

MAR 2 - 1936

7817

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator

Corrington Gill,
Assistant Administrator

Howard B. Myers, Director,
Social Research Division

RESEARCH BULLETIN

A SURVEY OF 1022 RELIEF CASES CLOSED IN MARCH 1935,
BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

January 1, 1936

Series II, No. 10

PREFACE

On March 21, 1935, all relief cases in Baltimore County, Maryland, a total of 1629, were closed. By the first of April, 256 of these cases had been officially reopened and during April the case load was increased to 511, most of which were apparently reopened from the original relief group of March. The case load was thus reduced by 1118, or about 69 percent, from March to April--a reduction in keeping with a tendency general throughout the state.

Two factors probably account for this drastic reduction in the case load, (1) the uncertainty about funds at that time, and (2) the feeling of the Baltimore County Welfare Board that the current increase in employment opportunities in the county were sufficient to insure those willing and able to work against want.

Because of the problems growing out of the closing of these cases, Mr. Harry Greenstein, Maryland State Relief Administrator, requested that a follow-up study be made to ascertain how the households involved obtained subsistence after being dropped from the relief rolls. With this in mind, 1022 of the closed cases were studied, this number representing the total exclusive of those cases which were either re-accepted for relief or were inaccessible for investigation.

The report deals with (1) employment, (2) shifts from one occupational level to another, and (3) income, covering periods prior and subsequent to closing in March.

The field work for the study was done under the supervision of Miss Mary L. Trippe, local supervisor of the Urban Current Change Survey in Baltimore. Mr. Robert Swem, of Miss Trippe's staff, was of special assistance in the study. Mr. John W. Mitchell did much of the work on the tables.

 Prepared by
 W. O. Brown and Mary L. Trippe
 under the supervision of
 Henry B. Arthur, Asst. Director
 Division of Social Research

SUMMARY

Various measures have been taken in a number of localities in an effort to clear the relief rolls of persons potentially able to support themselves. It is a fairly general practice, of course, to remove from the relief rolls persons who are found to be wilfully refusing private employment; and the acceptance of private jobs when offered is frequently facilitated by a policy or guarantee of immediate reinstatement to the relief rolls upon loss of temporary jobs. In order to bring direct pressure, not only for the acceptance of jobs offered, but also for the aggressive search for jobs, periodic re-examinations of the entire case load have been found desirable in a number of localities; a great deal is done in securing employment for workers on relief, both by case workers and through public employment offices; and in some places, large numbers of cases have been arbitrarily removed from relief on the assumption that work (e.g. harvesting) was available and that jobs would be secured if the proper pressure were exerted¹/.

In Baltimore County, Maryland, (which excludes the city of Baltimore) the total relief load of 1629 cases was "closed for re-examination" in March 1935. Provision was made to assist workers to find jobs, and to take back on the relief rolls those unable to shift for themselves. That the move was successful in reducing the relief rolls is apparent from the fact that the number of cases in the county in the three following months--April, May, and June--averaged only about 500, including some new as well as the reopened cases.

The closing of relief cases in Baltimore County was more in the nature of an organized campaign to secure employment than of an arbitrary sweeping order to cut off relief. The effort was fortunately supported by a substantial increase in employment opportunities in the region, which might very well have absorbed many of the workers, even if no effort had been made to secure employment for them.

This report upon 1022 cases out of the 1629 originally closed excludes those which were returned to the relief rolls. It was designed to discover how cases which did not return to relief subsisted during the three months subsequent to their closing.

During the period covered by this survey, there was a steady monthly increase both in the percentages of cases with one or more persons working and of workers employed, both for whites and Negroes. However, for each month there was a fairly large percent of persons and cases without employment, 447 workers and 145 households, for example, being without work in June, the last month of the survey. The increase in employment among the group was not neces-

¹/ None of these devices is to be confused with the closings of unemployable relief cases such as occurred in some states when responsibility for the care of cases not eligible for the Works Program was returned to the States. See Bulletins C-19, Series I, No. 11, and Series II, No. 8, surveys of cases removed from relief rolls in Georgia for administrative reasons in May and June, 1935.

sarily a result of the fact that the cases were closed. The facts show a general and seasonal increase in employment opportunities in the community to which the workers in this group responded. It is probable that without closing, some of the workers would have been less inclined to look for work. This assumption, however, is unproven. Nor can it be assumed, in the light of the brief period of the follow-up and the seasonal nature of much of the employment received, that these households will not have to re-apply for relief later.

Associated with this increase in employment was a slight tendency for workers to accept jobs below the economic level of their usual employment. In the main, however, they either maintained their old levels or obtained no work at all. Practically none moved up the economic ladder. A tendency to shift to lower occupational classes was normal under the circumstances. The pressure of need naturally forced some workers to accept whatever work was available, rather than to hold out for the type of employment to which they were accustomed.

These households, in the main, had higher average incomes subsequent to closing than during the months prior to closing--January and February. Moreover, these average monthly incomes exceeded the average monthly relief budgetary allowances of Baltimore County. The average income subsequent to closing increased for each successive month, in keeping with the monthly increase in employment.

It appears, then, that a majority of these households were raising themselves successfully above a relief status. But while in general this was true, nevertheless a sizable number of cases and persons were without either earnings or other cash income during each month subsequent to closing. In June, 70 cases reported no income. During the same month, 145 were without earnings from current employment, 57 of them being unemployable. Furthermore, the average monthly income of the 1022 cases, though higher than the average monthly relief allowance, was very low. In very few cases did earnings reach levels consistent with comfortable living. Earnings of about half of the families fell short of \$10. per week, and only about one-fourth rose above \$15.00.

SURVEY OF 1022 RELIEF CASES CLOSED IN MARCH 1935, BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

Characteristics of the Relief Group

The cases studied 1/ contained 4842 persons, or about 4.7 persons per case as compared to a median family size of 3.7 for the general population of the county (Table 1) 2/ Seven-hundred and eighty of these cases were whites, and 242, or 24 percent, were Negroes. The members of these relief households are, when compared to the general population of the county, disproportionately young. Thus, 46 percent of this group is fifteen years of age or less while only 32 percent of the population of the county is of this age (Table 2). The ratio of persons 15 years of age and over who are married is higher for the relief group than for the general population of the county, 69 percent compared to 61 percent (Table 3). The scant data available suggest a poorer school attendance record for the relief

cases than is true for the general population of the county, and also indicate a higher illiteracy rate for the group studied. Data on occupational distribution indicate both a marked concentration of family heads and of employable persons in the lower occupational groups. Thus 51 percent of the employable heads of households and 53 percent of the employable persons in the relief group were unskilled, while only five percent of the household heads, and five percent of the employable persons were in the white collar class (Table 4) 3/.

Experience

After Relief Was Withdrawn

Three questions arise with reference to the adjustments of these cases subsequent to closing. First,

1/ Baltimore County, where the families of this survey live, is politically, and in relief administration, distinct from Baltimore City, although economically, especially in the southern end of the county, dominated by it. The relief problem is concentrated primarily in the residential and industrial areas contiguous to Baltimore City (see map). The problem of relief in the farming district of the north is not serious; moreover, the farming population of the county is relatively small, comprising only 19,214 out of a total of 124,565, or about 15 percent (according to the 1930 Census). The eastern districts, where truck farming is important,

present a special type of relief problem, due to their seasonal labor. The population on the immediate outskirts of the city is naturally more dependent upon economic conditions in Baltimore City itself, with the result that the relief situation is more serious there.

2/ All data on the general population of the county are taken from the 1930 Census.

3/ In June, four industries accounted for 64 percent of the "last usual industry" entries of the heads of these households: - agriculture nine percent; building 20; iron and steel, 14; and domestic and personal service, 21.

to what extent did the cases as units, and their employable members, get work? Second, was there a shift downward or upward occupationally? Third, to what degree was there a decrease or increase in the income of these cases and their employable persons?

The answer to the first question is clear. There was a sharp rise, subsequent to closing, in the employment of both cases and persons^{4/}. For cases, there was an increase each month from January through June, 25 percent being employed in January, 26 percent in February, 43 percent in March, 75 percent in April, 84 percent in May, and 86 percent in June (Table 5). In June, only 145, or 14 percent, of the households were without a member employed^{5/}. This increase each month in the percentage of cases with one or more persons working is true for both whites and Negroes (Table 5). Although marked differences exist among families of the various sizes, all family sizes show an increase each month in the households with an employed member. The one-person family fared worse than the average partly because that family is necessarily a one-worker family (Table 6)^{6/}.

^{4/} An employed case is a case with one or more persons between the ages of 16-64 working.

^{5/} Fifty-seven households were unemployable, i.e. had no person between 16-64 working or seeking work.

^{6/} In January, only 6 or 9 percent, of the 65 one-person cases in the study had employment, and in June, in spite of the steady increase in the percent employed, there were still

The monthly rise, January through June, in the percentage of cases with one or more employed members is matched by an increase in the percentage of the 1652 individual workers employed each month, although in June there was a slight decrease of 45 persons, or about 3 percent (Table 7). In the case of the Negro however, the percentage of individual workers employed is low, while the percentage of cases with employed members is high, this being due to the high average of employable persons to each case^{7/}. The female workers, Negro and white combined, have a better employment record than the male workers. For example, in June, 90 percent of the employable females were working, compared to 67 percent of the employable males. The Negro male in particular had a poor employment record, since in no month were more than 45 percent (June) employed (Table 8).

In April, only 65 of the 556 persons who had been employed at the time of closing were without work; in May, there were 72, and in June, 76. However, the slight monthly losses of this group were more than offset by the excellent employment record of the 1096 persons seeking work at the time of closing. In June, for

only 57 percent working. Cases with 2 to 4 persons start with 20 percent in January and have 86 percent in June with one or more persons working. For the 5-or-more person cases the corresponding percentages are 32 and 89 (Table 6).

^{7/} The average number of workers for the Negro cases is 2.3, compared to 1.5 for the white cases (Table 7).

example, 66 percent of these persons were employed, 72 percent of the whites and 50 percent of the Negroes (Table 9).

How can this increase in employment be accounted for? For one thing employment opportunities increased. About 75 persons obtained employment in agriculture during the three months after closing occurred. Extra agricultural labor was required in March and April in the farming districts of the northern part of the county. Truck farming in the eastern area is reported to have absorbed extra workers during the early spring and summer months. Certain industrial plants adjacent to the city of Baltimore showed increases in employment for this period. For example, a steel company showed an employment increase for each month from January through June adding 58 new workers in March, 102 in April, 92 in May, and 161 in June. Forty-five of the workers in this study who were seeking work at the time the cases were closed obtained jobs with this company. One hundred and eighty-six workers who secured employment subsequent to closing were employed by fourteen companies in the county in which there had been increases in employment^{8/}. A

^{8/} Investigators went to leading employers and obtained their monthly records of employment and then identified workers in the study who received jobs with these various employers.

^{9/} Thus, in January the index of employment for Baltimore was 75.7; February, 78.4; March, 80.2; April, 83.2; May, 82.6; and June, 80.8; the last months indicating a slight seasonal recession (1929-1931 = 100).

large percent of the workers of this study are dependent upon employment in Baltimore City; and the records show a rise in the employment index for the months of this study for the industries of that city^{9/}.

From the standpoint of opportunities for work, the Baltimore County Welfare Board selected the right time for the reduction of its case load. Some agricultural employment was available. Building, seasonal in nature, picked up; this industry alone during the three month period subsequent to closing absorbed 143 of the 1096 persons who were unemployed at closing. Employment generally increased during this period. However, this three-month period is too short, and the seasonal factor in employment during the time was much too important, to justify accepting the employment record of the households as an adequate measure of their adjustment. No evidence is at hand to indicate how many of the workers would have availed themselves of the same employment opportunities if relief had not been withdrawn^{10/}.

Occupational shifts. Considering the pressure of need incident to closing, one would expect a tendency

These indices are taken from Survey of Current Business, Volume 15, August 1935.

^{10/} It should be emphasized that at no time were all individual workers and households employed. In June, for example, 145 households had no employed member, and during this month, 447 employable persons were without jobs. Moreover, employment is not an invariable index of welfare.

among the workers of the cases to take whatever work was available, and wherever necessary accept jobs below their usual occupational level. This did happen in about 7 percent of the cases; and 22 percent got no job at all. Their usual occupational status was maintained by 71 percent of the workers (Table 10)^{11/}. Of the white collar workers, 10 percent experienced a drop in status, while 50 percent of this group were unable to get work. Of the skilled workers, 10 percent dropped to lower levels, while 22 percent of their number secured no employment. The heaviest percentage getting no work was among those with no usual occupation, 51 percent, though the white-collar workers with a 50 percent unemployment followed closely (Table 10). No Negroes went above their usual employment while 7 percent of both Negroes and whites suffered a drop in status. However, the percentage of unemployment among whites was less than among Negroes, 20 percent compared to 28 (Table 11). Females were apparently less able to hold their own occupationally than were males. Seventy-four percent of the male workers experienced no change in status as compared to 56 percent

of the females; 5 percent of the males dropped below their usual status, compared to 14 percent of the female workers. Twenty percent of the males obtained no work, while the percentage of females unable to get employment was much higher -- 30 percent (Table 12).

Income. The best measure of how adequately these cases maintained themselves subsequent to removal from the relief rolls is their monthly income^{12/}.

Generally, the cases had higher incomes subsequent to closing than they had prior to closing. Thus, in January, February, and March, the average (median) monthly incomes, including relief, were \$23.10, \$22.70 and \$20.50, respectively, whereas in April, May and June, the incomes were \$29.60, \$36.70, and \$40.30, indicating, as well, a rise during each month subsequent to closing. Moreover, for all months subsequent to closing, the average income was higher than the average budgetary allowance of the relief agency^{13/}.

^{11/} Data on occupational shifts are only available for the 1096 workers who were seeking work at the time of closing.

^{12/} Monthly income is the net income from all sources--relief, earnings, and miscellanies. For these cases subsequent to closing, earnings practically constituted the source of income.

^{13/} The monthly allowance cited provides only for food. Rent is paid only in eviction cases. Clothing is supplied only when absolutely essential. The scant information available indicates that the average amount given for these items not included in the allowance is very

small. The allowance for food practically constitutes the entire amount provided. The amount allowed for a given month in a given case includes any amount earned by a member of the case. For example, if a case were entitled to \$30 for a given month, but a member of the case earned \$15, the relief agency would deduct this \$15 from the total allowance, actually giving only \$15 to the case.

The average allowance used here is an estimate of the average amount which would have been allowed for the cases of this survey had they been on relief. The estimate is based upon the average size of these cases.




CHART 1. DISTRIBUTION OF MONTHLY INCOME OF 1022 CLOSED RELIEF CASES WHICH SUCCESSFULLY MAINTAINED A NON-RELIEF STATUS AFTER MARCH 1935

Thus, the average monthly relief allowance for April, May and June, was \$25.10, as contrasted with monthly incomes of \$29.60, \$36.70 and \$40.30. The monthly income of the Negro households, subsequent to closing, however, was less except for June, than the average monthly budgetary allowance. For April, May and June, Negro families averaged incomes of only \$17.50, \$23.50, and \$26.70 (Table 13).

The proportion of cases in income levels above \$40 increase for each month subsequent to closing, while there is a corresponding decrease for income groups below \$40. The monthly decrease is slight for the \$20-\$39 group, but more definite for the lower group, \$1-\$19. Cases with no income decrease from 121 in April to 56 in June (Chart 1). Expressed in percentages, in April, 37 percent of the households had incomes of \$40 or more; in May, 46 percent; and in June, 50 percent; while cases with no cash income decreased from 12 percent in April to 6 percent in June (Table 14).

The increases in monthly incomes, subsequent to closing, were maintained when size of case is considered. Thus, the income for the 65 one-person families was \$10.10 in April, \$11.30 in May and \$12.10 in June. The corresponding amounts by months for the 465 two-to-four-person households were \$25.20, \$32.00 and \$39.10; and for the 492 families with five-or-more persons, \$34.40, \$45.10, and \$49.30. Moreover, for all of these family sizes and for each month except for the five-or-more person family in April, the average income was greater than the estimated relief allowance (Table 15).

There are certain significant differences in the monthly incomes of the various types of cases. Thus as previously indicated, white cases had higher incomes than Negro cases. The 926 cases with male heads had better incomes, subsequent to closing, than did the 96 cases with female heads. In April, May and June, the average (median) incomes of the cases with male heads were \$29.90, \$38.10, and \$42.20, as compared to \$15.50, \$17.30 and \$24.30 for cases with female heads. For each month the budgetary allowance was less than the income of the cases with male heads, but for no month did cases with female heads have an average income in excess of the budgetary allowance. For both types of cases, the percentage with no income declined for each succeeding month subsequent to closing, while the percentage with a monthly income of \$40 or more increased. However, the percentage of cases with female heads whose incomes were in this category never exceeded 3 percent (June) while it reached 52 percent in those cases with male heads (Table 16)^{14/}.

Naturally, the 438 cases with one or more members employed at time of closing had somewhat higher incomes than did those with no member employed at time of closing. Also, these cases with one or more persons working when closing occurred had a better average monthly income subsequent to closing than did the 877 cases with one or more persons

^{14/} These cases are, of course, smaller than the others. At the same time, however, they are less adequately equipped for earning a livelihood.

employed in June, the last month of the survey. These incomes were, for April, \$42.80, and \$31.10; for May, \$50.10 and \$42.10; and for June, \$51.60 and \$46.20 (Tables 17 and 18). This is according to expectation. The 438 cases with one or more persons working at closing had an advantage at the outset. Possibly, too, the fact of their having employment at closing reflected an ability to get on not possessed by the other cases.

The more or less cheerful outlook described for the cases of this survey is modified by certain facts. For one thing, a rather high percent of these cases either had no income at all, or a very low income during the months after closing. In April, 38 percent of the cases had less than \$20 monthly income; in May, 30 percent; and in June, 26 percent (Table 14).

Furthermore, a relatively large percent of these cases had no earnings and were dependent solely upon other sources of income during the months subsequent to closings. In April, there were 251 such cases, or 24 percent of the total; in May 166, or 16 percent of the total; and in June, 145, or 14 percent of the total (Table 19)^{15/}. As an example of the difficulties of cases without

earnings, the 145 in this condition in June may be taken. Seventy of this 145 insisted that they were totally without income. The average income for the group as a whole in April was \$8.60; in May, \$9.20; and in June, \$2.30. The income of the Negroes for each month was even lower (Table 18). Fifty-seven of these cases had no employable person between 16-64, though there were actually in this group persons below 16 and over 64, who were working at various times prior to June.

Finally, neither the average relief allowance nor the average income for these cases provides for more than a minimum subsistence standard of living^{16/}. In April, over fifty (50) percent of the households of this study were living on less than \$10 a week, and in June the month of the highest average income, only a slightly smaller proportion were forced to live at this level. In April, about 15 percent of the households had an income of \$15 per week or more, increasing to 20 percent of the total in June. Considering the large average size of these cases, it is obvious that even those cases with the highest incomes had no more than enough for their minimum needs.

^{15/} The data of this survey seem to indicate that other sources of income were relatively unimportant. Thus, in April and May, 1938, and in June, 207 of these cases derived income from sources other than earnings. The averages (median) for these cases were \$12.00, \$9.70 and \$9.90, respectively, for April, May and June. Possibly these miscel-

laneous sources were actually more important than the schedules reveal, since there was some tendency for the client to evade or understate on this item. Undoubtedly, however, cases without earnings fared much worse than when they were on relief.
^{16/} As previously stated, the relief allowance here cited provides only for food.

Table 1
Distribution of Households in the General Population and in
Relief Closings, by Size Groups

Size of Households	General Population ^{a/}		Relief Closings ^{b/}	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL	27,194	100	1,022	100
One person	1,231	5	65	6
Two persons	5,452	20	160	16
Three "	5,604	21	153	15
Four "	5,251	19	152	15
Five "	3,757	14	136	13
Six "	2,521	9	125	12
Seven "	1,400	5	81	8
Eight "	873	3	59	6
Nine "	497	2	41	4
Ten or more persons	548	2	50	5
Median	3.7		4.4	

^{a/} U. S. Census, 1930, Vol. VI, p. 585.

^{b/} March 1935

Table 2
Distribution of Persons in the General Population and in
Closed Relief Cases, by Age Groups

Age Groups	General Population ^{a/}		Relief Cases ^{b/}	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Ages	124,565	100	4,842	100
Under 16 years	39,687 ^{c/}	32	2,239	46
16 - 24 "	19,690	16	713	15
25 - 44 "	37,423	30	1,069	22
45 - 64 "	21,018	17	636	13
65 years and over	6,709	5	185	4
Unknown	38	*	--	--

^{a/} U.S. Census, 1930, Vol. III, Part 1, p. 1052.

^{b/} March 1935.

^{c/} Fifteen-year-old group estimated.

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 3
Marital Status of Persons 15 Years of Age and Over in the
General Population and in Closed Relief Cases

Marital Status	General Population ^{a/}		Relief Cases ^{b/}	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	87,178	100	2,603	100
Single	27,191	31	634	25
Married	53,505	61	1,800 ^{c/}	69
Widowed	5,840	7	160	6
Divorced	578	1	9	*
Unknown	64	*	-	-

^{a/} U. S. Census 1930, Vol. III, Part 1, p. 1055.

^{b/} March 1935.

^{c/} Includes 80 persons "separated"

* Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 4
Closed Relief Cases Containing Employable Members
March 1935, Classified by Occupational Groups ^{a/}

Occupational Group	Relief Cases ^{b/}		Employable Persons ^{c/}	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All Occupations	965 ^{d/}	100	1,652	100
White collar	45	5	84	5
Skilled	275	28	318	19
Semi-skilled	153	16	350	22
Unskilled	489	51	876	53
Inexperienced	3	*	24	1

^{a/} Current occupations of employed persons and usual occupations of unemployed persons.

^{b/} Occupation of head of unit.

^{c/} Persons 16-64 years of age who are working or seeking work.

^{d/} Excludes 57 households with no employable members.

Table 5
Relief Cases Closed in March 1935, Classified by Race and By
Cases Having Employed Persons
January thru June 1935

Month	Number			Percent		
	All Races	White	Negro	All Races	White	Negro
All Closed Cases	1,022	780	242	100	100	100
Cases Having Employed Persons						
January	257	173	84	25	22	35
February	265	188	77	26	24	32
March	438	324	114	43	42	47
April	771	579	192	75	74	79
May	856	648	208	84	83	86
June	877	664	213	86	85	88

Table 6
Relief Cases Closed in March 1935, Classified By Size of Case
and By Cases Having Employed Persons
January thru June, 1935

Month	Number				Percent			
	All Types	One Person	2-4 Persons	5 or more Persons	All Types	One Person	2-4 Persons	5 or more Persons
All Closed Cases	1,022	65	465	492	100	100	100	100
Cases Having Employed Persons								
January	257	6	93	158	25	9	20	32
February	265	9	97	159	26	14	21	32
March	438	11	183	244	43	17	39	50
April	771	34	346	391	75	52	74	79
May	856	34	384	438	84	52	83	89
June	877	37	402	438	86	57	86	89

Table 7
Relief Cases Closed in March 1935 Containing Employable Persons,
Classified by Race and by Employment Status
January thru June 1935

Month	Workers 16-64 Years of Age			Cases Having Employable Persons			Average Number of Workers per 100 Cases		
	All Races	White	Negro	All Races	White	Negro	All Races	White	Negro
Total, March 1935	1,652	1,137	515	965	743	222	171	153	232
<u>Number Employed at Non-Relief Jobs</u>									
January	321	234	87	257	173	84	124	135	103
February	330	240	90	265	188	77	125	127	117
March	556	324	232	438	324	114	126	100	204
April	1,065	805	260	771	579	192	137	137	135
May	1,250	959	291	856	648	208	146	149	130
June	1,205	906	299	877	664	213	137	136	135
<u>Employed as Percent of Total</u>									
January	19%	21%	17%	27%	23%	38%			
February	20	21	17	28	25	35			
March	34	28	45	45	44	51			
April	64	71	50	80	78	87			
May	76	84	57	89	87	94			
June	73	80	58	91	89	96			

Table 8
Employable Persons^{a/} in Relief Cases Closed in March 1935
Classified by Sex and Race and by Employment Status
January thru June 1935

Month	M a l e			F e m a l e		
	All Races	White	Negro	All Races	White	Negro
Total, March 1935	1,228	887	341	424	250	174
<u>Number of Employed Persons</u>						
January	213	169	44	108	65	43
February	218	173	45	112	67	45
March	384	249	135	172	75	97
April	729	536	193	336	209	127
May	857	709	148	393	250	143
June	824	672	152	381	234	147
<u>Employed as Percent of Total</u>						
January	17%	19%	13%	25%	26%	25%
February	18	20	13	26	27	26
March	31	28	40	41	30	56
April	59	67	39	79	84	73
May	70	80	43	93	100	82
June	67	76	45	90	94	84

^{a/} Between 16 and 64 years of age.

Table 9

Employed and Unemployed Persons in Closed Relief Cases, March 1935,
Classified by the Total Employed Subsequent to Closing, by Race

Month	Persons Employed At Closing			Persons Unemployed at Closing		
	All Races	White	Negro	All Races	White	Negro
March						
Number	556	324	232	1,096	814	282
Percent	100	100	100	100	100	100
			<u>Number of Persons Employed</u>			
April	491	319	172	574	486	88
May	484	322	162	766	637	129
June	480	322	158	725	584	141
			<u>Percent of March Group Employed</u>			
April	88%	98%	74%	52%	60%	31%
May	87	99	70	70	78	46
June	86	99	68	66	72	50

Table 10

Persons Unemployed at Time of Closing, March 1935, Classified by Usual
Occupation and by Occupational Status Subsequent to Closing

Usual Occupation	Occupational Status, April-June 1935				
	Total	No Change	Above Usual Occupation	Below Usual Occupation	No Work
<u>Number of Persons</u>					
All Occupations	1,049 ^{a/}	739	5	74	231
White collar	38	15	-	4	19
Skilled	193	132	-	19	42
Semi-skilled	277	163	3	51	60
Unskilled	541	429	2	-	110
<u>Percent Distribution</u>					
All Occupations	100 ^{a/}	71	*	7	22
White collar	100	40	-	10	50
Skilled	100	68	-	10	22
Semi-skilled	100	59	1	18	22
Unskilled	100	79	*	-	21

* Less than one-half of one percent.

^{a/} The totals of tables 10, 11 and 12 exclude those workers with no usual occupation. There were 47 of those workers, 39 whites and 8 Negroes, 19 males and 28 females. Twenty-three of the 47 got employment, 1 as a clerk, 4 as semi-skilled workers and 18 as unskilled workers.

Table 11

Persons Unemployed at Closing, Classified by Usual Occupation and by Occupational Status, Subsequent to Closing, by Race

Usual Occupation	Occupational Status, April-June 1935									
	Number of Persons					Percent Distribution				
	Total	No Change	Above Usual Occ.	Below Usual Occ.	No Work	Total	No Change	Above Usual Occ.	Below Usual Occ.	No Work
<u>White</u>										
All Occupations	774 ^{a/}	560	5	55	154	100 ^{a/}	72	1	7	20
White collar	35	15	-	3	17	100	43	-	8	49
Skilled	181	129	-	13	39	100	71	-	7	22
Semi-skilled	220	132	3	39	46	100	60	1	18	21
Unskilled	338	284	2	-	52	100	84	1	-	15
Laborers	234	202	-	-	32	100	86	-	-	14
Servants	104	82	2	-	20	100	79	2	-	19
<u>Negro</u>										
All Occupations	275 ^{a/}	179	-	19	77	100 ^{a/}	65	-	7	28
White collar	3	-	-	1	2	100	-	-	33	67
Skilled	12	3	-	6	3	100	25	-	50	25
Semi-skilled	57	31	-	12	14	100	54	-	21	25
Unskilled	203	145	-	-	58	100	71	-	-	29
Laborers	111	84	-	-	27	100	76	-	-	24
Servants	92	61	-	-	31	100	66	-	-	34

Table 12

Persons Unemployed at Closing, Classified by Usual Occupation and by Occupational Status, Subsequent to Closing, by Sex

Usual Occupation	Occupational Status, April-June 1935									
	Number of Persons					Percent Distribution				
	Total	No Change	Above Usual Occ.	Below Usual Occ.	No Work	Total	No Change	Above Usual Occ.	Below Usual Occ.	No Work
<u>Male</u>										
All Occupations	825 ^{a/}	615	5	42	163	100 ^{a/}	74	1	5	20
White collar	21	12	-	4	5	100	57	-	19	24
Skilled	191	131	-	18	42	100	69	-	9	22
Semi-skilled	205	139	3	20	43	100	68	1	10	21
Unskilled	408	333	2	-	73	100	82	*	-	18
Laborers	342	283	-	-	59	100	83	-	-	17
Servants	66	50	2	-	14	100	76	3	-	21
<u>Female</u>										
All Occupations	224 ^{a/}	124	-	32	68	100 ^{a/}	56	-	14	30
White collar	17	3	-	-	14	100	18	-	-	82
Skilled	2	1	-	1	-	100	50	-	50	-
Semi-skilled	72	24	-	31	17	100	33	-	43	24
Unskilled	133	96	-	-	37	100	72	-	-	28
Laborers	3	3	-	-	-	100	100	-	-	-
Servants	130	93	-	-	37	100	72	-	-	28

Table 13

Monthly Income of Closed Relief Cases, Classified by Race,
and the Average Amount of Relief Allowance
January thru June, 1935

Month	Monthly Income (median)			Average Amount of Relief Allowance
	All Races	White	Negro	
January	\$23.10	\$24.30	\$19.10	\$23.00
February	22.70	24.00	18.50	23.00
March	20.50	23.10	14.70	23.00
April	29.60	33.60	17.50	25.10
May	36.70	40.50	23.50	25.10
June	40.30	45.00	26.70	25.10

Table 14

Monthly Income of Closed Relief Cases, Classified by Race
January thru June, 1935

Month	Total	None	\$1-19	\$20-39	\$40-69	\$70-99	\$100 or more
<u>Percent Distribution of 1,022 Cases</u>							
January	100	16	29	34	18	2	1
February	100	7	38	39	12	3	1
March	100	5	44	33	13	3	2
April	100	12	26	25	24	9	4
May	100	7	23	24	28	12	6
June	100	6	20	24	29	14	7
<u>Percent Distribution of 780 White Cases</u>							
January	100	16	27	34	20	2	1
February	100	7	35	40	13	3	2
March	100	2	43	36	14	3	2
April	100	11	22	25	26	11	5
May	100	7	18	24	29	15	7
June	100	5	16	24	31	16	8
<u>Percent Distribution of 242 Negro Cases</u>							
January	100	17	35	33	12	2	1
February	100	7	47	32	12	2	*
March	100	12	52	23	10	2	1
April	100	14	42	23	16	4	1
May	100	8	38	24	23	5	2
June	100	7	35	24	22	9	3

* Less than one-half of one percent.

-14-

Table 15
Monthly Income^{a/} of Closed Relief Cases and Average Relief Allowance
Subsequent to Closing, by Size of Case

Size of Case	April		May		June	
	Income	Allow- ance	Income	Allow- ance	Income	Allow- ance
One person	\$10.10	\$ 8.30	\$11.30	\$ 8.30	\$12.10	\$ 8.30
2 - 4 persons	25.20	18.40	32.00	18.40	39.10	18.40
5 or more persons	34.40	39.10	45.10	39.10	49.30	39.10

^{a/} Median

Table 16
Monthly Income of Closed Relief Cases, Subsequent to Closing, Classified
by Sex of Head, and the Average Monthly Relief Allowance

Month	Aver- age Relief Allow- ance	Income of Relief Cases (median)			Percent of cases with:					
		All Types	With Male Head	With Female Head	No Income			\$40 or more		
					All Types	With Male Head	With Female Head	All Types	With Male Head	With Female Head
April	\$25.10	\$28.30	\$29.90	\$15.50	16	15	17	36	38	2
May	25.10	36.30	38.10	17.30	10	10	13	46	49	2
June	25.10	39.80	42.20	24.30	9	8	12	50	52	3

-15-

Table 17
Monthly Income of Closed Cases With Persons Employed and With No Persons Employed
at Time of Closing Classified by Race, and Average Monthly Relief Allowance
January thru June, 1935

Month	Average Relief Allowance	Income of Relief Cases			Percent of Cases With -					
		All Races	White	Negro	No Income			\$40 or more		
					All Races	White	Negro	All Races	White	Negro
Cases With One or More Persons Employed										
January	\$23.00	\$26.60	\$28.50	\$21.10	14%	14%	14%	28%	31%	20%
February	23.00	28.50	30.20	23.30	5	6	5	27	34	19
March	23.00	33.50	35.70	26.30	*	1	0	37	41	25
April	25.10	42.80	49.20	19.00	3	4	2	53	60	32
May	25.10	50.10	54.50	34.70	2	3	1	62	68	45
June	25.10	51.60	55.50	39.00	1	2	0	64	69	49
Cases With No Person Employed										
January	\$23.00	\$20.60	\$21.50	\$17.50	17%	16%	18%	16%	17%	1%
February	23.00	18.60	19.70	15.70	8	9	8	8	8	9
March	23.00	14.30	15.90	8.90	8	3	23	3	4	1
April	25.10	21.70	23.90	15.70	18	17	23	25	29	13
May	25.10	28.10	31.30	18.50	11	10	14	34	39	17
June	25.10	33.10	37.00	20.00	9	7	14	40	46	21

*Less than one-half of one percent.

Table 18
Monthly Income of March Closed Cases With Persons Employed and With No Persons
Employed During June, Classified by Race, and the Average Monthly Relief Allowance
January thru June, 1935

Month	Average Relief Allowance	Income ^{a/} of 877 Cases With Persons Employed in June			Income ^{a/} of 145 Cases With No Persons Employed in June		
		All Races	White	Negro	All Races	White	Negro
January	\$23.00	\$23.70	\$25.00	\$19.30	\$15.80	\$17.30	\$12.10
February	23.00	22.80	25.00	16.00	14.70	15.40	12.50
March	23.00	18.20	18.50	17.20	11.50	10.60	15.00
April	25.10	31.10	33.40	24.40	8.60	9.30	6.70
May	25.10	42.10	44.80	33.80	9.20	10.20	6.70
June	25.10	46.20	50.80	31.90	2.30	6.90	-

^{a/} Median

Table 19

Monthly Earnings of Closed Relief Cases, Subsequent to
Closing, Classified by Race

Month	Total	None	\$1-9	\$10-19	\$20-29	\$30-39	\$40-49	\$50-59	\$60-69	\$70 or more	Median
Percent Distribution of 1,022 Cases											
April	100	24	9	12	12	9	10	5	6	13	\$23.90
May	100	16	8	12	10	8	12	7	8	19	34.10
June	100	14	7	10	11	10	13	7	8	20	38.00
Percent Distribution of 780 White Cases											
April	100	26	6	9	12	9	10	6	7	15	27.80
May	100	16	6	9	9	9	13	7	9	22	39.90
June	100	15	5	8	10	10	14	7	8	23	47.90
Percent Distribution of 242 Negro Cases											
April	100	21	19	21	12	6	7	4	5	5	15.00
May	100	14	15	20	15	7	10	6	6	7	20.90
June	100	12	13	17	15	10	10	6	6	11	25.80

DISTRIBUTION OF 1022 CLOSED RELIEF CASES, BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND
MARCH 1935, BY NUMBER PER SQUARE MILE.

