique, having a sense of State-wide solidarity and a common purpose, and capable of interpreting this new gospel of child care to their own communities. In only 22 counties do we have funds sufficient to provide for the employment of paid or trained workers. In the remaining counties, 29 in all, the trustees themselves do all the work of investigation and supervision and the clerical and visitation work. In the counties which employ workers the boards assume large responsibilities for actual family visiting, for tabulation of statistics, for health and other special studies, for budget work, and for legislative and publicity work. These volunteer county boards are thus the bedrock of the whole plan. They become a form of county organization which is capable of initiative and much independent action and which has its roots firmly and substantially embedded in local consciousness and custom.

My second point refers to State supervision and grows out of the first. The law provides that the State supervisor "shall have general supervision over the boards of trustees," shall "issue rules of procedure by which they shall be governed," and shall visit each board at least twice each year. In accordance with the spirit of the law, all responsibility for administration is thrown back upon the local boards, and it has been demonstrated to the complete satisfaction of everyone that they are thoroughly capable, economical, and conscientious administrators.

Thus within the framework of a unified and coherent State program special methods and forms of administration suitable to local needs have grown up. The boards have also developed special interests. Some are most interested in dietetics and household budgets, some in health work, some in school supervision, some in recreation and extra-educational opportunities. This has not, however, been at the expense of all-around supervision.

As the State office is not an administrative agency, neither is it a bureau of inspection. In a limited sense it fulfills a function similar to that of a central office in a city charity organization society: Race cards with summaries are filed there; statistics are compiled, grants approved, and policies outlined. But the first and foremost function of the State supervisor is the establishment of standards, and the chief means to that end is the instruction of the county boards in the method and technique of family case work and child care. It has been found that while it is not possible to insist upon absolutely the same standards in counties where boards are doing all of the work as in counties where there is a staff of highly trained workers, it is possible to develop among all the boards a realization

of fundamental ends to be achieved, and something of the machinery for attaining those ends. Thus in Pennsylvania there are few boards which do not appreciate the fact that the all-around well-being of the child is their responsibility, and that this involves supervision over at least health, education, dietetics, and home care, and that a minimum of supervision requires a monthly visit to the family.

Summing up, the State office in Pennsylvania has served as a valuable instrument in gathering and utilizing a vast amount of hitherto unorganized service and in arousing the social instinct in behalf of the dependent, fatherless children of the State.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. William Hodson, director of the Children's Bureau of the State of Minnesota, will now contribute to the discussion.

MINNESOTA.

Mr. HODSON. I rise to discuss this question with some hesitation because of the interesting way in which the State of Minnesota has failed to meet the obligation which is placed upon it under the statutes. Under the law in Minnesota it is required that the State return to the counties one-third of the amount which the counties have expended. At the time the law was passed the chairman of the appropriations committee of the senate informed us that he had voted for the bill, but that he didn't know it called for this appropriation, and therefore he couldn't meet the obligation. During the second session of the legislature in 1919 the chairman of the finance committee informed us that inasmuch as it had not been done previously he didn't see any way in which the appropriation could be made during the second session. In the third session we were informed that, although the obligation still existed on the statute books, nevertheless the amount of money then due was so great that the finance committee was afraid it couldn't possibly meet the obligation. Then, to cap the climax, we were told that the whole proposition was socialistic, and they were not going to listen to it any longer.

Fortunately, however, we have been able to work out in a very limited way a splendid cooperation between the State office and the local offices outside the large communities, where the work is very well organized. You have probably heard from Mr. Hush, who is engaged in this work in Minneapolis. Outside these large communities we have established a rather close contact between the State office and the local units; and it is based not upon the power which the State office might have had if there had been appropriations, because the money would have been given upon the approval of the State office, but solely upon the fact that the local community, the juvenile courts, and the local child-welfare boards were really interested in knowing how much the State officials knew about the

subject. They didn't throw a great deal of light on this subject, but we do keep in very close contact with the county child-welfare boards, which cooperate with the juvenile court judges in the administration of the statute.

I believe sometimes that in this unofficial and purely cooperative way we may accomplish in the long run almost as much as it would be possible to accomplish with the appropriations. I am not sure that that is absolutely so, but I think that it has been a very great advantage to have the local community ask for this assistance from the State, in view of the fact that the State has failed to meet its financial obligations to the local community.

In conclusion, there are two things which it seems to me are in point in considering the problem, at least from the experience of Minnesota. One is that we have not gotten away in the rural communities from the thought that this aid is a pension, and that the mother by virtue of being a widow is entitled to an allowance irrespective of all other considerations. And we are trying very hard to get the proper educational program across which will make it apparent that she is entitled to that aid if she enters into partnership with the State on the right basis, but not otherwise.

Second, very frequently juvenile court judges look upon the allowance as a method of plugging up the hole in the wall of support for the family and not as a means of doing a constructive job in bringing that family up to better standards. Once having taken that point of view, the thought is: "What is the smallest amount that will plug up the hole in the wall?" Therefore, we find some judges giving aid of \$8 a month to every family irrespective of the conditions which obtain in that family and not recognizing that this is a partnership between the State and the mother for the purpose of raising good citizens; that the dividends are good citizenship, and that this point of view offers the opportunity of working out the right solution of the problem.

The judges are still taking the other point of view: "We will give you \$8 per month per child, so that the family may get along." That is about all they are concerned about. I hope we shall be able through this cooperation to bring home to the judges of the juvenile courts of our State the fact that they have here a means of great power, as Miss Bogue has pointed out, if they will use it in the development of family life and not merely for giving the smallest possible sum they can to the family. If they realize this, they can make a real contribution to the State of Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The next discussion will be by Miss Lucia B. Johnson, director of the division of child welfare, Ohio Institute of Public Efficiency.

OHIO.

Miss JOHNSON. In Ohio we look upon this aid as a matter of great advantage to the mother and the unlucky children whose fathers have deserted them or who happen to be born in unfortunate situations. We have no State supervision, and what is being done by the Ohio Institute for Public Efficiency is a sort of "feeling around," in order to get a more efficient administration, and to arouse public opinion and to help develop the work.

During the war Governor Cox asked the women's committee of the Council of National Defense to find out what was wrong with this "mothers' pension business," as he called it. We made a little investigation, and the women of the State got very much excited when they found that one county was doing extremely well but that three counties were not getting anywhere and were practically throwing the money out of the window. They wanted something done. Then the war stopped.

At last we called a meeting of the judges and the probation officers, and got the judges talking upon this very topic. Before the meeting was dissolved—we don't know exactly how it happened—the judges voted to have a committee make a study and to hold a series of conferences over the State.

During the last year we had eight district conferences in different sections of the State, attended by judges and volunteers and by probation officers and any social workers who wanted to come and discuss this matter.

Another important thing was that out of these meetings came a desire to have some sort of State supervision. We are not hurrying this matter and are not promoting it, but are waiting to see what happens. In the meantime, the Ohio State University has also discovered the advantages of this work and has asked for a little money to spend on it. Last summer, and again this summer, it is giving a two weeks' institute course for probation officers and judges. And they come, even the judges. They talk these things over, and are digging up little ideas here and there. We are very fortunate in having with us this summer Miss Nesbitt, who will talk to us on the budget.

We think there are three important things to get across: First, the matter of budget keeping; second, the matter of standard face cards, and we have a committee of the judges themselves preparing these standard face cards. In the third place we are trying to get an advisory committee on the mothers' pension and the probation work, that committee to be composed of volunteer workers and representative social workers who will advise with the probation officers about the grant.

At this point Chairman Bruno relinquished the chair to Miss Mary F. Bogue, who presided during the remainder of the meeting.

The next speaker on this program was Dr. Gertrude Hall, State supervisor of mothers' aid of Maine.

MAINE.

Dr. HALL. The Maine law is very satisfactory to the people of the State and we have no thought of changing it at the present time.

The administration of mothers' aid is in the hands of the State board of charities, under the name of the State board of mothers' aid. This is an unpaid board of 5 members who meet monthly. They have a secretary, a supervisor, and 10 agents. There are 1,500 municipal boards of mothers' aid, also unpaid. A board in a large town or city that needs a paid agent employs one, otherwise the members do the work themselves.

The Maine law provides that the applications for mothers' aid shall originate in the towns. The municipal board may receive them, or the county or State board, after which the State investigates the case and passes on it. The municipal board makes monthly visits to the families, and the State agents visit them twice a year at least.

The advantage of the State system in Maine is that it makes the work uniform throughout the State. I could not mention any counties or cities in Maine that are doing poorer work than others, because the work is all pretty well standardized.

The State board is the instrument for securing free hospital treatment for the mothers or children who need it. The members go around and give competent advice and teach the municipal boards how to do the work. They study the reports that come in from all the mothers and from the municipal boards, and supervise. There is no limit to the mothers' aid that can be given in Maine. We give what is necessary, and on that account we raise and lower the rate each summer and winter, or whenever there is special hardship in the family.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall now hear from Miss Mary A. Steer, supervisor, boards of child welfare, State board of charities, Albany, N. Y.

NEW YORK.

Miss STEER. I can not begin without speaking for just a moment on the size of our problem. I think Pennsylvania has about 3,000 cases, perhaps only 2,500; and in the current year, I think, Massachusetts has about 3,000. In the State of New York we have almost 12,000 cases, and probably about 37,000 children are being cared for to-day through boards of child welfare under the mothers' aid plan.

The theory and organization of our plan of aid in New York State is very similar to that in Pennsylvania. We administer aid through local boards of child welfare composed of seven members, six of whom are appointed by the county judge, the seventh being the superintendent of the poor, *ex officio*. At least two members of a board must be women. The members receive no compensation for their services, but are entitled to the actual and necessary expenses incurred by them in properly discharging their official duties. Thus the unit of administration is the unpaid board, except in Westchester County, where under special statute mothers' allowances are administered by the department of child welfare under the county commissioner of public welfare as part of its work of caring for all dependent and defective children. All the funds expended for the work are appropriated by local financial authorities (namely, the boards of supervisors, in all counties except the five included in the city of New York, where the board of estimate and apportionment is the appropriating body). The principle behind our organization is that of local autonomy with full responsibility placed upon each county outside of New York City and on the city of New York to administer the law.

Responsibility for supervision over the several local boards of child welfare rests with the State board of charities, both by constitutional provision and under the State charities law, as well as by the requirements of article 7-A of the general municipal law, which governs the boards of child welfare. It should be explained here that the organization and plan of the State board of charities in our State is similar to that of the boards of child welfare. That is, it is an unpaid board of citizens appointed by the governor, which gives its time and services to problems of administration of all matters of charitable and eleemosynary endeavor in the State, just as a board of child welfare gives its services for the administration of the mothers' aid law in the county, with the difference that its duties are advisory and supervisory, while the board of child welfare is an administrative body.

When the law first became operative, in 1915, the State board prepared certain forms for applications, investigations, and the like from the material and information at that time available. Naturally, these were crude, and they were soon outgrown. Active opposition to State supervision was found in certain quarters, and this, together with the lack of adequate machinery on the part of the State board to render to the local boards the kind of definite assistance (in organization, policies, and methods of work) which it felt they should have, was a serious matter. Further, during the period of the war so many of the staff of the State board were released for war work.

that it was in no position to undertake new activities in this direction. In 1919, however, at the request of the State board the legislature added a supervisor of boards of child welfare to its staff, and for the first time one person was available in its office to give full time to public agencies in the State granting mothers' allowances. The following year an assistant to the supervisor was secured.

Since that time the State board has been endeavoring to stimulate and standardize the work of the local boards through a carefully planned scheme of cooperative supervision. The boards have been advised as to general policies and methods of procedure; opinions have been rendered in cooperation with the office of the attorney general on the interpretation of the law with reference to particular cases coming before the boards for decision; the appointment of members has been taken up with county judges, especially where vacancies have existed for some time; regional conferences have been held for board members and employees at which both the practical and theoretical sides of their activities are discussed; a standard application blank has been prepared after a careful study of the forms in use in various places in this and other States and after consultation with the local boards and other relief-dispensing agencies; and finally, detailed studies of the work of all but two of the individual county boards have been made which have included visits to families, and the reports of such studies have afterwards been taken up with the boards in conference.

The net results, so far as we can judge at present, are a general cooperative and cordial attitude between the State board and the local boards of child welfare, practical improvement in the work and methods of local boards, a marked tendency toward the employment of paid executive secretaries, and an increasing faith on my part—which I believe is shared by others—in the possibilities of making the local unpaid board an effective agency in problems of public welfare.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall now hear from Miss Lundberg, of the Federal Children's Bureau.

MISS LUNDBERG. I just want to say a word about the study that the Children's Bureau is making, because the group represented here—the people interested in mothers' pensions—wanted us to make the study.

We try to keep our ears to the ground and find out what is wanted, and mothers' pensions seemed to be particularly desired during the last year. I think we will all agree that the idea has now become accepted. There are only eight States that do not have mothers' pension laws. We are not ready to say how many there are that

don't have administration. We keep quiet about that when our Canadian friends and the people from England write to know what we are doing over here.

During the past year, in addition to the studies that Miss Nesbitt has made, we have been making a study—largely by correspondence, and partly as I have had the opportunity to get around—in which we have been trying to find out what is the status of mothers' pensions throughout the country.

The subject that we are at this moment discussing—State supervision—seems to be the most definite thing in the air at this time. A short time ago I was talking with three or four heads of State departments in the Southern States—the States that do not yet have mothers' pensions. They said: "Of course, we are going to have mothers' aid; we know the benefit of it. But we don't want such a law until we can have State supervision with it."

In some States the feeling is now that they must have some form of State supervision—not necessarily regulation, but some assistance and educational promotion by the State.

I have here three or four maps, and I shall not take the time to show you all the details because you can not see them at such a distance. They will be here if you care to study them. They illustrate some of the material that we are going to give you in our report. The report will give some information about each of the 40 States having mothers' pensions. In one State we had to correspond with 200 local officials. A great many of the people down there didn't know they had a mothers' pension law, and until they get some form of State supervision they probably won't find out. That happened to be the situation in a number of States.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions or any other contributions to this discussion?

The committee will be glad to receive suggestions for the continuance into the next year of the work that has been done this year. It did consider following out Mr. Goodhue's suggestion that we still continue the study, that has been so very fruitful, of the general standards of living under which the children under our care ought to grow up. There was also the question of forms for keeping expense accounts, which we were not able to study exhaustively. There are two suggestions, and we will welcome further suggestions now from the floor or in writing.

Mr. H. ROGER JONES, department of State agencies and institutions, Connecticut. I should like to suggest to the committee that at the meeting next year you do not try to crowd this most important part of social work in a two-hour session. I think it is an important matter throughout the entire country, and its growth since 1911 to the great success of to-day warrants that we have at least four two-

hour meetings to cover the field. I earnestly hope that your committee in arranging a program for the next meeting will give more time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very splendid suggestion and one which ought to hearten us all very much. The gathering this afternoon certainly does cheer your committee and we will give earnest consideration to Mr. Jones's suggestion. Are there any other suggestions? If not, I should like to say that there are on the table a few forms that are in use in Pennsylvania and if any of you care to have them—the cards and school record blanks and budget plans, etc.—so far as they go, you are welcome to them.

Miss STEER. We have had much assistance from all over the country in preparing standard applications, and revising them, and they are now in the hands of the printer. If you will write to the New York State Board of Charities, the Capitol, Albany, I shall be glad to send samples of these blanks at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. We shall soon adjourn. I simply want to express my gratitude for the whole committee for the splendid cooperation which the agencies gave us in filling out the questionnaires. We want you to feel that we appreciate it, that we are an organization to help you, that we are your instrument of expression, and that we are responsive to this local group of mothers' pension officials in the closest possible way.

I will now announce the appointment of two members to the committee in addition to those appointed last year: Mr. William Hodson, of St. Paul, Minn.; and Miss Emma C. Puschner, who is director of the board of children's guardians, St. Louis, Mo.

The committee will meet here immediately following this session.

Whereupon the meeting adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE MOTHERS' PENSION COMMITTEE.

5.30 p. m., June 28, 1922, at the Providence-Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R. I.

Miss Mary A. Steer, State supervisor of the boards of child welfare of the State of New York, was unanimously elected chairman of the committee for the coming year.

The committee considered plans for the future. It was the judgment of the members present that it could make the greatest contribution by continuing its study of the standards of living now applied by the progressive agencies granting mothers' allowances; and by attempting to define such minimum standards in regard to housing, food, clothing, fuel and light, education, recreation, household equipment, etc., as might be considered fundamental to the proper rearing of children in their own homes. A report based on this or any study undertaken by the committee this year will be presented for discussion at the next mothers' pension conference to be held during the session of the National Conference of Social Work in 1923.

The committee will welcome suggestions both as to the scope of next year's study and as to the program for the Washington meeting. Letters should be addressed to Miss Mary A. Steer, State Supervisor, Boards of Child Welfare, State Board of Charities, the Capitol, Albany, N. Y.



MOTHERS OF THE MOTHERS' PENSION
COMMITTEE

...

The committee has been organized to represent the mothers of the dependent children of the Federal Government who are entitled to the Mothers' Pension...

The committee has been organized to represent the mothers of the dependent children of the Federal Government who are entitled to the Mothers' Pension...

The committee has been organized to represent the mothers of the dependent children of the Federal Government who are entitled to the Mothers' Pension...

The committee has been organized to represent the mothers of the dependent children of the Federal Government who are entitled to the Mothers' Pension...

The committee has been organized to represent the mothers of the dependent children of the Federal Government who are entitled to the Mothers' Pension...

The committee has been organized to represent the mothers of the dependent children of the Federal Government who are entitled to the Mothers' Pension...