

citizen but it applies also to United States veterans, of whom I am one, and I want to say that even as to your United States veterans, when they have the hospitals here in the city of Washington out at Mount Alto Hospital, although all the Negroes are lumped in one ward, regardless of diseases, and they are not separated according to their diseases.

In the matter of public health, we have received some of the greatest discriminations that has ever been perpetrated in this country. In the city of Columbia, S. C., a Negro ward was only put into the county hospital in the year 1933. Down at Fiske University, the dean of women died as the result of an automobile accident because she was not admitted to a hospital—they would not take Negro citizens in.

Under those circumstances, if this Federal Government which calls upon Negroes to defend it in time of war is going to contribute money for public health, and we hope it does contribute money for public health, because our flat position is we do not want to deprive the white citizens of anything but we simply want to have all citizens share in the benefits under the law, and I say if the Federal Government is going to make provisions for public health for the care of the fatherless and dependent children, for maternal care, then I say to you that so far as institutions are concerned, so far as the administration of personnel is concerned, then we ask that the guaranties of no discrimination be written into the act.

And let me make our position on this point unmistakably clear. The National Association is not endorsing or condoning segregation; but where there is segregation it is making its fight for real equality under and before the law.

Finally, as to the whole bill and its administration we urge that guaranties be written in that the administrative personnel be selected according to individual merit without discrimination as to race, the same as guaranties have been written in that the administrative personnel is to be selected without regard to political affiliation. We Negroes are United States citizens who have never failed to shoulder our full share of the national burden; if we have not paid you more money in taxes, it is because you have denied us equal opportunity to work. That is the opportunity which we seek and need now the same as any other citizen regardless of color or creed.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Miss Dorothy Kahn, Philadelphia. You represent the American Association of Social Workers, Miss Kahn?

Miss KAHN. Yes; and I was chairman of the advisory committee on public employment and public assistance of the President's Committee on Economic Security.

STATEMENT OF MISS DOROTHY KAHN, PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL
WORKERS

Mr. Chairman, in coming before this committee, the American Association of Social Workers desires to indicate its support of the general principles involved in this program. It believes that the bill in its intent affords a framework for economic security

for people in whom we are interested, the like of which this country has never seen before.

We, of course, as social workers of the people who in the last analysis deal with the end results of insecurity, and so we think that we have a few things to contribute in connection with the details of this bill, that we would like to lay before you.

Our comments are going to be confined very largely to the material in titles I and II of the bill. We agree also with the President's announced principle that the country has to get out of this relief business, but we believe that the only way to get out of this relief business is of course first to increase opportunities for genuine employment. Where that is impossible, a work program sponsored by the Government, such insurance provisions as will protect workers in industry against the hazards of unemployment, and finally, and this refers particularly to the two titles of the bill about which I would like to speak, through such provisions as these titles afford that lay the groundwork for what is a genuinely American program of public assistance.

Our belief is that there are certain questions that we must ask ourselves with reference to the whole program and particularly with reference to these two titles. In the first place, with the program as contemplated, if it assumes that all of the supposedly employable workers are going to be employed in the contemplated work program, and our first question is, can this work program absorb these workers? If not, what will be left over, and is that left-over group adequately cared for in the other provisions of the security measure?

The second question is can the States absorb that left-over group other than as provided for in titles I and II under the program that has been outlined?

The second question we would like to discuss very briefly is the organization for caring for what we call the "revidual load", and in that connection it is our belief that we require some administrator's machinery that is not clearly indicated in the bill to care for these groups.

On the first question, as to whether or not the work program can be expected to absorb the entire number of supposedly eligible workers, that is 80 percent who are not under the program going to be turned back to the States and are not cared for by the old-age provisions or the dependent-children provisions, we would like to call attention first of all to the fact that, according to the figures of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, 44 percent of all heads of families included in this employable group are between the ages of 45 and 65, that is, in the group, of course, who are provided for under the old-age provision, but nevertheless in an age group which our industrial organization is increasingly finding itself unable to absorb, and I think we have no reason to assume that our work program will be any more effective in absorbing these old workers than has private industry been.

These are the chief breadwinners in 44 percent of all of the families of supposedly employable persons.

There is another large group of these employable persons who fall between 16 and 21, young persons who have had no working experience whatsoever, largely because there has been no work opportunities during this depression, and we mention those as another

group that it will be exceedingly difficult for the work program to absorb. In our work program also, there has been indicated a plan to limit work opportunities to only 1 member of a family. The Federal figures show that the average number of wage earners per family is 1.4, but that in 57 percent of all of the families on relief at the present time, there is only 1 wage earner. In other families there is more than 1 wage earner, the rest of this group of course, under the contemplated program would automatically be eliminated.

There is a further limitation on the capacity of the work program to absorb these employable workers inherent in the fact that according to the F. E. R. A. figures, 18 percent of all of the relief population have jobs in private industry, jobs that are either part-time jobs or low-wage jobs where the income is so small that the family requires additional assistance, and they are therefore on relief.

I would like to call attention to the fact that, while this 18 percent who are already in private industry is nevertheless on relief is a figure for the country as a whole, our experience in an urban community—and I am a relief administrator in Philadelphia—our experience in an urban community and an industrial community is that nearly 50 percent of all of the families on relief have some income or some employment which is still so small that it does not provide them with an adequate means of livelihood. So that there is another group that is disadvantaged in relation to our work program. We would not wish to take that group out of normal industry even though their earnings are now small or their jobs are only part-time jobs.

Perhaps the most fundamental difficulty, however, in this question of absorbing the employable workers in the contemplated work program is the occupational distribution of those workers. What do they represent? Again I refer to our own Government figures in that connection and call attention to the fact that a very considerable number of the workers are lacking in adaptability to the projects which we are contemplating pursuing. For instance, 30 percent of this entire group are women, that is, there are some 2,600,000 men and 1,235,000 females.

As we look at these projects or think of the projects that have been pursued even in the aiding by C. W. A., we know that we had great difficulties in absorbing a large number of women in the program. If you break down this figure of occupations, you will find that, of the clerical workers on relief, 41 percent are of the professional group and 20 percent are women. Of the skilled group, only 5 percent are women, but I will call particular attention to this—that of the unskilled group, 34 percent are women.

Moreover, if you consider the classifications by another type of break-down, and I am quoting now from an occupational-distribution table that we made of the relief population in Philadelphia, we found that 18 percent of a sample group were in domestic and personal service. If that group of persons who constitutes a very substantial part of the employable workers had been men, I think we might readily consider that they would adapt themselves to work on roads, harbors, and so on, even though their previous occupations had been domestic or personal service or sales occupations, if we could find no other work for them. But, as a matter of fact, 56

percent of that group of domestics are women and, as I quote these figures, I would like to call attention to the fact that we are excluding from them all the persons who are supposedly in such situations that would preclude their working? that is, these are employable workers that we contemplate absorbing in a work program.

There is a further fact that gives us a pause, gives me pause, particularly in our situation in Philadelphia, that is, that even now with a very limited work program, without a single housing project under way, that we have already practically exhausted what we call the employment inventory, that is that supply of available workers in the group of painters and carpenters on relief, which shows that the occupational distribution of the people that we are expecting to absorb in our work program is much less varied.

We have assumed that we have in that group a number of persons, with the greatest ingenuity that we can command, will not be absorbed in any projects that we can conceive, even though they are physically and mentally able to work and very eager for employment.

On the physical side, I would like to quote from some figures that we have recently secured from the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission who undertook to give health examinations to a group of people that had been classified as employable and referred for work. These were people that did not have sufficiently obvious defects to bar them from participation in the work program and in that group it was found that only 50 percent of the whole group were sufficiently healthy, sufficiently strong, to pursue any of the labor projects. Eighteen percent were incapacitated entirely, and another group, a smaller number, constituting 16 percent were suffering from defective vision, epilepsy, high blood pressure, and other serious handicaps that made it necessary to assign them to what we call light clerical jobs.

It seems to us in view of these facts that it is most unlikely that we will be able by the greatest stretch of our imaginations and ingenuities to absorb in the contemplated work program anything like 100 percent of the 80 percent of the supposedly employable persons.

Senator COSTIGAN. You have been very helpful to the committees of the Senate in other hearings having to do with human needs. May I ask you whether your conclusion just stated applies to the country as a whole or merely to your Pennsylvania data?

Miss KAHN. I think, Senator Costigan, it applies to the country as a whole, because we are basing these conclusions upon an examination of the Federal figures of the experience in various parts of the country. It is of course more true of the urban areas, that we are more, even more, concerned, because of that fact, because our largest work projects are very likely to be pursued in our urban areas, and if we confine that to the relief population, the largest part of the relief population is in the urban communities.

Senator COSTIGAN. Have you any suggestions as to the percentage of the unemployed employables who are not likely to be given employment by the Federal Government under the public-works program?

Miss KAHN. Percentages are always a little dangerous, Senator, and our estimates of course are estimated on experience and observa-

tion and mathematics. I think we hold no brief for their accuracy, but we believe that if one-half of the supposedly employable workers or at the most 60 percent of the employable workers are absorbed in a works program, we will be doing remarkably well.

Senator COSTIGAN. Can you state that conclusion in figures, approximately?

Miss KAHN. I am afraid I cannot.

Senator COSTIGAN. How many employed employables do you have reason to suppose there are in the United States at this time?

Miss KAHN. I think the only figures we have are those which have been provided by the F. E. R. A., and I think their estimate for the work program is something like 3,500,000, is it not?

Senator COSTIGAN. Is it your suggestion that only approximately half or slightly more than half of that number can probably be absorbed under the Public Works program now being considered?

Miss KAHN. Of course, that is a conservative estimate; but I would like to call attention to one more fact, Senator, and that is—people will deny this on the ground that we employed considerably more than that during C. W. A., but the C. W. A. was a short-time program. This other program is contemplated as a long-time program, not a lot of short projects that would use a considerable number of persons over a period of a few weeks and then fold up; and if we are going to undertake to guarantee long-time employment to a group of people on any projects such as those that have been designed, we feel that it is most unlikely that a larger number than that will be employed even with all the ingenuity that we have.

Senator COSTIGAN. With respect to another part of the announced program, have you reached a conclusion as to the ability of the several States to take care of the unemployables who may be turned back?

Miss KAHN. That was the next point I was getting to, Senator Costigan.

Senator BYRD. Before you leave that; I understood there were 10 million unemployed at this time. Miss Perkins testified to that.

Miss KAHN. I was only confining my figures to the employables on relief.

Senator BYRD. In other words, so far as millions that are now on relief, three and a half million of them are employables.

Miss KAHN. These are the F. E. R. A. estimates.

Senator BYRD. You think half of those can be provided for in this program?

Miss KAHN. In a long-time work program; yes, sir. That, by the way, is my personal estimate. I do not want to charge it to my association.

Senator BYRD. I think it is a very conservative one.

Senator COSTIGAN. You are especially qualified to make it.

Miss KAHN. Of course, we have had a little experience with this business of trying to find people who are able to do the particular jobs that we want them to do, and we are thinking again of real jobs that really represent constructive work.

With reference to this point of the State's capacity to absorb the unemployables or the balance of this load that does not fall into the works program or is not absorbed by the works program, our belief, of course, is that this relief business will not liquidate itself, that it

will only be liquidated as the other parts of the security program absorb the people who are now on relief, through the security program of private employment. I think perhaps we are a little likely to forget that private employment exists, but only as private employment and the various parts of the security program absorb these persons will they come off of relief, and if you consider the capacity of our States to absorb this group, I think we have to recognize that our States now doing certain jobs in this field that they have done for generations, that we have a system of poor laws in this country that we have recognized for a long time as unsuitable to our standards and that perhaps the greatest thing that has been done about the worker by the Federal Emergency Relief Administration is that it has for the first time given assistance to a group of people who were in trouble through no fault of their own, on a standard inadequate as it was, that was way over and above anything that we have known in our State poor laws. And various legislatures that are meeting this year are trying to consolidate the gains that have been made in the administration of relief by an improvement in those poor laws. But the efforts of these States, we believe, require by the continued encouragement and support of the Federal Government, and it is our belief that the States and local government with few exceptions are not prepared at this time to assume by themselves the tremendous extra financial burden which would be required in the 30 percent of the present number of families on relief rolls were shifted to their care.

State and local governments, to prepare themselves to provide for the means of those left to their care, face great obstacles in reorganizing poor relief systems, providing unified welfare departments, and satisfactory assistance programs, and progress along this line could be expected only by continuous aid from the Federal Government.

If, as is feared, the number not absorbed by a work program should constitute half the present number of families, the problem of the States would be correspondingly worse.

It is also likely that the total number of families would be more than the estimated 5,000,000, particularly in view of the announcement that relief clients only will be eligible to the work program. This refers to the fact that most of us believe that this limitation is dragging more and more families to the relief rolls.

Consideration should be given to the extent to which States are already providing welfare services not included in Federal figures. Complete estimates of costs are lacking but might be conservatively estimated at \$300,000,000 annually. These include State provisions for old age, dependent children, blind pensions, almshouses, poor relief, institutions for care of insane, feeble-minded, and so on.

If from 30 to 50 percent of the present cost of relief estimated at the rate of approximately \$2,000,000,000 a year were to be accepted by the States, it would mean an annual obligation of \$600,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 in addition to the \$300,000,000 mentioned above. If such a situation were forced on the States and local governments, it is doubtful whether it would be possible to expect any improvement over the situation which led in 1933 to a Federal relief policy, which led some of us, as Senator Costigan has indicated, to come down here and plead for the organization of decent, adequate care for the people that we knew were in need.

No doubt some of the States would be able to pay a proportionate share from local and State taxes; but other States and local governments would be unable to do so. The extent of need is now vastly greater than at any time during which the practice of State and local responsibility for relief developed.

State and local relief programs combined have never undertaken the continuing obligation for any such number of families as it has been proposed to return to their care. The depression itself, aside from the unemployment which it caused, has reduced the natural resources of great numbers of families in all classifications of need. If, as has been suggested, the State and local governments should be asked to assume the care of 1,500,000 families, even though grants-in-aid should be provided to the extent of approximately \$100,000,000, the States' burden would be from three to four times as great as those governmental units have ever been required to care for prior to the recent time.

Now, in further support of our belief in the inability of the States to assume this burden immediately, or in the near future, we would like to refer to some figures that appear in the publication of the Brookings Institution by Mr. Warburton, entitled, "America's capacity to consume", which gives indexes of the State welfare and income, and shows, among other things—and I will not go into great detail about this—there are 18 States in this country where the per capita income in 1929 was under \$500. One of those States had a per capita income of \$237.

Senator COSTIGAN. You refer to the per capita income of the employees?

Miss KAHN. No; the per capita income of wealth in the States, which indicates something in relation to the current resources of the States.

Now I think there are a number of other points that might be made with reference to the nature of these vast resources; that is, the extent to which funds for the care of these groups that are returned to the States must be secured through equitable tax measures; and that is, without placing the burdens further on the very people who bear them now.

The State I come from, for instance, happens to be a State which, at the moment, does not have a State income tax; and in order to assume this burden all sorts of taxes would have to be resorted to, which would further burden real estate and the small merchant and the very group of people who are now burdened with other seemingly inequitable taxes. The Federal Government is, of course, at the moment, the only resource that can be used in an equitable tax program that can equalize the inequalities of income and resources throughout the States.

Senator COSTIGAN. Miss Kahn, what is the relation between the conclusions you have stated and the bill before the committee?

Miss KAHN. I was just coming to that, Senator. These things that I have said lead us to the conclusion that the titles I and II, with which we are chiefly concerned in the bill, do not adequately cover the group that the bill, in its purposes, intends to cover. We welcome this purpose of the bill to alleviate the hazards of old age, unemployment, illness, and dependency; and we believe that these titles, while they set great mileposts in our forward movement toward

economic security and care for the people of our country who require it, leave literally thousands of persons, as I think the previous witness said, "falling between the slats."

There are, of course, provisions for the aged. There are the provisions in title II for the broken families, where there is no wage earner; but I want to call your attention there to another figure of the F. E. R. A., which shows that only 3 percent of all the families under their care are broken families, and those include not only the families where there is only a mother and dependent children but also those families where there is only a father and dependent children. So it is a very liberal estimate of the number of broken families that might be considered under this title of the act.

We believe that the social hazards referred to in this bill, aggravated by the depression, affect families in a variety of ways, and that unified programs of general assistance are required to provide for the needs of great numbers of families who do not fall in the particular classifications or categories like those mentioned in titles I and II of the bill. These family situations, however, represent individual problems and are in constant change. Measures for dealing with them must, therefore, be unified and must be general enough so each person is not shifted from one jurisdiction to another when a change of category occurs.

As an illustration I would point out the families who are now finding that the assistance already afforded them under State legislation for mothers' assistance, for instance, are being shifted, in many instances, to the emergency-relief load, because the children who were formerly depended upon to supplement the State grant for mothers' aid are now unemployed.

Except for the self-defining problem of old age, families and individuals needing assistance are not permanently indigent or unemployable. Through application of rehabilitation methods, a program of public welfare could help them overcome the disasters which the depression has meant for them. The need for broad and general provision is shown by the fact that under mother and aid programs many more families and children are dependent on poor relief than are admitted to the preferable treatment given by the special program. I would like to further emphasize that point, because in State after State where such provisions for old age, or mothers' aid, or blind pensions, or other forms of categorical relief, as we call them, have already been set up, we find that only a small number of persons logically fall in those categorical reliefs, and somebody has to take care of all of the rest. At the present time it seems to be the Federal Emergency Relief Administration that is caring for all the rest.

In our own community there are more widows with dependent children being cared for by the Relief Administration than by the State mothers'-assistance fund. The same is true of the blind, the same is true of the aged, and the same is true of almost any other group of persons who can easily be defined and set off, if you happen to have a very simple, uncomplicated case. Some of us occasionally, Senator, do not know what to do when we get hold of a blind, unemployed veteran. There are so many different administrations in which his relief might fall.

So we believe that this group of all of the rest of persons who do not fall in the two simple categories, who are not absorbed by the works program, must be provided likewise with some public assistance of a self-respecting character.

We believe that grants-in-aid from the Federal Government to the States and to the local governments should be general, so that attention will not be given to any one special category at the expense of others. In addition to other financial pressure, a State is required to support dependent children, let us say, 'in one type of family. It is less likely to be able to deal with equally meritorious situations that do not happen to fall in that particular class.

Finally, we believe that all of these things that are in this present bill, and these others who are not specifically included in this bill, should be provided for through an economical, unified, Federal administration ; not in the sense that it had a jurisdiction but that it is a unifying, coordinating agency in the Federal Government.

These first two titles of the act are lodged in the Federal Emergency Relief Administration—which I understand goes out of existence before the act becomes effective, if it is passed—and other titles of the bill are lodged elsewhere ; and so far as we can observe, in our practical experience, these are all the same people and should not be provided for specially.

We feel that this could be done by changing the provisions of titles I and II of the security bill so that assistance on the same basis, extended to other families in need, would be given the same kind of Federal aid. By close coordination with the " tapering off " of the present relief program, the change to a cooperative Federal, State, and local program could take place in an orderly fashion, with the emergency activities relaxing as State and local measures got under way.

It is our fundamental belief that the worst feature of our present relief program is the fact that it is needed.; next, that it should be inadequate, uncertain, and humiliating. With a works program providing jobs wherever possible, and Federal encouragement to States, it would be possible to build a Federal, State, and local assistance program which would reconcile the problem of the relief programs of the past. It would provide the basic means for those for whom other means were not available and would further assist each one of the family situations in its individual set of circumstances to remove itself from the general category of need. It would therefore avoid the greatest evil of a continuing relief system, namely, the segregation of a portion of the population living permanently from public relief. It would also break down the concept of pauper relief and of destitution as the basis for Government aid which characterized the relief programs in the past.

In further support of this point I would like to quote from the report of the Committee on Economic Security, in reference to administration :

The Federal Government has long had important functions in relation to social welfare. In the depression these activities have grown apace, particularly in connection with relief. For some time the Government has had the major responsibility for the assistance to above one-sixth of the entire population of the country. Hereafter, the Federal Government will still have large and continuing responsibility for many parts of the heretofore undifferentiated

relief problem, and some of our recommendations contemplate expansion in Federal social-welfare activities.

The importance which the social-welfare activities of the Federal Government have assumed is such that they should clearly all be administratively coordinated and related. The detailed working out of such coordination does not fall within the scope of this committee, but we deem it important to direct attention to the desirability of early action in this matter.

It is our belief that action in this matter should be included in the consideration of this bill, in order that we may have a single, unified Federal agency which will be coordinated with the unified State agencies required in the bill, in order to give us the most effective administration of these provisions and any others that may be added.

One of the most difficult problems for the States and local governments to deal with is that of the transient and homeless persons and families. In the past, relief funds came almost wholly from local taxes. The needs of persons from other communities were therefore disregarded, and the transient and homeless person or family was kept on the move from place to place. By the use of Federal funds, it has been possible to provide measures to deal with this problem, and only through regular participation of the Federal Government is it likely that continuing provision will be made. It may properly be assumed that a Government work program may be the means of giving employment to large numbers of transients, but not all of these persons could be regularly put to work because of age, health, and other handicaps.

Continued Federal aid to States for the purpose of helping the States to provide care for persons in need could be most appropriately given by grants-in-aid for general assistance programs of State and local governments, administered through a permanent bureau or department of the Federal Government combining economically the administration of special grants-in-aid for particular classes of need, and providing a means through which collateral services of the Federal Government could cooperate most effectively in strengthening the Federal, State, and local programs to care for those, in need.

The program of the Federal bureau should be broad enough to include the following:

(cc) Old-age assistance grants-in-aid as provided in the security bill (S. 1130).

(b) Families and dependent children without breadwinners able to be employed in public or private employment. This would include the provision that is made for some of these families under title II of the security bill (S. 1130).

(c) Families whose wage earner, because of long periods of unemployment, have incurred disabilities due to physical disorders and mental strain.

(d) Those able to work but because of industrial dislocation or for other causes cannot be fitted into employment programs.

(e) Transient and homeless families and individuals who cannot be employed on a work program.

(f) The families, such as those now on relief rolls, who are on part-time nonrelief jobs but whose wages would need to be supplemented.

(g) Families and individuals in villages and semirural areas not accepted for rural rehabilitation and for whom no work program is available.

The county or regional assistance office would be the point of local administration served by a State public welfare department. Such a department would in turn be served by the Federal bureau.

Particular services to be performed might be the basis for divisions within the bureau, as follows:

(a) Division on family and child welfare : Through a field staff, this division would serve as the connecting link between Federal and State programs.

(b) Division of accounting, statistics, and research. This division would be responsible for providing national reports on the amount of assistance under various Federal appropriations, and responsible for collecting such data as was necessary for determining the amounts of grants-in-aid to the several States. The division would also be expected to develop a system of statistics concerning the extent of the problems and the functioning of the local, State, and national measures under which the various governments operated.

(c) Division on personnel and training : The character of public-assistance program would depend to a great extent upon the kind of persons employed to deal with those who were in need of assistance and with the administrators of the programs. In order that the personnel could be kept free from partisan politics and could be selected on a basis of qualifications which would assure the local administration being at the level of Federal standards., the division on personnel and training should be available to maintain standards of personnel selection and assist in the professional education of persons who would become eligible for positions in the assistance program. In view of the cooperative nature of the relationship between the Federal, State, and local programs., it is urged that the Federal Civil Service Commission be authorized to set the standards for the State and local merit selection of personnel.

The field staff of the Federal bureau would represent special provisions made by the Federal Government for any special categories of need, such as, old age, dependent children, and so forth, in relation to the State departments. The Federal bureau would be equipped with such specialists in the various kinds of public assistance as would be necessary and these specialists would work with the States through the general field staff. The operation of the bureau would be under a chief and an assistant chief in general charge of the various divisions and functions of the bureau.

The bureau should have, in addition to the authority to require certain standards regarding personnel to be employed by State and local governments, authority also to establish standards regarding adequacy of assistance and establish certain minimum policies regarding the functions of the Federal, State, and local assistance programs. In addition to its authority to allocate grants-in-aid from the Federal Government to the State;, some provision for equalization should be included in its authorization in view of the varying degrees of need in the several States and the varying capacities of the States to meet these needs.

Senator KING. Mr. Sherwood Reeder.