

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

Report of Stanley L. Bird
to
Committee on Welfare
Ninety-Third Legislature
relative to
A Study of the Public Assistance Program
of
The Department of Health and Welfare

In Senate April 15, 1947, ordered printed in pamphlet form pursuant to Senate Order.

CHESTER T. WINSLOW, Secretary of Senate.

I. Introduction.

On March 14, 1947 the writer was employed by the Committee on Welfare to supervise a study of the Public Assistance Program of the Department of Health and Welfare. Instructions were given by the Committee that first attention be directed toward the Old Age Assistance (OAA) and Aid to Dependent Children (ADC). The Committee expressed a desire that a total of three hundred cases be included in this study. The Committee requested a factual report of the activities of the Department in the field as to these cases.

II. Scope.

There are four types of assistance programs in the Public Assistance Division of the Department, namely, Old Age Assistance, Aid to Dependent Children, Aid to the Blind, and Aid to War Veterans. This study has been confined to Old Age Assistance and Aid to Dependent Children. In the study of the Old Age Assistance Program an effort was made to determine; 1, the sufficiency of the Field Worker's investigation; 2, the existence of responsible relatives (those relatives who by law are legally responsible for the support of a recipient) able to support the recipient; 3, the justification of the grant. In the study of the Aid to Dependent Children an effort was made to determine; 1, the sufficiency of the Field Worker's investigation; 2, the extent to which desertion is the contributing cause; 3, the justification of the grant.

III. Personnel Engaged In This Study.

In as much as the purpose of this study was to render a factual report, the writer determined to employ as assistants persons who by experience and training had the ability to note facts and to report them as noted. The writer considers himself fortunate to have located eleven assistants with the necessary qualifications during the first two

days of the period of this study. Because certain of these assistants have discovered and conscientiously reported information concerning some of their acquaintances, their names are being withheld from this report. However, in order to better evaluate the information contained herein, there follows brief background data concerning each of the assistants.

1. An attorney, 47 years old, Republican, Protestant, Veteran of World War I, married.
2. Investigator, 33 years old, Republican, Catholic, Veteran of World War II, four years an investigator in Army Intelligence, married, two children.
3. Retired State employee, 71 years old, Republican, Protestant, employed by State for 32 years in a supervisory capacity, married, three children, (because of sudden illness only a few cases were handled by him).
4. Attorney, 30 years old, Republican, Catholic, Veteran of World War II, four years service, married, two children.
5. Police Inspector, 45 years old, Republican, Protestant, married, one child.
6. Attorney, 31 years old, Republican, Jewish, Veteran of World War II—combat engineer four years, single.
7. Police Patrolman, 35 years old, no political affiliations, Catholic, formerly an investigator for a municipal welfare department, married, 3 children.
8. Attorney, 35 years old, Republican, Protestant, Veteran of World War II, naval officer, married, five children.
9. Investigator, 37 years old, Republican, Protestant, formerly employed by Office of Price Administration, single.
10. Town Manager, 55 years old, Republican, Protestant, has been a town manager for nine years, married, two children.
11. Retired Investigator, 53 years old, Republican, Protestant, married, one child.
12. Business Executive, 54 years old, Republican, Protestant, Veteran of World War I, married.

It should be noted that no inquiries were made relative to the political affiliations of the assistants or relative to their religious beliefs until after they had completed their work.

By virtue of his investigative experiences the writer has had an opportunity to observe the results obtained by numerous investigators. The writer is of the opinion that the assistants in this study have done their work thoroughly and recorded their observation fairly.

IV. Procedure.

In selecting the cases to be checked, a warrant was obtained from the Controller's Office which contained the names of all the recipients for the month of February 1947. In the Old Age Assistance cases the warrant indicated those cases which were new grants. Names were taken from the new grants because it was believed that a study of the new cases would indicate the present activities of the Department. A selection of 250 names was made by making a check mark opposite names at random. An effort was made to make the selection evenly over the entire state keeping in mind the relative density of the population in different areas. In the Aid to Dependent Children cases the warrant did not indicate the new grants. A selection of 150 names was made at random as in the Old Age Assistance cases. For the purpose of this study no cases were utilized which were not in this selection.

For uniformity in procedure and results, mimeograph questionnaires were prepared for the use of the interviewers. One form to be used when interviewing the recipient; another to be used when interviewing a relative of the recipient; and another to be used when interviewing a municipal official. Copies of these questionnaires are made a part of this report.

A folder for each case was prepared containing a sufficient number of forms. The case folders were then given to the above described assistants who conducted the interviews.

When the interviews were completed our case folders were taken to the several Field Offices of the Department where the assistants pulled the Department case file and examined it in the light of our own inquiries. When discrepancies or omissions appeared they were noted and, if available, the field worker to whom the case was assigned interviewed in an effort to fix the responsibility for such discrepancies or omissions.

At the conclusion of this examination the Assistant was instructed to indicate whether or not there had been a sufficient investigation on the part of the field worker. The writer asserts that the assistants were qualified to make this decision.

The assistants were also instructed by the writer to indicate whether or not in their opinion the amount of the grant was justified. They were also instructed to indicate the amount of reduction which should be made if any. The writer wishes to state emphatically that no one connected with this study professes to be a trained social worker. That fact should be kept in mind by the reader in making any evalu-

ation of the cases recommended for reduction. It should also be kept in mind, that although the assistants in this study lack training in social welfare in the academic sense, they are men of mature judgment, possessed of common sense and further that when making their recommendations for a reduction they had before them the results of both their own investigation and that of the Field Worker.

The interviewer's notes of one such interview are made a part of this report. It should be constantly kept in mind by the reader of these notes that the comments and opinions are those of departmental employees and not those of the interviewer. The reporting of the results of all such interviews would have made this report too voluminous and would have served no purpose inasmuch as the comments obtained were of a similar nature. The results of all interviews are being maintained in the writer's files and are identified by the name of the employee. The names of the employees are purposely withheld in accordance with the promises of the interviewers.

Of the 250 Old Age Assistance cases selected, the study of 191 cases was completed. The failure to complete the other 49 cases was due in part to deaths, in part to visits away from home, and in part to road conditions. Of the 150 ADC cases selected the study of 125 cases was completed. Failure to complete the other 25 cases was due chiefly to road conditions. Our overall total is 315 which is very slightly in excess of the number requested by the Committee.

Made a part of this report is a brief synopsis of each of the 315 cases. The writer is in a position to substantiate any material statement contained therein.

The writer concedes that the omission of page numbers in the report may lead to some confusion. Because of the volume of stenographic work involved and the brief time which was had in which to make the report it was necessarily done in sections. Reference may be made to a particular case by referring to the section, case number, and type of case, i.e., II, 12, ADC.

In only three of the cases examined was there anything noted which might be construed as an attempt to use political influence in securing a grant. (Sec. I, #1, OAA; Sec. IV, #8, OAA; Sec. VI, #9, OAA)

No activities of a fraudulent or scandalous nature on the part of any employee of the Department has come to the writer's attention during the course of this study. We received courteous co-operation from every member of the Department with whom we were in contact. Some misunderstandings as to procedure did arise but they were frankly discussed and speedily settled.

During the course of this study the writer has appreciated the non-interference of the Committee on Welfare and the intelligent industry of his assistants. Should it be decided that this report is not "scientific" and is only the result of a "witch hunt" the writer accepts the responsibility therefor.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF REPORTS

ADC

Total cases active February 1947 (H & W Dept. Records)	1902
Total reviewed	125
Per cent reviewed	6.566
Cases insufficiently investigated by H & W Dept.	44
Per cent of total cases	35.2
35.2% of 1902	670
No. of desertion cases found in total review	41
Per cent desertion cases found in total review	32.8
32.8% of 1902	624
Average February grant (H & W Dept. records)	\$91.14
624 x \$91.14 = average monthly grant in desertion cases = ...	\$56,871.36
\$56,871.36 x 12 = yearly grant in desertion cases =	\$682,456.32
The 41 desertion cases have cost the state to date	\$96,397.00
Average cost per case (desertion)	\$2,351.15
624 cases x \$2,351.15 =	\$1,467,117.60
No. of cases where reduction recommended	70
Per cent of cases reviewed	56.
56% of 1902	1065
Total monthly saving on 70 cases	\$2,997.00
Saving per case	\$42.81
1065 x \$42.81 = monthly saving =	\$45,592.65
\$45,592.65 x 12 = yearly saving =	\$547,111.80
No. of cases where recipient disclosed assets of \$1,000 or over	27
Per cent of cases reviewed	21.6
21.6% of 1902	411
\$1,000 x 411	\$411,000.00

OAA

Total cases active February 1947 (H & W Dept. Records)	15,574
Total reviewed	191
Per cent reviewed	1.2264
Cases insufficiently investigated by H & W Dept.	58
Per cent insufficiently investigated by H & W Dept.	30.367
30.367% of 15,574	4,730

Cases reviewed where responsible relatives able to contribute	69
Per cent of such cases	36.125
36.125% of 15,574	5,626
Average monthly grant for February (H & W Dept. records)	34.26
5,626 x \$34.26 = monthly grants in cases where responsible relatives able to contribute =	\$192,746.76
\$192,746.76 x 12 = yearly grants =	\$2,312,961.12
Cases reviewed where reduction recommended	31
Per cent of cases reviewed	16.23
16.23% of 15,574	2,528
Total monthly saving on 31 cases	\$532.00
Saving per case	\$17.16
2,528 x \$17.16 = monthly saving	\$43,380.48
\$43,380.48 x 12 = yearly saving	\$520,565.76
No. of cases where recipient disclosed assets of over \$1,000	22
Per cent of cases reviewed	11.518
11.518% of 15,574	1,794
\$1,000 x 1,794	\$1,794,000.00

Summary (Theoretical)

Yearly grants in ADC cases of desertion ...	\$ 682,456.32	
Yearly savings in ADC cases in which grants could be reduced	547,111.80	
	<hr/>	\$1,229,568.12
Yearly grants in OAA cases where respon- sible relatives are able	\$2,312,961.12	
Yearly savings in OAA cases in which grants could be reduced	520,565.76	
	<hr/>	\$2,833,526.88
Total		<hr/> \$4,063,095.00

The above summary is obviously a perfection which could never be obtained. It cannot be expected that 100% of the fathers who desert their families can be made to furnish full support. Neither is it to be expected that assistance could be obtained in OAA cases from 100% of the responsible relatives who are able to furnish full support.

Should it be considered that an estimated 50% contribution could be obtained in these two categories a practical summary might be:

Summary (Practical)

Yearly savings in ADC cases of desertion ...	\$ 341,228.16	
Yearly savings in ADC cases in which grants could be reduced	547,111.80	
	<hr/>	\$ 888,339.96
Yearly savings in OAA cases where responsible relatives are able	\$1,312,961.12	
Yearly savings in OAA cases in which grants could be reduced	520,565.76	
	<hr/>	\$1,833,526.88
Total		<hr/> \$2,721,866.84

I

#1 ADC. Woman, 39; eight children; ages thirteen and younger; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$215.00; February 1947 payment, \$215.00; total paid to date, \$430.00; assets of recipient, \$1,472.00; sources of outside income, none; responsible relatives: husband under court order to pay \$20.00 per week but does not do it, heavy drinker and not a steady worker; two young daughters recently married, unable to contribute; recipient's own budget, \$215.00, H & W Dept. budget, \$214.62.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that husband should be made to contribute towards the support of his family.

#2 ADC. Woman, 38; five children below ten years of age; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$156.00; total paid to date, \$312.00; assets of recipient, \$990.00; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: husband and father of children deserted family about a year ago, present whereabouts unknown; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$127.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$155.90; 2/47 payment, \$156.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced by at least \$26.00.

#3 ADC. Woman, 38; seven children below the age of twelve; date of first payment, 8/46; amount of first payment, \$154.00; February 1947 payment, \$266.00; total paid to date, \$1,415.00; assets of recipient, \$525.00; sources of outside income, none; husband now in a tuberculosis sanatorium; maternal grandfather earning \$40.00 per week, was not contacted by field worker; recipient's own budget, \$184.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$203.34.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$185.00 per month.

#4 ADC. Woman, nine children below the age of fourteen; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$262.00; February 1947 payment, \$262.00; total paid to date, \$771.00; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: husband, disabled, living with family; no other responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$225.00 per month.

#5 ADC. Woman, 52; three children; daughter, 15; daughter, 14; son, 12; date of first payment, 7/45; amount of first payment, \$87.00; February 1947 payment, \$126.00; total paid to date, \$2,039.00; assets of recipient, \$600.00; receives \$10.00 per week from an older daughter for room and board; responsible relatives: husband, deceased, no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$158.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$147.02.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment be reduced by \$20.00.

#6 ADC. Woman, 40; five children, eldest thirteen, date of first payment, 1/44; amount of first payment, \$88.00; February 1947 payment, \$191.00; total paid to date, \$4,792.00; assets of recipient, \$610.00; receives \$54.00 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: husband has been in sanatorium since 1943; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$175.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$191.57.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment be reduced to \$110.00 per month.

#7 ADC. Woman, 31; four children, eldest 8; date of first payment, 10/46; amount of first payment, \$188.00; February 1947 payment, \$169.00; total paid to date, \$896.00; assets of recipient, \$1,360.00; receives \$5.00 per week from rent of other side of house; responsible relatives: father of

children, unable to work ; no other responsible relatives ; recipient's budget, \$198.00 ; H & W Dept. budget, \$190.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$147.00.

#8 ADC. Woman, 31 ; six children, eldest 10 years ; date of first payment, 3/45 ; amount of first payment, \$183.00 ; February 1947 payment, \$187.00 ; total paid to date, \$3,978.00 ; assets of recipient, \$500.00 ; outside income, none ; responsible relatives : husband, dead ; no other responsible relatives ; recipient's own budget, \$183.00 ; H & W Dept. budget, \$187.46.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that reduction to \$150.00 is warranted.

#9 ADC. Woman, 39 ; eight children, eldest 16 ; date of first payment, 1/47 ; amount of first payment, \$260.00 ; February 1947 payment, \$260.00 ; total paid to date, \$520.00 ; assets of recipient, \$1,320.00 ; no outside income ; responsible relatives : husband in hospital and unable to work ; no other responsible relatives ; recipient's own budget, \$248.00 ; H & W Dept. budget, \$260.11.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$200.00.

#10 ADC. Woman, 40 ; five children, eldest, 13 ; date of first payment, 8/46 ; amount of first payment, \$118.00 ; February 1947 payment, \$151.00 ; total paid to date, \$958.00 ; assets of recipient, \$165.00 ; outside income, receives \$25.00 a month doing housework ; responsible relatives : husband, inmate insane asylum ; maternal grandmother has real estate valued at \$9,000.00 ; recipient's own budget, \$177.00 ; H & W Dept. budget, \$172.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#11 ADC. Woman, 27 ; two children : son, 2 ; son, 1 ; date of first payment, 10/45 ; amount of first payment, \$86.00 ; February 1947 payment, \$107 ; total paid to date, \$1,609.00 ; assets of recipient, \$75.00 ; no other source of income ; responsible relatives : only husband who is in the Federal Penitentiary ; recipient's own budget, \$107.00 ; H & W Dept. budget, \$106.97.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#12 ADC. Woman, 40 ; two children : daughter, 15 ; son, 11 ; date of first payment, 12/44 ; amount of first payment, \$144.00 ; at time of first

payment there were two other children obtaining benefit; February 1947 payment, \$118.00; total paid to date, \$3,029.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000.00; no other source of income; responsible relatives: parents of these children are divorced, whereabouts of husband unknown, last known address Florida; one daughter, married unable to contribute; one daughter in the State Reform School for Girls; one son in the Merchant Marines; recipient's budget, \$118.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$117.66.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that present payment is justified.

#13 ADC. Woman, 47; five children: daughter, 17; daughter, 13; daughter, 10; daughter, 8; daughter, 5; date of first payment, 11/43; amount of first payment, \$121.00; February 1947 payment, \$153.00; total paid to date, \$6,064.00; assets of recipient, none; an older daughter is paying \$45.00 a month board; responsible relatives: daughter, 18, earns \$24.00 per week, stays at home and pays board as stated above; two other daughters ages 17, and 16, now working and earning \$16.00 per week; recipient's own budget, \$178.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$196.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of \$53.00 in this payment is indicated.

#14 ADC. Woman, 47; one daughter, 7; date of first payment, 11/45; amount of first payment, \$62.00; February 1947 payment, \$106.00; total paid to date, \$1,694.00; assets of recipient, \$100.00; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: parents of this child are divorced, husband is a truck driver in New York City and does not contribute to child's support; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$106.00, of this amount she pays \$45.00 per month rent; H & W Dept. budget, \$105.97.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of at least \$20.00 per month is indicated.

#15 ADC. Woman, 40; five children: oldest 12; date of first payment, 10/45; amount of first payment, \$131.00; February 1947 payment, \$183.00; total paid to date, \$2,975.00; assets of recipient, \$469.00; no other sources of income; responsible relatives: husband, unable to work due to permanent injuries, he lives with the family, states field worker had no discussion with him; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$192.40; H & W Dept. budget, \$194.98.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that reduction in the payment of at least \$14.00 per month is indicated.

#16 ADC. Woman, 25; daughter, 6; daughter, 5; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$37.00; February 1947 payment, \$43.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; receives \$15.00 per week support from separated husband; responsible relatives; husband separated from wife under court order to pay wife \$15.00 per week, truck driver, earns \$43.78 per week, had never been interviewed by welfare worker, when interviewed during the course of this study he advised that he is willing and able to assume the full support of his family; recipient's own budget, \$90.25; H & W Dept. budget, \$108.30; no other responsible relatives.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be discontinued.

#17 ADC. Woman, 37; eight children: daughter, 17; daughter, 16; son, 12; daughter, 11; son, 10; son, 8; son, 5; son, 2; date of first payment, 10/46; amount of first payment, \$142.00; February 1947 payment, \$142.00; total paid to date, \$710.00; assets of recipient, none; receives \$7.00 per week for board from two oldest children; responsible relatives: father of these children deserted family, present whereabouts unknown; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$171.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$189.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#18 ADC. Woman, 39; six children: son, 17; daughter, 15; daughter, 11; daughter, 6; daughter, 8; son, 3; date of first payment, 10/45; amount of first payment, \$129.00; February 1947 payment, \$184.00; total paid to date, \$2,427.00; assets of recipient, \$3,000.00; receives \$10.00 per month for rent of part of house; responsible relatives: husband, dead; one son working, earns \$26.00 per week, has an automobile; recipient's budget, \$188.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$194.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#19 ADC. Woman, 58; two grandchildren: granddaughter, 5; grandson, 3; date of first payment, 12/46; February 1947 payment, \$76.00; total paid to date, \$232.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; grandparents receive \$40.00 a month as aid to the blind and \$17.90 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: father and mother of these children deserted them and they have been cared for by the grandparents.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

I

#20 ADC. Woman, 28; three children: oldest 6; date of first payment, 7/45; amount of first payment, \$140.00; February 1947 payment, \$176.00; total paid to date, \$2,944.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; no outside source of income; responsible relatives: husband living at home, sick and unable to work; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$175.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$176.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of at least \$20.00 per month should be made in this payment.

#21 ADC. Woman, 39; six children: son, 15; daughter, 14; son, 13; son, 11; son, 10; daughter, 5; date of first payment, 7/45; amount of first payment, \$106.00; February 1947 payment, \$104.00; total paid to date, \$2,082.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; receives \$60.00 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$195.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$104.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#22 ADC. Woman, 39; three children: son, 15; daughter, 13; son, 4; date of first payment, 11/45; amount of first payment, \$98.00; February 1947 payment, \$164.00; total paid to date, \$1,997.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; no source of outside income; responsible relatives: parents are divorced, husband living outside the state, does not contribute to children's support; maternal grandfather, refuses to give financial statement, has a good job; recipient's own budget, \$135.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$164.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$135.00 per month and that maternal grandfather should be made to contribute toward this family's support.

#23 ADC. Woman, 36; seven children; oldest 12; date of first payment, 3/44; amount of first payment, \$120.00; February 1947 payment, \$168.00; total paid to date, \$4,848.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; no source of outside income; responsible relatives: father, living at home with family, physically unable to work; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, unable to give one; H & W Dept. budget, \$173.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that present payment is justified.

#24 ADC. Woman, 31; four children; oldest 11; date of first payment, 10/44; amount of first payment, \$103.00; February 1947 payment, \$153.00;

total paid to date, \$3,614.00; assets of recipient, none; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: husband deserted family, presently in California; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$153.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$153.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#1 OAA. Woman, 84; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$28.00; total paid to date, \$28.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: son, captain in police force, substantial salary, no dependents other than wife; daughter, married to assistant chief of police who has substantial income; Poor Dept. of the City have no knowledge of application; files reflect that application prepared by clerk to Overseer of the Poor.

Case insufficiently investigated. Opinion of the reviewer that case should be discontinued.

#2 OAA. Man, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$120.00; responsible relatives: wife, earns \$15.00 per week; two minor children in school.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time.

#3 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$240.00; outside earnings, \$20.00 per month doing odd jobs; responsible relatives: two daughters; housewives, unable to contribute.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#4 OAA. Man, 78; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$459.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: wife, assets, \$3,500.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$35.00.

#5 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000.00; outside income, \$3.00 per week; responsible relatives: two daughters, two sons; children unable to contribute.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#6 OAA. Man, 70; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$23.00; receives Social Security benefits of \$27.72 per month; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#7 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$1,300.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: husband deceased; six sons, three daughters residing outside the state, contacted with negative results.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment be reduced to \$30.00 per month.

#8 OAA. Woman, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipients, \$85.00; receives \$12.50 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: husband deceased; has one son in the Army.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#9 OAA. Woman, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$20.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$912.50; receives occasional gifts of food from children; responsible relatives: husband unable to work, receiving \$29.00 per month OAA, net worth \$1,000.00; two daughters, married with large families.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#10 OAA. Woman, 72; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$215.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#11 OAA. Woman, 83; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$34.00; assets of recipient, \$220.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, married, providing living quarters for mother; two other married daughters unable to contribute; recipient has exceptional medical expenses.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#12 OAA. Woman, 85; date of first payment, 12/41; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$770.00; assets of recipient, \$100.00; responsible relatives: none; receives small contributions from two nieces.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#13 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#14 OAA. Man, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$38.00; assets of recipient, none; no outside income; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#15 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 12/39; amount of first payment, \$24.00; amount of February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$2,469.00; assets of recipient, \$50.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: wife receiving \$40.00 per month OAA; son and three daughters unable to contribute.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#16 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$15.00; total paid to date, \$15.00; assets of recipient, \$121.00. Obtains board and room from brother. Responsible relatives, none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#17 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; wife receives \$40.00 a mo. OAA and social security of \$18.88; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#18 OAA. Man, 79; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$30.00; total paid to date, \$30.00; assets of recipient, \$159.00; outside income, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: three sons and three grandsons.

I

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction in the amount of \$15.00 per month is indicated.

#19 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$1,001.00. Unable to work; receives social security of \$23.12 per month; no responsible relative other than wife who has social security income of \$11.56 a month.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#20 OAA. Woman, 69; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; receives \$15.50 per month social security; responsible relatives: two sons working outside of State.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at the time, but some effort should be made to have the sons assume support of mother.

#21 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$1,060.00; unable to work; no source of outside income; responsible relatives: two daughters married; one son who earns \$30.00 per week. No contact made with relatives by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at the time, but children should be made to support their father.

#22 OAA. Woman, 68; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; receives \$10.00 per month social security; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#23 OAA. Woman, 68; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; unable to work; no other source of income; responsible relatives: son, assets of \$3,000.00, earns \$60.00 per week. Was not interviewed by field worker; daughter, housewife.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified, but that son should be made to assume full support of mother.

#24 OAA. Man, 79; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$76.00; assets of recipient, \$50.00; unable to work; receives \$10.00 monthly social security; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#25 OAA. Woman, 79; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$422.00; receives \$10.00 per month social security; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#26 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$28.00; total paid to date, \$28.00; assets of recipient, none; wife's income, \$15.00 weekly; responsible relatives other than wife: 2 daughters married and unable to contribute.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#27 OAA. Man, 73; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; no other income; responsible relatives; none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment was justified.

#28 OAA. Woman, 83; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; is bed-ridden; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#29 OAA. Woman, 73; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$2,000.00; responsible relatives: husband receiving OAA; no other responsible relatives.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#30 OAA. Woman, 68; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$15.00. Receives \$22.72 monthly social security; is unable to work; responsible relatives: 2 married daughters unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#31 OAA. Woman, 68; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$600.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: husband receiving \$15.00 per month social security, 2 daughters, one son.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment was justified but that children should be made to assume full support of mother.

#32 OAA. Woman, 38; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$178.00; no outside income; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#33 OAA. Man, 76; date of first payment 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: wife earns \$16.00 per week; 2 married daughters unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#34 OAA. Man, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; outside sources of income, none; unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#35 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$41.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives, none other than wife who earns a small amount scrubbing floors; no other responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#36 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: 3 daughters, 2 of whom are working, the other is a housewife.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer

that payment is justified but that daughters should contribute to the support of their father.

#37 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; physically unable to work; responsible relative other than wife, none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#38 OAA. Woman, 81; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$32.00; total paid to date, \$32.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; other income, none; responsible relatives, married daughter who keeps recipient in her home; unable to contribute entire support; no other responsible relatives.

Case was sufficiently investigated. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#39 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; no other sources of income. Physically unable to work; responsible relatives: 2 sons and one daughter; son with whom he lives takes \$35.00 of the grant and gives the recipient the remaining \$5.00. This son is a taxi driver. Another son earns \$36.00 a week and has assets of \$3,000.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced by \$10.00 each month. Children should be made to assume full support of their father.

#40 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; earns about \$3.00 a week doing odd jobs; responsible relatives, none; recipient's budget, \$32.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$49.00.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that there should be a reduction in this grant of \$19.00 per month.

#41 OAA. Man, 79; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$22.00; total paid to date, \$44.00; assets of recipient, \$37.00; no outside income; responsible relatives: son who refused to give financial statement, but who earns \$50.00 a week. Recipient is living with a brother who is unable to provide entire support.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that son should be made to assume full support of father.

I

#42 OAA. Woman, 75; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$2,540.00; no sources of outside income; responsible relatives: married daughter unable to contribute; recipient owns her own home and is having work done on it.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#43 OAA. Man, 70; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$4,000.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: wife living with recipient, one son and one daughter.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#44 OAA. Woman, 68; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: none; recipient died, March, 1947.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment was justified.

#45 OAA. Woman, 73; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$700.00; unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#46 OAA. Woman, 88; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives, none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker; opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#47 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$400.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: 2 daughters, one son, one daughter has mother in her home but is unable to furnish full support.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that grant is justified but the other two children should be made to contribute towards their mother's support.

#48 OAA. Man, 83; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; unable

to work; receiving \$30.00 monthly social security benefits; responsible relatives: two sons; one, address unknown; the other son unable to contribute, but does have 7 room house.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that grant should be discontinued in as much as recipient receives \$30.00 a month social security and son is in a position to furnish a home.

#49 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$5.00; total paid to date, \$5.00; assets of recipient, \$515.00; receives \$50.00 a month pension from an oil company; responsible relatives: wife who lives with recipient; unemployed son also at home drawing \$20.00 a week employment insurance.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is not justified.

#50 OAA. Man, 76; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: son, gainfully employed, was not interviewed by field worker.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that son should be made to assume full support of his father.

#51 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; earns approximately \$15.00 per month doing odd jobs; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#52 OAA. Woman, 75; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$27.00; total paid to date, \$54.00; assets of recipient, none; receives \$10.90 a month social security; responsible relatives: husband receives \$25.00 per month OAA; three daughters married.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced by \$5.00 each month.

#53 OAA. Man, 76; date of first payment, 2/39; amount of first payment, \$22.00; February, 1947 payment, \$25.00; total paid to date, \$1,220; assets of recipient, \$160.00; receives \$21.00 per month social security and \$20.00 a month for room and board of granddaughter; responsible relatives: 3 married daughters.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced by \$5.00 per month.

#54 OAA. Man, 68; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment \$28.00; total paid to date, \$28.00; assets of recipient \$275.00; outside source of income, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#55 OAA. Woman, 69; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date \$80.00; assets of recipient \$200.00; responsible relatives, none; recipient has brother who is a substantial business man and owns considerable property. When interviewed during the course of investigation of sister, he advised he did not know his sister was receiving OAA; declined to give a financial statement. He owns the apartment building in which his sister is living.

Case insufficiently investigated. Opinion of reviewer that payment be reduced to \$20.00 per month.

#56 OAA. Man, 75; date of first payment 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of \$329.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives, none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#57 OAA. Woman, 79; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#58 OAA. Man, 79; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$25.00; total paid to date, \$50.00; assets of recipient, \$18.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives; wife who lives with husband in their own home; 3 sons who were not interviewed by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified, but sons should be made to support their father.

#59 OAA. Man, 75; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$33.00; total paid to date, \$33.00; assets of recipient, \$100.00; no source of outside income; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: one daughter married who makes what contribution she can.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#60 OAA. Woman, 74; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$610.00; unable to work; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment in this case is justified.

#61 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$18.00 per month social security; unable to work; responsible relatives: wife who lives with recipient, 4 sons and one daughter. Children were not contacted by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated. Opinion of reviewer that a present cut of \$10.00 per month is indicated and that children should be forced to assume full support of their father.

II

#1 ADC. Woman, 35; 3 children; daughters 15, 13, and 11; date of first payment, 11/37; amount of first payment \$24.00; February, 1947 payment, \$164.00; total paid to date \$5,591; assets of recipient, \$500; unable to do outside work; responsible relatives: husband, these parents were divorced in 1936; husband pays \$6.00 per week towards the support of children; other responsible relatives, none; recipient's budget \$153.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$190.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should be reduced at least \$10.00 a month.

#2 ADC. Woman, 50; son, 15; date of first payment, 1/34; amount of first payment, \$35.00; February, 1947 payment, \$85.00; total paid to date, \$4,080.00; assets of recipient, \$550.00; responsible relatives: husband dead, one daughter, married with whom recipient lives; recipient's budget, \$76.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$84.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 ADC. Woman, 52; 3 children, daughters 17 and 14; son, 11; date of first payment, 11/36; amount of first payment \$25.00; February, 1947 payment, \$87.00; total paid to date, \$3,943; assets of recipient, \$500.00; responsible relatives; husband, dead; one son in Army from whom she receives \$37.00 each month; another son pays her \$40.00 per month for room and board.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$45.00 per month.

#4 ADC. Woman, 40; 3 children, daughter 17, son 16, daughter 14; date of first payment, 7/38; amount of first payment, \$58.00; February, 1947 payment, \$101.00; total paid to date, \$7,192.00; assets of recipient, \$250.00; outside income, none; responsible relatives: husband, in sanatorium; recipient's budget, \$107.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$100.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#5 ADC. Woman, 39; 3 children, daughter 14, son 12, daughter 10; date of first payment, 7/40; amount of first payment, \$48.00; February, 1947 payment, \$152.00; total paid to date, \$5,025; assets of recipient, \$500.00; responsible relatives, none; husband dead; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$152.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$152.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

II

#6 ADC. Woman, 45; 2 children, daughter 14; daughter, 9; date of first payment, 9/39; amount of first payment, \$60.00; February, 1947 payment, \$134.00; total paid to date, \$5,402.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; receives \$12.00 per month from one aged boarder. Responsible relatives: husband dead; recipient's budget, \$125.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$134.47.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should be reduced by \$25.00 each month.

#7 ADC. Woman, 35; 3 children, son 12, daughter 10, daughter 8; first payment, 7/41; amount of first payment, \$56.00; February 1947 payment, \$139.00; total paid to date, \$6,153.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; responsible relatives, none; husband dead; recipient's budget, \$152.00; H & W Dept. \$138.60.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#8 ADC. Woman, 53; 5 children, son 15, son 14, son 13, son 12, and son 7; date of first payment, 9/41; amount of first payment, \$50.00; February 1947 payment, \$93.00; total paid to date, \$3,397.00; assets of recipient, \$250.00; responsible relatives: husband dead; daughters working at \$15.00 and \$22.00 per week. These two children pay a total of \$72.00 a month board and room.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#9 ADC. Woman, 34, husband, 32; two children, son 8; daughter 7; date of first payment, 7/41; amount of first payment, \$66.00; February, 1947 payment, \$136.00; total paid to date, \$6,170.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000; receives \$50.00 each month from a business of husband; responsible relatives: husband, unable to work; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$120.00; H & W Dept. \$135.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that there should be a reduction of \$25.00 a month in this payment.

#10 ADC. Woman, 32, daughter, 6; date of first payment, 12/45; amount of first payment, \$65.00; February, 1947 payment, \$96.00; total paid to date, \$1,099.00; assets of recipient, none; income from outside sources, none; responsible relatives: this woman is not married and had an illegitimate child; recipient's budget, \$84.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$95.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

II

#11 ADC. Woman, 42; four children: son, 18; son, 13; son, 9; daughter, 7; date of first payment, 9/41; amount of first payment, \$76.00; February, 1947 payment, \$134.00; total paid to date, \$5,063.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: parents of these children are divorced, whereabouts of father presently unknown; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$124.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$147.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that there should be a reduction of at least \$10.00 per month in this case.

#12 ADC. Woman, 48; two children: daughter, 14; son, 6; date of first payment, 9/41; amount of first payment, \$59.00; February, 1947 payment, \$123.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: husband, physically unable to work, lives with family; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$115.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$122.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#13 ADC. Woman, 43; three children: son, 16; son, 14; son, 7; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$92.00; February, 1947 payment, \$92.00; total paid to date, \$276.00; assets of recipient, \$600.00; receives \$49.00 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: husband, dead; one daughter, working, married, unable to contribute; no other relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#14 ADC. Woman, 53; three children: son, 18; daughter, 16; son, 14; date of first payment, 8/46; amount of first payment, \$89.00; February, 1947 payment, \$108.00; total paid to date, \$661.00; assets of recipient \$500.00; no outside source of income; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other relatives; recipient's budget, \$92.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$108.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#15 ADC. Woman, 55; one son, 15; date of first payment, 4/43; amount of first payment, \$87.00; February, 1947 payment, \$94.00; total paid to date, \$4,024.00; assets of recipient, \$800.00; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other relatives; recipient's budget, \$74.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$93.00.

II

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#16 ADC. Woman, 34; four children: oldest 11; date of first payment, 5/43; amount of first payment, \$55.00; February 1947 payment, \$118.00; total paid to date, \$3,407.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000.00; no outside source of income; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other relatives; recipient's budget, \$124.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$154.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#17 ADC. Woman, 35; four children: son, 15; son, 13; daughter, 11; daughter, 8; date of first payment, 12/44; amount of first payment, \$95.00; February 1947 payment, \$164.00; total paid to date, \$2,532.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; receives \$25.00 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other relatives; recipient's budget, \$157.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$163.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#18 ADC. Woman, 35, six children: daughter, 16; daughter, 14; son, 13; son, 11; son, 10; son, 10; date of first payment, 9/45; amount of first payment, \$71.00; February 1947 payment, \$172.00; total paid to date, \$1,420.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; receives \$21.00 per week from municipality as death benefit when husband was killed; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other relatives; recipient's budget, \$155.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$263.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that there should be a reduction of \$50.00 per month in this payment.

#19 ADC. Woman, 35; four children: oldest 14; date of first payment, 9/45; amount of first payment, \$115.00; February 1947 payment, \$145.00; total paid to date, \$2,160.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: husband, recently returned to family, advises that he did not know family was receiving aid from the State, states that he is willing and able to assume full support of his family in the future and to refund to the State the money which the State has expended in his family's behalf.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should cease.

#20 ADC. Man, 43; woman, 37; son, 7; daughter, 6; date of first payment, 4/46; amount of first payment, \$145.00; February 1947 payment,

II

\$146.00; total paid to date, \$1,446.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000.00; no sources of outside income; responsible relatives: husband and wife living with children, husband permanently disabled because of an accident; no other relatives; recipient's budget, \$143.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$146.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#21 ADC. Woman, 35; four children: oldest, 12; date of first payment, 11/46; amount of first payment, \$162.00; February 1947 payment, \$171.00; total paid to date, \$666.00; no sources of outside income; responsible relatives: husband, deserted family, present whereabouts unknown; no other relatives; recipient's budget, \$117.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$162.00; assets of recipient, \$600.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that there should be a reduction of at least \$25.00 per month.

#22 ADC. Woman, 44; five children: oldest, 10; date of first payment, 9/46; amount of first payment, \$123.00; February 1947 payment, \$143.00; total paid to date, \$739.00; assets of recipient, \$100.00; receives \$28.00 per month for renting two rooms; responsible relatives: parents of these children are divorced, father residing in same city but does not contribute to children's support; recipient's budget, \$131.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$143.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that consideration should be given to removing the children from the mother's custody.

#23 ADC. Woman, 32; five children: daughter, 16; son, 14; daughter, 13; daughter, 11; daughter, 10; date of first payment, 11/46; amount of first payment, \$197.00; February 1947 payment, \$197.00; total paid to date, \$788.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: husband, deserted family, residing outside the State, reportedly earning \$100.00 per week; maternal grandfather, owns own home, earns \$50.00 per week, refuses to give a financial statement, had never been interviewed by field worker; recipient's budget, \$197.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$196.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment be reduced at least \$50.00 per month.

#24 ADC. Woman, 49; two sons, 12 & 11; date of first payment, 2/41; amount of first payment, \$54.00; total paid to date, \$5,709.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other relatives;

recipient's budget, \$125.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$127.00; 2/47 payment, \$128.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#1 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 9/39; amount of first payment, \$21.00; February 1947 payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$888.00; assets of recipient, \$1,750.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: recipient living in own home with wife who earns approximately \$8.00 monthly; three sons, married, unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#2 OAA. Woman, 70; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$1,706.00; receives \$22.00 per month for boarding a child; responsible relatives: one son unable to contribute; two daughters unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$600.00; sources of outside income, municipality pays for rent and fuel; unable to work; responsible relatives: wife, living with recipient; no other responsible relative.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment was justified.

#4 OAA. Man, 69; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$17.00; total paid to date, \$34.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: two sons, two daughters, unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#5 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$27.00; February 1947 payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$65.00; assets of recipient, none; receives \$10.00 per month Social Security benefits; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: four sons, four daughters, all married with large families, unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

II

#6 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$18.00; total paid to date, \$36.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: husband, dead; one son who partially supports mother and is unable to do more.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment is justified.

#7 OAA. Woman, 71; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$27.00; total paid to date, \$54.00; assets of recipient, none; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: four married daughters; one son; children partially supporting mother, unable to do more.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#8 OAA. Man, 77; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$21.00; February 1947 payment, \$21.00; total paid to date, \$42.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: wife with whom recipient lives; four married daughters and one married son who contribute according to their ability.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#9 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$30.00; total paid to date, \$60.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: three daughters, two sons, none of whom were contacted by field worker; husband with whom recipient lives.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that children should assume the full support of their parent.

#10 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$29.00; total paid to date, \$58.00; assets of recipient, \$680.00; unable to work because of tuberculosis; responsible relatives: wife, this man is the husband of the recipient in the preceding case; children were not contacted by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that children should assume full support of their parents.

#11 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: son who is a merchant.

II

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that son should assume full support of his father.

#12 OAA. Man, 70; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$24.00; total paid to date, \$48.00; assets of recipient, none; outside income, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: none; resides with his sister who cannot provide full support.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#13 OAA. Woman, 85; date of first payment, 2/46; amount of first payment, \$16.00; February 1947 payment, \$19.00; total paid to date, \$227.00; assets of recipient, \$45.00; receives \$40.00 per month Civil War pension; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#14 OAA. Woman, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$27.00; total paid to date, \$27.00; assets of recipient, \$100.00; receives \$37.00 per month from her son in the Army; responsible relatives: son in the Army; two other sons and a daughter; husband, dead.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#15 OAA. Man, 68; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$26.00; total paid to date, \$26.00; assets of recipient, \$800.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: two sons and one daughter are contributing to the extent of their ability.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#16 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$22.00; total paid to date, \$22.00; assets of recipient, \$175.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: one son, two daughters; children contribute to the best of their ability.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#17 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$28.00; total paid to date, \$28.00; assets of recipient, \$310.00; responsible relatives: husband, dead; five sons, five daughters; recipient is living with a son and daughter.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that children should assume full support of their mother.

#18 OAA. Man, 73; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$25.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#19 OAA. Man, 68; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$215.00; physically unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#20 OAA. Woman, 70; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$125.00; receives \$15.00 per month income from a trust fund; responsible relatives: two sons, one daughter; sons have substantial incomes.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that sons should assume the full support of their mother.

#21 OAA. Woman, 84; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#22 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: son has substantial income, one of his children is attending college and he is making payments of \$70.00 per month on a home.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that son should be made to assume full support of his mother.

#23 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$27.00; total paid to date, \$54.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: wife who lives with hus-

II

band; they receive \$50.00 per month for boarding one child, no relation; no other responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

III

#1 ADC. Woman, 38; five children: son, 15; daughter, 14; daughter, 12; son, 11; son, 9; three nephews: one, 16; one, 7; one, 3; date of first payment, 3/46; amount of first payment, \$184.00; February 1947 payment, \$307.00; total paid to date, \$2,557.00; assets of recipient, \$2,010.00; outside income: daughter living at home receives a \$60.00 a month Government pension; father of children lives at home and does part-time work; no other responsible relatives; recipient conveyed real estate to her son a short time prior to application for ADC; recipient's budget, \$220.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$307.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that this payment should be reduced at least \$100.00 each month.

#2 ADC. Woman, 45; four children: daughter, 16, son, 15; daughter, 12; son, 12; date of first payment, 8/39; amount of first payment, \$65.00; February 1947 payment, \$120.00; total paid to date, \$6,001.00; assets of recipient, \$1,800.00; no income from outside sources; responsible relatives: parents are divorced, husband is steadily employed but does not contribute to the support of the children; two sons beyond school age who are living at home, but are lazy and don't work; recipient's budget, \$167.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$169.59.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should be reduced to \$100.00.

#3 ADC. Woman, 32; four children, eldest 11; date of first payment, 1/42; amount of first payment, \$75.00; February 1947 payment, \$139.00; total paid to date, \$4,950; assets of recipient, \$100.00; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: these parents are divorced, whereabouts of husband unknown; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$140.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$139.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time.

#4 ADC. Woman, 39; four children: daughter, 15; son, 14; son, 12; daughter, 1; date of first payment, 4/46; amount of first payment, \$114.00; February 1947 payment, \$136.00; total paid to date, \$1,444.00; assets of recipient, \$1,460.00; no outside income; responsible relatives: husband deceased; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$145.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$136.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$114.00 per month.

#5 ADC. Woman, 32; five children; eldest 14; date of first payment,

III

4/46; amount of first payment, \$104.00; February 1947 payment, \$157.00; total paid to date, \$1,548.00; assets of recipient, none; no outside income; responsible relatives: parents of these children are divorced, father's present whereabouts unknown; paternal grandparent owns and operates a grocery store, professes not to know where son is now located; recipient's own budget, \$155.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$191.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the payment should be reduced to \$140.00 per month but that an attempt should be made to locate the father and that the grandfather be made to contribute towards the support of these children.

#6 ADC. Woman, 46; three children: daughter, 16; daughter, 15; son, 13; date of first payment, 10/35; amount of first payment, \$38.00; February 1947 payment, \$136.00; total paid to date, \$10,069.00; assets of recipient, none; income from outside sources, none; responsible relatives: husband dead; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$140.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$136.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced at least \$20.00 per month.

#7 ADC. Woman, 33; six children: daughter, 16; son, 15; son, 13; son, 11; daughter, 8; son, 7; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$172.00; February 1947 payment, \$172.00; total paid to date, \$516.00; assets of recipient, \$25.00; no outside source of income; responsible relatives: husband dead; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$170.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$172.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that there should be a reduction of at least \$22.00 in the monthly payment.

#8 ADC. Woman, 41; two children: son, 10; daughter, 8; date of first payment, 8/40; amount of first payment, \$60.00; February 1947 payment, \$96.00; total paid to date, \$4,848; assets of the recipient, \$100.00; no outside sources of income; responsible relatives: the parents are divorced, husband lives in a near-by town but does not contribute towards support of the family; no other responsible relatives; recipient's budget, \$95.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$93.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment is justified at this time but that father of children should be made to contribute to their support.

#9 ADC. Woman, 37; five children: daughter, 16; son, 13; son, 11; daughter, 7; son, 6; date of first payment, 8/45; amount of first payment,

III

\$145.00; February 1947 payment, \$194.00; total paid to date, \$2,969.00; assets of recipient, \$400.00; no outside income; responsible relatives: these parents are divorced, present whereabouts of husband is unknown; recipient's own budget, \$200.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$194.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that a reduction of \$50.00 per month is indicated.

#10 ADC. Man, 39; woman, 30; seven children, eldest 12; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$202.00; February 1947 payment, \$202.00; total paid to date, \$586.00; assets of recipient, \$700.00; husband earns irregular amounts in outside employment; responsible relatives: husband upholsterer by trade, unable to work steadily because of sickness; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$176.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$202.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of \$80.00 per month in the payment is indicated.

#11 ADC. Woman, 53; four children, eldest 14; date of first payment, 3/45; amount of first payment, \$133.00; February 1947 payment, \$172.00; total paid to date, \$3,270.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000.00; no outside income; responsible relatives: none; husband dead; recipient's budget, \$175.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$172.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of \$20.00 per month in this payment is indicated.

#12 ADC. Woman, 54; two children: son, 13; daughter, 11; date of first payment, 7/39; amount of first payment, \$25.00; February 1947 payment, \$226.00; total paid to date, \$4,691.00; assets of recipient, \$8,635.00; does earn some money during the summer; responsible relatives: none; husband dead; recipient's budget, \$75.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$128.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the monthly payment should not exceed \$98.00.

#13 ADC. Woman, 30; two children: daughter, 13; daughter, 11; date of first payment, 6/41; amount of first payment, \$42.00; February 1947 payment, \$97.00; total paid to date, \$3,553.00; assets of recipient, \$50.00; she receives her rent for keeping house for a man; responsible relatives: husband dead; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$80.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$97.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of at least \$22.00 per month in this payment is indicated.

III

#1 OAA. Woman, 89; date of first payment, 1/42; amount of first payment, \$27.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$2,023.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#2 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$23.00; total paid to date, \$23.00; assets of recipient, \$520.00; works part-time and earns about \$30.00 per month; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 OAA. Woman, 71; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$31.00; total paid to date, \$62.00; assets of recipient, \$6,300.00; receives \$20.16 per month Social Security benefits; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#4 OAA. Woman, 83; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$4,400.00; unable to work but receives \$20.00 per month from a roomer.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#5 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$38.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#6 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$20.00; unable to work steadily, does earn approximately \$15.00 per month from sewing; has three daughters and two sons who are unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#7 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$468.00; no outside sources of income; unable to work; no responsible relatives.

III

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#8 OAA. Man, 69; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$35.00; total paid to date, \$70.00; assets of recipient, \$3,700.00; receives on an average of \$10.00 per month for outside work; responsible relatives: three sons mentally deficient.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#9 OAA. Woman, 84; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$25.00; total paid to date, \$50.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; no outside income; unable to work; responsible relatives: single son with whom she lives but who is physically handicapped.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of investigator that payment is justified.

#10 OAA. Man, 78; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$28.00; total paid to date, \$28.00; assets of recipient, none; no source of outside income; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: two daughters; he lives with one of them, other daughter unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#11 OAA. Man, 76; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#12 OAA. Man, 82; date of first payment, 7/42; amount of first payment, \$18.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$846.00; assets of recipient, \$550.00; no other income; physically unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#13 OAA. Man, 77; date of first payment, 6/38; amount of first payment, \$14.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$1,019.00; assets of recipient, none; no other source of income; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

III

#14 OAA. Man, 73; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; receives \$28.00 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: wife whom recipient supports.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#15 OAA. Man, 77; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$23.00; total paid to date, \$46.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, who furnishes rent for parents, unable to do more.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#16 OAA. Woman, 75; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$29.00; total paid to date, \$29.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: husband, dead; has three sons.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that three sons should be made to assume the full support of their mother.

#17 OAA. Woman, 74; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$38.00; assets of recipient, none; receives \$5.00 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: husband who receives \$20.00 per month OAA; two sons who are unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#18 OAA. Woman, 80; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; responsible relatives: none; she receives \$64.00 a month from sister.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment in this case is not justified.

#19 OAA. Man, 73; date of first payment, 9/41; amount of first payment, \$20.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$1,083.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; no other income; responsible relatives: daughter, housewife, unable to contribute; son, has income of \$40.00 per week.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but steps should be taken to require son to contribute to the support of his father.

III

#20 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$38.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#21 OAA. Man, 68; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, married, unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#22 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$26.00; total paid to date, \$26.00; assets of recipient, \$2,000.00; does part-time work during the summer; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

IV

#1 ADC. Woman, 30; six children: oldest, 12; date of first payment, 8/46; amount of first payment, \$36.00; February 1947 payment, \$135.00; total paid to date, \$280.00; assets, none; earnings, none; responsible relatives: father, divorced, has now deserted children, has not been located; grandfather of children was not interviewed by field worker, he has assets of \$2,780.00, including \$1,500 cash on hand; recipient's own budget is \$133.80; H & W Dept. budget is \$122.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that recipient needs amount now being paid but that steps should be taken to have the grandfather contribute to the support of the children and that the father of the children should be located.

#2 ADC. Woman, 36; two children: daughter, 14; daughter, 13; date of first payment, 11/42; amount of first payment, \$62.00; February 1947 payment, \$106.00; total paid to date, \$4,600.00; assets of recipient, none; outside earnings, none; responsible relatives: father of children lives in home, is totally disabled because of sickness, has been unable to work since 1936; recipient's own budget, \$106.00; Dept. of H & W budget, \$106.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 ADC. Woman, 52; two children: son, 17; son, 15; date of first payment, 3/43; amount of first payment, \$59.00; February 1947 payment, \$57.00; total paid to date, \$2,591.00; assets of recipient, \$43.00; outside income, \$40.00 per month Social Security benefits; mother is in poor health; responsible relatives: none; father of children died five years ago; recipient's own budget, \$97.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$59.23.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#4 ADC. Woman, 51; three children: daughter, 16; daughter, 12; daughter, 11; date of first payment, 3/44; amount of first payment, \$96.00; February 1947 payment, \$105.00; total paid to date, \$3,564.00; assets of recipient, \$1,000.00; responsible relatives: father of children, dying of tuberculosis, has been in the sanatorium since 1943; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$105.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$104.95.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#5 ADC. Woman, 37; four children: daughter, 13; son, 9; daughter, 4; son, 4; date of first payment, 3/45; amount of first payment, \$52.00;

IV

February 1947 payment, \$60.00; total paid to date, \$1,414.00; assets of recipient, none; divorced husband contributes \$10.00 per week towards support of the family; responsible relatives: divorced father, assets, \$75.00, earns \$40.00 per week; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$106.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$95.56; although the parents of these children are divorced, the father rooms in the same house with his former wife, mother of these children. He spends much of his time with her and no doubt eats from her table.

Case insufficiently investigated by the field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should be reduced at least \$40.00 per month and that father should be made to assume more of his responsibilities.

#6 ADC. Woman, 31; three children: daughter, 11; son, 6; daughter, 3; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$88.00; February 1947 payment, \$90.00; total paid to date, \$1,358.00; assets of recipient, \$115.00; outside income, \$12.00 per month; responsible relatives: husband, deserted children in 1945, contributes nothing towards their support; is not working, resides in the same city where the mother and children now are, was ordered to pay \$20.00 per week for their support; one grandfather of the children, that is the father of the husband, never contacted by social worker, has a fine home, refuses to give a financial statement, and refuses to help support the grandchildren; the other grandfather of the children, that is the father of the mother, was not interviewed by a field worker, he has assets of \$4,850.00, which includes \$2,700.00 cash in the bank; recipient's own budget, \$102.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$88.32.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the recipient is in need of this amount and payment in this amount is justified, but that husband and grandparents of the children should be made to contribute to their support.

#7 ADC. Woman, 35; four children: son, 13; son, 12; daughter, 10; daughter, 7; date of first payment, 11/45; amount of first payment, \$104.00; February 1947 payment, \$170.00; total paid to date, \$2,307.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: none; father of children was taken to Fairfield Sanatorium in 1945 and died there in 1946; mother and children in very poor health; recipient's own budget, \$129.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$125.51.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified due to medical needs of mother and children.

#8 ADC. Woman, 26; five children: son, daughter, 8; daughter, 5;

IV

son, 3; daughter, 4 mos.; date of first payment, 8/45; amount of first payment, \$123.00; February 1947 payment, \$177.00; total paid to date, \$2,532.00; assets of recipient, none; outside income, none; responsible relatives: father of children, has ruptured heart, is unable to work, is living with family; recipient's own budget, \$138.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$127.04; the home is filthy and the children are the same; parents do not know how to handle money.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the grant is too high and should be reduced at least \$27.00 per month.

#9 ADC. Woman, 29; three children: son, 9; daughter, 7; son, 1; date of first payment, 12/45; amount of first payment, \$75.00; February 1947 payment, \$102.00; total paid to date, \$1,271.00; assets of recipient, \$20.00; earnings, none; responsible relatives: father of children, deserted family, they are now divorced, allegedly living in Connecticut; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$98.00; H & W budget, \$74.91; the youngest child mentioned is illegitimate; she had this child since receiving ADC; she is now pregnant with another illegitimate child.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that present payment is justified on the basis of need, but that father should be located and made to support the two oldest children. Reviewer feels that some consideration should be given towards placing of this woman in a reformatory to stop the increase of illegitimate children which the state will have to support.

#10 ADC. Woman, 32; five children: son, 11; daughter, 7; daughter, 4; daughter, 2; son, 1; date of first payment, 3/43; amount of first payment, \$27.00; February 1947 payment, \$11.00; total paid to date, \$143.00; assets of recipient, none; amount of outside income, \$34.00 per month; responsible relatives: father of three oldest children is divorced from the mother, contributes \$8.00 per week towards the support of the three oldest children; recipient now living with a man to whom she is not married but who is the father of the youngest child, he provides the rent for the family; father of the next to the youngest child is unknown; the father who is contributing \$8.00 per week has a weekly wage of \$45.00; all children are filthy and are living in a filthy house; recipient's own budget, \$151.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$138.64.

Case was sufficiently investigated by the field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that the children should be taken by the State and that the father of the two oldest children be made to assume their full support.

#11 ADC. Woman, 35; three children: son, 15; daughter, 14; son, 2 months; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$109.00; February 1947 payment, \$109.00; total paid to date, \$436.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: this mother married twice; father of the oldest two children deserted her and contributes nothing towards the support of children, reported living in the vicinity of Portland; mother re-married and had no children by the second husband whom she divorced; youngest child is illegitimate; recipient's own budget, \$110.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$108.73.

Case was insufficiently investigated by the field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment in this amount is needed at this time, but that the father of the two oldest children should be located and made to assume their support.

#12 ADC. Woman, 29; three children: daughter, 11; son, 8; daughter, 6; date of first payment, 11/46; amount of first payment, \$73.00; February 1947 payment, \$126.00; total paid to date, \$427.00; assets of recipient, \$52.00; earns \$10.00 per month doing housework; responsible relatives: father, deserted family three years ago, no divorce, father is not contributing towards the support of the children; mother is having affairs with other men.

Case was insufficiently investigated by the field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced by at least \$30.00 per month.

#13 ADC. Woman, 44; three children: boy, 12; daughter, 10; son, 6; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$117.00; February 1947 payment, \$117.00; total paid to date, \$234.00; assets of recipient, none; earnings, none; responsible relatives: father of children, is irresponsible, has record of six arrests, is a heavy drinker and cannot hold a job; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$117.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$116.89.

Case was sufficiently investigated by the field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but steps should be taken to force father of children to contribute to their support.

#14 ADC. Woman, 28; two children: son, 6; son, 4; date of first payment, 3/46; amount of first payment, \$70.00; February 1947 payment, \$74.00; total paid to date, \$1,014; assets of recipient, none; weekly earnings of mother, \$4.00; responsible relatives: father of children committed bigamy in 1945, he has re-married and is living in Texas; grandmother, that is the mother of the children's mother, has liquid assets of \$3,000.00,

keeps house for a son, she was not interviewed by field worker; recipient's own budget, \$84.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$74.01.

Case was insufficiently investigated by the field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should be reduced by \$10.00 per month.

#15 ADC. Woman, 37; 3 children: all under 8 years; first payment, 2/46; amount, \$91.00; Feb. 1947 payment, \$113.00; total to date, \$1,227.00; assets, none; income, none; responsible relatives: these parents are divorced, husband does not pay court order of \$15.00 per week, is good worker but interested in another woman; paternal grandmother has property and knowledge of her son's whereabouts, she refuses to discuss the case; recipient's budget, \$105.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$132.00.

Case insufficiently investigated. In opinion of reviewer payment is justified but action should be taken against responsible relatives.

#16 ADC. Woman, 41; four children: son, 17; daughter, 14; daughter, 13; daughter, 12; date of first payment, 4/45; amount of first payment, \$122.00; February 1947 payment, \$91.00; total paid to date, \$2,341.00; assets of recipient, \$461.00; responsible relatives: husband, deserted family but living in State; two sons, now working, they contribute \$40.00 per month; recipient's own budget, \$120.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$91.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$60.00 per month, and that sons should contribute more to the support of the family and that the father be made to contribute.

#17 ADC. Woman, 33; four daughters: 15, 14, 11, 6; date of first payment, 11/46; amount of first payment, \$191.00; February 1947 payment, \$191.00; total paid to date, \$764.00; assets of recipient, \$100.00; responsible relatives: father, deserted children, whereabouts unknown; recipient's own budget, \$224.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$103.00; this woman is paying \$90.00 a month rent for three rooms; she is working and earning on an average of \$23.00 per week.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$100.00 a month.

#18 ADC. Man, 51; four children: daughter, 14; son, 12; daughter, 10; son, 8; date of first payment, 1/46; amount of first payment, \$63.00; February 1947 payment, \$131.00; total paid to date, \$912.00; assets, \$18.00; Federal pension, \$60.00 per month; responsible relatives: mother of children divorced from father, her address unknown; grandparents of chil-

IV

dren, old and unable to work; recipient's budget, \$148.00, H & W Dept. budget, \$131.00.

The case was sufficiently investigated by the field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the \$131.00 per month from the State and \$60.00 per month from the Federal Government is more than sufficient for the family needs and that the monthly payment should be reduced to \$90.00 per month.

#19 ADC. Woman, 38; four children: daughter, 15; daughter, 13; son, 12; daughter, 11; date of first payment, 3/45; amount of first payment, \$61.00; February 1947 payment, \$91.00; total paid to date, \$1,479.00; assets of recipient, \$203.00; receives \$72.00 per month as widow's pension from Government; responsible relatives other than mother: grandfather, assets unknown. weaver by trade; recipient's budget, \$154.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$91.00.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the children are not getting the benefit of the money expended and that the taking of the children by the State should be considered.

#20 ADC. Woman, 35; one child, 3; date of first payment, 3/45; amount of first payment, \$49.00; amount of February 1947 payment, \$56.00; total paid to date, \$1,099.00; assets of recipient, none; earnings, none; responsible relatives: husband, dead; grandmother, owns considerable property and has substantial income.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be stopped as woman is perfectly able to work and grandmother of the child is able to support them.

#21 ADC. Woman, 49; four children: daughter, 17; daughter, 15; daughter, 14; daughter, 12; date of first payment, 7/41; amount of first payment, \$70.00; February 1947 payment, \$99.00; total paid to date, \$3,143.00; assets of recipient, \$279.00; mother works, receives on an average of \$20.00 per week; oldest child contributes \$7.00 per week; recipient's own budget, \$164.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$100.65.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that since the income from outside sources to the family is \$138.00 per month, payments by the State should cease.

#22 ADC. Woman, 49; five children: son, 17; son, 16; daughter, 13; daughter, 9; daughter, 4; date of first payment, 8/39; amount of first payment, \$51.00; February 1947 payment, \$160.00; total paid to date, \$7,957.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: father of the children,

IV

is disabled and unable to work, he lives with the family; a nineteen year old son is in the Navy; a married daughter, 23 years old, has a good position with the Federal Government in Washington; recipient's own budget, \$232.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$178.00.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the money is needed but that the son and daughter should be made to contribute something to the support of the family.

#23 ADC. Woman, 45; two children: son, 14; son, 12; date of first payment, 4/46; amount of first payment, \$55.00; February 1947 payment, \$63.00; total paid to date, \$637.00; assets of recipients, \$230.00; mother had three children by a former marriage, the oldest of these three children is now working at a weekly wage of \$16.00, she is living in the home; mother re-married, has one child by second husband; husband of that child also is in the home; present husband employed by the Federal Government, weekly wage of \$45.00, making total income of the family \$61.00.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the family has sufficient income for their needs without assistance from the State. However, present husband is not legally responsible for the support of these two children by the first husband. Amount now being paid should at least be reduced.

#24 ADC. Woman, 24; three children: son, 3, daughter, 2; son, 2 months; date of first payment, 8/46; amount of first payment, \$100.00; February 1947 payment, \$120.00; total paid to date, \$782.00; assets of recipient, \$800.00; responsible relatives: husband of these children is habitually in jail and is now there awaiting Grand Jury action; recipient's own budget, \$93.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$121.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced at least \$10.00 per month.

#25 ADC. Woman, 34; four children: daughter, 10; daughter, 8; son, 6; son, 1; date of first payment, 7/45; amount of first payment, \$58.00; February 1947 payment, \$100.00; total paid to date, \$1,463.00; assets of recipient, \$37.00; receives \$37.00 per month survivors' insurance; responsible relatives: father of children dead; the municipality is paying grandmother of the children \$5.00 a week so that she may care for the children while the mother works, which the mother does not do; recipient's own budget, \$130.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$100.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced \$50.00 per month.

IV

#26 ADC. Woman, 38; four children: daughter, 15; son, 12; son, 8; daughter, 3; date of first payment, 11/41; amount of first payment, \$90.00; February 1947 payment, \$170.00; total paid to date, \$5,456.00; assets of recipient, \$1,505.00; now receiving \$10.00 per month from one son; responsible relatives: father of children dead; one single son now working for the State at a weekly wage of \$25.00; grandfather of children, apparently financially able to give some assistance but refuses to discuss case.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that son now working should substantially increase his contribution to the family's support and that payment by the State be reduced by \$40.00.

#27 ADC. Woman, 39; two children: daughter, 13; son, 10; date of first payment, 1/46; amount of first payment \$93.00; February 1947 payment, \$124.00; total paid to date, \$589.00; assets of recipient, \$2,000.00; earns \$9.00 weekly doing part-time housework; responsible relatives: father of children deceased; recipient's budget, \$134.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$124.00.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced \$50.00 per month.

#1 OAA. Woman, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$269.00; unable to work because of husband's sickness; responsible relatives: husband who has no assets and is unable to work; recipient's own budget, none supplied; H & W Dept. budget, \$75.43.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#2 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$7.60; unable to work because of illness; no responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$40.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$43.34.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$31.00; total paid to date, \$31.00; assets of recipient, \$600.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: five married daughters; recipient's own budget, \$31.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$31.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer

that recipient is in need of money, but that daughter should contribute towards her support.

#4 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$36.00; total paid to date, \$36.00; assets of recipient, \$10.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: three sons and one daughter, only one son interviewed by field worker; recipient's own budget, \$36.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$36.12.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that recipient is in need of this money but that children should be made to contribute towards her support.

#5 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives, none; recipient's own budget, \$55.00; H & W budget, \$51.27.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#6 OAA. Woman, 72; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: husband who is receiving \$40.00 per month old age pension; recipient's own budget, \$50.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$45.84.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#7 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, \$120.00; unable to work because of illness; responsible relatives: none; recipient's own budget, \$74.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$40.85.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#8 OAA. Woman, 77; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$1,410.00 which includes some real estate; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, married to a member of present State Legislature; assets, \$2,500.00; daughter, married to professional man, assets, \$4,500.00; son, professional man, assets, \$4,250.00; daughter, employed by Health & Welfare Dept., husband employed Federal Government, no children; none of these responsible relatives were contacted by field

IV

worker; when interviewed during the course of this study they expressed a willingness to support their mother.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is not justified.

#9 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets, none; recipient bedridden; responsible relatives: none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment is justified.

#10 OAA. Woman, 90; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: granddaughter, assets, \$1,950.00; was not interviewed by field worker.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment at present is justified but an attempt should be made to have the granddaughter contribute towards grandmother's support.

#11 OAA. Woman, 69; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; bedridden; responsible relatives, none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#12 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$37.00; total paid to date, \$111.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: son, no assets, earning \$40.00 per week, he was not interviewed by field worker.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is presently justified but an attempt should be made to have son contribute towards mother's support.

#13 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$37.00; total paid to date, \$37.00; assets, \$1,700.00; unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified in this case.

#14 OAA. Woman, 81; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; presently in a rest home; responsible relatives: none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified in this case.

IV

#15 OAA. Man, 68; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: daughter, no assets, unable to work.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#16 OAA. Man, 90; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$34.00; total paid to date, \$34.00; assets, \$690.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: none other than wife who receives State assistance of \$10.00 per month.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#17 OAA. Woman, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, \$550.00; unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#18 OAA. Woman, 70; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#19 OAA. Woman, 72; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: five children who were not contacted by social worker.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that the recipient is in need of this money, but that children should be made to support her.

#1 ADC. Woman, 51; one child: daughter, 17; date of first payment, 7/31; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$66.00; total paid to date, \$3,727.00; assets of recipient, \$510.00; earns \$40.00 to \$60.00 per month part-time work as practical nurse; responsible relatives: husband, deceased; one son twenty-nine years old, presently a college student; recipient's own budget, \$115.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$109.61.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is not justified.

#2 ADC. Woman, 31; five children: son, 15; daughter, 14; son, 13; son, 12; daughter, 9; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$157.00; February 1947 payment, \$157.00; total paid to date, \$489.00; assets, none; responsible relatives: father of children and mother divorced, he is not contributing to support of family; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$166.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$156.81.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment of this money is justified at the present time but that husband should be made to contribute towards family's support.

#3 ADC. Woman, 42; five children: daughter, 16; daughter, 13; daughter, 12; son, 7; son, 4 months; date of first payment, 10/41; amount of first payment, \$67.00; February 1947 payment, \$153.00; total paid to date, \$6,004.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; responsible relatives: father, deserted family in 1937, alleged to be living in New Hampshire; son, 21 years old, unable to work due to mental deficiency; recipient's budget, \$152.50; H & W Dept. budget, \$56.70.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the payment is justified at this time but that husband should be made to contribute to the family's support and that the advisability of taking the children from this mother should be considered.

#4 ADC. Woman, 32; five children: daughter, 12; son, 10; daughter, 8; daughter, 4; daughter, 2; date of first payment, 3/46; amount of first payment, \$78.00; February 1947 payment, \$78.00; total paid to date, \$1,028.00; assets of recipient, \$60.00; father of children presently in Federal Penitentiary; recipient's own budget, \$171.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$170.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time.

#5 ADC. Woman, 47; one daughter, 14; date of first payment, 4/45; amount of first payment, \$72.00; February 1947 payment, \$88.00; total

paid to date, \$1,836.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; mother able to do part-time work; responsible relatives: none except mother; husband deceased; recipient's budget, \$101.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$111.49.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified at this time.

#6 ADC. Woman, 38; five children: daughter, 19; son, 16; son, 15; daughter, 13; son, 8; date of first payment, 8/43; amount of first payment, \$81.00; February 1947 payment, \$182.00; total paid to date, \$5,450.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; receives \$24.00 a month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: husband, dead; oldest daughter works, earns \$19.00 per week; recipient's budget, \$206.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$183.44.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#7 ADC. Woman, 48; two children: daughter, 16; daughter, 15; date of first payment, 12/40; amount of first payment, \$57.00; February 1947 payment, \$103.00; total paid to date, \$5,793.00; assets of recipient, \$700.00; responsible relatives: none; recipient's own budget, \$125.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$131.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that present payment is justified.

#8 ADC. Woman, 41; seven children: son, 17; son, 16; daughter, 14; son, 10; daughter, 9; daughter, 6; daughter, 4; date of first payment, 1/46; amount of first payment, \$159.00; February 1947 payment, \$159.00; total paid to date, \$1,226.00; assets of recipient, none; earns \$20.00 per week; responsible relatives: husband serving a sentence in State Prison; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$179.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$179.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that there should be a reduction in this payment of \$20.00 per month.

#9 ADC. Woman, 37; three children: son, 18; son, 15; daughter, 14; date of first payment, 8/40; amount of first payment, \$50.00; February 1947 payment, \$138.00; total paid to date, \$5,838.00; assets of recipient, \$2,500.00; responsible relatives: none; husband dead; recipient's budget, \$138.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$109.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of \$29.00 per month is indicated.

#10 ADC. Woman, 36; five children: son, 14; daughter, 12; son, 10; daughter, 9; daughter, 7; daughter, 5; date of first payment, 4/42; amount of first payment, \$81.00; February 1947 payment, \$152.00; total paid to date, \$6,804.00; assets, none; responsible relatives: husband dead; has one son 16 years old who is not attending school.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#11 ADC. Woman, 41; seven children: oldest 15; date of first payment 7/43; amount of first payment, \$91.00; February 1947 payment, \$117.00; total paid to date, \$5,233.00; assets of recipient, none; outside income, none; responsible relatives: husband deserted family, whereabouts unknown.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#12 ADC. Woman, 36; three children: oldest 8; date of first payment, 10/42; amount of first payment, \$68.00; February 1947 payment, \$134.00; total paid to date, \$5,807.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: husband, permanently disabled, living with family.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is necessary.

#13 ADC. Woman, 46; two children: daughter, 15; daughter, 9; date of first payment, 11/39; amount of first payment, \$54.00; February 1947 payment, \$56.00; total paid to date, \$5,702.00; assets of recipient, \$780.00; receives \$45.00 per month for board and room from two oldest children; responsible relatives: father of the children deserted family in 1939, presently residing in same city but does not contribute towards support of the family; daughter and son working at small pay, contribute as noted; recipient's own budget, \$135.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$117.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that present payment is justified.

#14 ADC. Woman, 33; four children: oldest 12; date of first payment, 8/45; amount of first payment, \$92.00; February 1947 payment, \$156.00; total paid to date, \$2,258.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; outside income, \$8.00 per month doing outside work; responsible relatives: father of children deserted family in 1943, presently residing in same city but does not assist in support of the family; no other responsible relatives: recipient's own budget, \$134.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$156.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of \$21.00 per month is indicated.

#15 ADC. Woman, 44; one child, daughter 16; date of first payment, 4/40; amount of first payment, \$51.00; February 1947 payment, \$64.00; total paid to date, \$4,608.00; assets of recipient, none; receives \$45.00 per month board from two working daughters; responsible relatives: husband, divorced from wife, under court order to pay \$12.00 per week which he does not do, presently residing in near-by city; one daughter, single, earns \$35.00 per week; two other daughters, married, unable to contribute; recipient's own budget, \$146.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$64.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that daughters should assume the full support of their mother and sister.

#16 ADC. Woman, 35; three children: daughter, 16; daughter, 15; daughter, 9; date of first payment, 2/38; amount of first payment, \$56.00; February 1947 payment, \$136.00; total paid to date, \$11,032.00; assets of recipient, \$3,000.00; responsible relatives: husband, permanently disabled; one son, single, working full time; two other sons attending college.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that there should be a reduction of \$78.00 per month in this payment.

#17 ADC. Woman, 29; six children: oldest 12; date of first payment, 1/46; amount of first payment, \$112.00; February 1947 payment, \$198.00; total paid to date, \$2,416.00; assets of recipient, \$250.00; outside income, none; responsible relatives: husband, dead; no other relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that woman does not know how to manage this amount of money and that children are not getting the benefit. A reduction of \$75.00 a month is indicated.

#18 ADC. Woman, 33; father, 37; six children: oldest 14; date of first payment, 11/46; amount of first payment, \$187.00; February 1947 payment, \$187.00; total paid to date, \$760.00; assets of recipient, none; outside income, none; responsible relatives: father living at home with family, permanently disabled.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment is justified.

#19 ADC. Woman, 46; daughter, 17; date of first payment, 11/46; amount of first payment, \$77.00; February 1947 payment, \$77.00; total paid to date, \$308.00; assets of recipient, \$150.00; outside income, \$40.00 per month; responsible relatives: father and mother were divorced in 1930, father was ordered to pay \$5.00 per week for support of his child which he

has done regularly, father was interviewed during the course of this study, he stated that he had never been interviewed by field worker and that he had no knowledge that his daughter was receiving ADC, he gave a financial statement indicating his net worth to be \$13,000.00, \$9,000.00 of which is in liquid assets, he states that he is willing and able to pay any money necessary for his daughter's support.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that this payment should cease.

#20 ADC. Woman, 44; three children: daughter, 16; son, 14; daughter, 10; assets of recipient, none; no income from outside sources; responsible relatives: husband, dead; oldest son, 18, working and living with mother. 2/47 payment, \$140; total paid to date, \$4,298.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced to \$100.00 per month.

#21 ADC. Woman, 43; one son, 14; date of first payment, 1/38; amount of first payment, \$47.00; February 1947 payment, \$112.00; total paid to date, \$6,591.00; assets of recipient, \$1,100.00; outside income, none; responsible relatives: husband, dead; one son, 24; three daughters who are not living at home; children were not contacted by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that children should assume full support of this family.

#1 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$83.00; receives \$15.00 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: none; recipient's budget, \$89.80; H & W Dept. budget, \$89.17.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that present payment is justified.

#2 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; recipient's budget, \$44.00; H & W budget, \$49.21.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets, none; responsible rela-

V

tives: son, has a large family of his own; recipient's budget, \$62.50; H & W budget, \$54.42.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#4 OAA. Woman, 79; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$25.00; February 1947 payment, \$25; total paid to date, \$50.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, assets, \$1,800.00, invalid; recipient's own budget, \$43.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$25.29.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#5 OAA. Woman, 72; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$38.00; total paid to date, \$38.00; assets, none; unable to work.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#6 OAA. Woman, 73; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$32.00; total paid to date, \$64.00; assets of recipient, none; receives some assistance from daughter who is married, husband of daughter has no assets; responsible relatives: none other than daughter; recipient's budget, \$42.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$36.01.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#7 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$20.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$16.50; responsible relatives: none; recipient's own budget, \$65.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$67.35.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#8 OAA. Man, 87; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: wife, lives with him; recipient's budget for himself and wife, \$73.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$85.08.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#9 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; \$18.74 per month Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: wife, deceased;

daughter, lives in Washington, D. S., husband works for Federal Government; daughter, living in Maine; recipient's budget, \$67.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$76.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is needed at this time but that effort should be made to have daughters contribute toward father's support.

#10 OAA. Man, 77; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$26.00; total paid to date, \$52.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; unable to work; Social Security benefits of \$25.52 per month; responsible relatives: none; recipient's own budget, \$64.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$51.22.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#11 OAA. Woman, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$28.00; total paid to date, \$56.00; assets of recipient, \$175.00; unable to work; responsible relative: son, declined to give financial statement, earns \$45.00 per week, willing to help support mother; daughter, has home of her own, willing to help support mother; neither had been contacted by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that grant is not necessary and should cease.

#12 OAA. Man, 67; date of first payment, 12/45; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$457.00; assets of recipient, \$120.00; responsible relatives: none; has a brother who is financially able to take care of recipient.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that grant is necessary at the present time but effort should be made to solicit assistance from the brother.

#13 OAA. Man, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; gets an occasional day's work; responsible relatives: three sons, 1 daughter; sons are painters by trade, average weekly earnings of \$45.00, were not interviewed by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that grant should cease due to the ability of the children to assume support of parent.

#14 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 2/46; amount of first pay-

ment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$480.00; assets of recipient, none; outside income, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: wife who is living with recipient, no assets; two daughters who are unable to contribute.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#15 OAA. Woman, 56; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$36.00; total paid to date, \$36.00; assets of recipient, \$700.00; unable to work out; responsible relatives: husband, living with recipient but unable to work; two sons, gainfully employed, one son lives with recipient.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should cease.

#16 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; sources of outside income, none; physically unable to work; responsible relatives: wife who lives with recipient and is unable to do outside work.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#17 OAA. Woman, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$13.00; total paid to date, \$26.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; no outside income; unable to work; responsible relatives: two sons gainfully employed, recipient lives with one of them, one earns \$54.00 per week, other earns \$38.00 per week.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should cease.

#18 OAA. Man, 82; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$480.00; responsible relatives: none.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#19 OAA. Woman, 67; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$75.00; unable to work; responsible relatives; husband dead; one daughter and two sons; one son, married, has no children, earns \$49.00 to \$62.00 per week, has assets of \$4,400.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer

that payment is justified at this time but that children should be made to assume the full support of their mother.

#20 OAA. Woman, 71; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; responsible relatives: none.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#21 OAA. Woman, 68; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$26.00; total paid to date, \$52.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: four daughters, one of them single, earns \$30.00 per week, was not interviewed by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that responsible relatives should be made to assume full support in this case.

#22 OAA. Man, 72; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; earns approximately \$7.00 a month doing outside work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#23 OAA. Woman, 79; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$25.00; total paid to date, \$50.00; assets of recipient, \$21.00; responsible relatives: son with whom recipient lives, son is unmarried and earns a good weekly wage.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should cease in this case.

#24 OAA. Man, 88; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: two sons, one daughter; living with one son at present; children willing and able to care for father.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should cease.

#1 ADC. Woman, 39; four children: boy, 16; boy, 15; boy, 14; boy, 11; date of first payment, 11/45; amount of first payment, \$101.00; February 1947 payment, \$177.00; total paid to date, \$2,232.00; assets, \$2,900.00; mother and children in good physical condition; father of children deserted family in 1945, he was a welder by trade, present address unknown, no indication of attempt to locate father; H & W Dept. budget, \$146.00; mother's budget \$133.33; in November 1946 payment was increased from \$146.00 to \$177.00 without being requested by recipient; responsible relatives of children: father, address unknown; grandfather, total assets, \$4,800.00, has \$1,000.00 in cash, and owns home, has never been approached by a field worker.

Case not sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that there should be a substantial reduction in this payment in the amount of at least \$57.00. It is thought that some effort should be made to have the grandfather of the children contribute to their support and that because of the age of the children the mother could take some part-time employment. It is also felt that the two oldest children should earn some money.

#2 ADC. Woman, 39; disabled husband; six children: daughter, 16; daughter, 15; son, 14; son, 13; son, 12; son, 11; date of first payment, 8/39; amount of first payment, \$78.00; amount February 1947 payment, \$154.00; total paid to date, \$9,242.00; husband is a totally disabled war veteran now obtaining a government pension of \$60.00 per month; total assets, \$4,950.00; the woman states that her own budget for the family is \$138.00; she received \$8.00 a month for part-time work; the Dept. of H & W's budget is \$158.76.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment in this amount is not justified, and that the payment should be reduced to \$78.00 per month.

#3 ADC. Mother, 35; four children: son, 14; daughter, 12; daughter, 10; son, 8; deserted by husband; date of first payment, 4/46; amount of first payment, \$110.00; February 1947 payment, \$142.00; total paid to date, \$1,480.00; assets of mother, none; steady weekly employment at \$18.00 per week; her budget, \$124.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$142.00; no attempt made to locate father; mother not capable of handling money.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should be reduced to \$54.00 per month.

#4 ADC. Mother, 32; husband; eight children: ages, 14, 11, 9, 7, 4, 3,

2, and 6 mos.; father claims to be in ill health but does earn on an average of \$19.00 per week, no assets; budget of the mother is \$150.00; budget of the H & W Dept. is \$152.15; the home is filthy; children not obtaining benefit of the money. 2/47 payment \$152.00; total paid to date, \$608.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that at least \$50.00 a month be deducted from this payment.

#5 ADC. Grandmother, 65; caring for illegitimate grandson; date of first payment, 5/43; amount of first payment, \$24.00; February 1947 payment, \$24.00; total paid to date, \$1,128.00; assets of grandmother, none; not able to work out; the parents of this child deserted it in infancy and their present whereabouts are unknown; no other responsible relatives.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer is that this payment is justified.

#6 ADC. Mother, 62; two children: daughter, 16; daughter, 15; father dead; date of first payment, 4/42; amount of first payment, not noted; February 1947 payment, \$95.00; total paid to date, \$3,861.00; assets of mother, \$2,700.00; H & W budget, \$95.19; mother's budget, \$103.50; responsible relatives other than mother: daughter, single, no assets, weekly wages, \$15.00; daughter, single, no assets, weekly wages \$21.75.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of at least \$10.00 per month is indicated.

#7 ADC. Mother, 34; two children: son, 12; son, 3; husband, dead; no other living responsible relatives; date of first payment, 2/38; amount of first payment, \$18.00; February 1947 payment, \$89.00; total paid to date, \$3,160.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$88.90; mother's budget, \$90.50; she obtains the rent free from her brother.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payments should be reduced at least \$10.00 per month.

#8 ADC. Mother, 32; three children: daughter, 14; daughter, 8; daughter 5; husband, dead; no other living responsible relatives; date of first payment, 4/46; amount of first payment, \$45.00; February 1947 payment, \$85.00; total paid to date, \$745.00; assets of mother, \$200.00; works when possible in canning factory; H & W budget, \$84.52; mother's budget, \$87.00.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of at least \$10.00 per month is indicated.

#9 ADC. Mother, 31; four children: son, 14; son, 12; daughter, 11;

VI

son, 10; husband, deserted family; date of first payment, 8/42; amount of first payment, \$43.00; February 1947 payment, \$155.00; total paid to date, \$4,453.00; assets of mother, none; responsible relatives: grandfather of children, he states he was never interviewed by a field worker, assets, \$3,800.00; weekly earnings, \$25.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$155.03; mother's budget, \$175.00, which does not include rent as she receives rent free.

Case was sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that a reduction of at least \$40.00 per month is indicated.

#1 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, nothing; earning capacity, none; responsible relatives: son, unable to work, no assets; daughter, married, no assets.

Sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment in this case is justified.

#2 OAA. Woman, 77; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, \$250.00; unable to work; no responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 OAA. Woman, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$34.00; amount of February 1947 payment, \$34.00; total paid to date, \$68.00; assets, \$2,380.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, married, husband has \$550.00 monthly income; son has \$44.00 weekly income.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that responsible relatives are able to support recipient.

#4 OAA. Man, 66; first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets, \$55.00; able to work; no responsible relatives; recipient states he can get by on \$36.00 per month.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that full payment not justified and that a reduction of at least \$8.00 per month is indicated.

#5 OAA. Man, 73; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$37.00; amount of February 1947 payment, \$37.00; total paid to date, \$37.00; assets, none; earning capacity, none; responsible relatives:

daughter, assets, \$1,940.00, did not know father was receiving OAA; daughter, assets, \$600.00, did not know father was receiving OAA; recipient living with woman not his wife.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is not justified and that responsible relatives are able to support the recipient.

#6 OAA. Woman, 69; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$25.00; amount of February 1947 payment, \$25.00; total paid to date, \$25.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: son, assets, none, shiftless and lazy; daughter, assets, none, is supporting an illegitimate child; recipient living in filth and cold.

Sufficient investigation by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that son should be made to contribute.

#7 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$35.00; amount of February 1947 payment, \$35.00; total paid to date, \$35.00; assets, \$969.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#8 OAA. Man, 76; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$32.00; February 1947 payment, \$32.00; total paid to date, \$32.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#9 OAA. Woman, 82; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$18.00; amount of February 1947 payment, \$18.00; total paid to date, \$54.00; assets, \$2,190.00; income, rent \$8.00 per month; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, husband a First Selectman of town, assets, \$6,800.00, states that she is willing to assume full support of recipient.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is not justified and should be discontinued.

#10 OAA. Woman, 88; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, \$2,800.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#11 OAA. Woman, 69; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first

payment, \$24.00; February 1947 payment, \$24.00; total paid to date, \$48.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, married, no assets, earns \$19.00 per week; daughter, married, no assets, earns \$24.00 per week; daughter, married, earns \$20.00 per week, her husband earns \$26.00 per week, they have \$2,000.00 in the bank, own a home, have no debts, and have thirty-nine \$18.75 war bonds.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment is not justified, that it should be reduced at least \$15.00 per month and that responsible relatives be made to contribute towards support.

#12 OAA. Woman, 73; date of first payment, 2/40; amount of first payment, \$18.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$722.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: son, assets, none, weekly earnings, \$26.00; son, assets, unknown, earnings, unknown; first son states he has not been interviewed by a field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified but that son should be made to contribute to mother's support.

#13 OAA. Man, 73; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: none.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#14 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 12/46; amount of first payment, \$34.00; February 1947 payment, \$34.00; total paid to date, \$102.00; assets, \$1,155.00; unable to work out since she is caring for her husband who is blind and who receives assistance of \$34.00 per month from the State for that reason; responsible relatives: none.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment is justified.

#15 OAA. Man, 67; date of first payment, 2/46; amount of first payment, \$5.00; February 1947 payment, \$10.00; total paid to date, \$45.00; assets, none; able to work and earns \$800.00 per year; responsible relatives: son, earns \$35.00 per week; daughter, married, no assets, and no income of her own.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the money is not needed and that payment is not justified.

VI

#16 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets, \$500.00; cripple, unable to work; responsible relatives: son, no assets, working part time and caring for mother.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at present but that son should eventually assume full support of his mother.

#17 OAA. Woman, 70; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$25.00; February 1947 payment, \$25.00; total paid to date, \$50.00; assets, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: daughter, assets, none; weekly earnings, \$30.00; son, assets, \$1,100.00, unemployed due to illness.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that son and daughter should assume full support of their mother.

#18 OAA. Man, 69; date of first payment, 8/25/46; amount of first payment, \$26.00; February 1947 payment, \$26.00; total paid to date, \$390.00; assets, \$4,100.00; receives \$29.50 per month Social Security; responsible relatives: none; wife of same age is being supported from this income.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment of this money is justified.

VII

#1 ADC. Woman, 40; three children: son, 16; son, 12; daughter, 11; date of first payment, 11/36; amount of first payment, \$45.00; February 1947 payment, \$128.00; total paid to date, \$7,281.00; assets of recipient, \$150.00; responsible relatives: father, deserted family; recipient's own budget, \$128.00; H. & W Dept. budget, \$155.61.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced at least \$35.00 per month and that father be located and made to contribute towards the children's support.

#2 ADC. Woman, 38; twelve children: eight going to school, four below school age; date of first payment, 10/41; amount of first payment, \$65.00; February 1947 payment, \$125.00; total paid to date, \$7,281.00; assets of recipient, none; outside earnings by children approximately \$75.00 per month; outside earnings by father approximately \$50.00 per month; responsible relatives: father of children, lives at home but is physically unable to work steadily; no other responsible relatives.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#3 ADC. Woman, 40; four children: son, 18; son, 16; son, 15; son, 12; date of first payment, 4/38; amount of first payment, \$45.00; February 1947 payment, \$113.00; total paid to date, \$6,943.00; assets of recipient, \$1,425.00; \$45.83 monthly income from children's earnings; responsible relatives: father of children; deceased; no other responsible relatives; recipient's own budget, \$113.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$173.65.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that monthly payments should be reduced by \$50.00.

#4 ADC. Woman, 51; two children: daughter, 14; daughter, 11; date of first payment, 9/41; amount of first payment, \$30.85; February 1947 payment, \$140.00; total paid to date, \$5,170.00; assets, \$5,402.00; responsible relatives: father of children, deceased; son, 24, assets, \$1,150.00; has not been interviewed by field worker; recipient's own budget, \$140.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$146.83.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment should be reduced at least \$25.00 per month.

#5 ADC. Woman, 49; five children: son, 19; son, 17; daughter, 15; daughter, 9; date of first payment, 7/40; amount of first payment, \$58.00; February 1947 payment, \$92.00; total paid to date, \$5,370.00; assets of recipient, \$5,000.00; also receiving \$78.00 Federal benefits; oldest son receiving \$29.47 monthly that is State Aid for Crippled Children, he being

VII

a cripple; responsible relatives: father of children, deceased; son, 21 years old, lives with mother, earns about \$34.00 per week; recipient's own budget, did not furnish information; H & W Dept. budget, \$151.85.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that this payment should be reduced by at least \$40.00 per month.

#6 ADC. Woman, 33; eleven children below the age of fifteen; another expected shortly; date of first payment, 5/41; amount of first payment, \$86.00; February 1947 payment, \$164.00; total paid to date, \$8,168.00; assets of recipient, \$1,100.00; responsible relatives: father of the children, living at home, has lost one leg and one arm and cannot work; recipient's own budget, \$164.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$163.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the money is needed at this time.

#7 ADC. Woman, 41; seven children: son, 17; son, 16; son, 15; son, 14; son, 12; son, 11; son, 9; date of first payment, 8/41; amount of first payment, \$84.00; February 1947 payment, \$145.00; total paid to date, \$6,834.00; assets of recipient, \$1,150.00; responsible relatives: father of children, deceased; son, 20, unable to work, lives at home; recipient's budget, \$145.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$144.00.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time.

#1 OAA. Man, 70; date of first payment, 2/42; amount of first payment, \$22.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$476.00; assets of recipient, \$300.00; unable to work; no outside earnings; responsible relatives: two sons and two daughters, one son, Captain in the Army, none of the children were contacted by field worker; recipient's own budget, \$55.00; H & W Dept. budget, \$75.00.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that responsible relatives should be contacted and made to assume full support of their father.

#2 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$30.00; total paid to date, \$60.00; assets of recipient, none; outside income, none; responsible relatives: has four sons and three daughters.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that recipient needs this money but steps should be taken to have the children assume the full support of their father.

VII

#3 OAA. Woman, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$29.00; total paid to date, \$58.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: this recipient is the wife of the man in the above case, same responsible relatives.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that recipient needs this money but steps should be taken to have the children assume full support of their mother.

#4 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; responsible relatives: three sons.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that sons should be forced to assume the full support of the parent.

#5 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$27.00; total paid to date, \$54.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: five sons, four of whom were not contacted by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that children should be made to assume the full support of their parent.

#6 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$29.00; total paid to date, \$58.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: this woman is the wife of the recipient in the last mentioned case, same responsible relatives.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that children should be forced to assume full support of their mother.

#7 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 2/47; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; outside earnings, none; responsible relatives: six sons.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that sons should be forced to assume full support of their father.

#8 OAA. Man, 65; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: three sons living outside of the United States.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#9 OAA. Woman, 70; date of first payment, 2/47; total paid to date, \$25.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives: husband, unable to work, has son and daughter who were not contacted by field worker.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that children should be forced to assume full support of their mother.

#10 OAA. Woman, 71; date of first payment, 5/38; amount of first payment, \$22.00; February 1947 payment, \$22.00; total paid to date, \$1,190.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: three sons, two daughters; one daughter has assets of several thousand, \$1,000.00 of which is cash in the bank; one daughter has assets of \$3,800.00 jointly with her husband; one son is a painter by trade.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment at this time is justified but that children should be forced to assume full support of their mother.

#11 OAA. Man, 70; date of first payment, 3/38; amount of first payment, \$25.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$2,307.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#12 OAA. Woman, 87; date of first payment, 1/40; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of the reviewer that payment is justified.

#13 OAA. Woman, 67; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: husband, unable to work; six sons, none of whom were contacted by field worker; this woman is the wife of the recipient in case No. 24.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that sons should be made to assume full support of their mother.

#14 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 11/39; amount of first payment, \$15.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$1,729.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: one son, two daughters who

were not interviewed by field worker; son has assets of \$1,800.00, earnings, \$45.75 per week; both daughters are working.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that children should be forced to support their father.

#15 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 2/47; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets, none; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#16 OAA. Woman, 70; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$24.00; total paid to date, \$24.00; responsible relatives: husband who is unable to work and is an OAA recipient; daughter, has assets of \$3,000.00, is caring for parent in her home, states she has joint bank account of \$400.00 with recipient; daughter, working out and also has a roomer in home; has three other daughters.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the five daughters should assume full support of their mother.

#17 OAA. Man, 74; date of first payment, 1/42; amount of first payment, \$11.00; February 1947 payment, \$23.00; total paid to date, \$373.00; assets of recipient, \$400.00; responsible relatives: five daughters; this recipient is the husband of recipient in the preceding case.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the five daughters should assume full support of their father.

#18 OAA. Man, 69; date of first payment, 2/47; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; unable to work; responsible relatives, none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that the payment is justified.

#19 OAA. Woman, 65; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first payment, \$22.00; total paid to date, \$22.00; assets of recipient, \$500.00; receives \$19.95 Social Security benefits; responsible relatives: two sons and three daughters; one son earning \$58.00 per week.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified but that children should be forced to support their mother.

#20 OAA. Woman, 70; date of first payment, 2/47; amount of first

payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$40.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: five sons and three daughters.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that children should be made to support their mother.

#21 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$30.00; total paid to date, \$60.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: none.

Case sufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified.

#22 OAA. Man, 67; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, none; responsible relatives: two daughters living in New Hampshire; one son living in Maine.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at present but that children should be forced to contribute towards mother's support.

#23 OAA. Man, 71; date of first payment, 8/39; amount of first payment, \$21.00; February 1947 payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$1,193.00; assets of recipient, \$700.00; responsible relatives: six sons.

Case insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment at the present time is justified but that the six sons should be made to assume full support of their father.

#24 OAA. Man, 66; date of first payment, 1/47; amount of first payment, \$40.00; total paid to date, \$80.00; assets of recipient, \$200.00; unable to work; responsible relatives: six sons none of whom were contacted by field worker.

Case was insufficiently investigated by field worker. Opinion of reviewer that payment is justified at this time but that sons should be forced to assume full support of their father.

An interviewer's notes of a round table discussion had with a district supervisor and four field workers.

#1 Heavy Case Load. Worker states the case load is entirely too heavy. This fact is attributed to the rapid turnover of personnel, an insufficient number of field workers to begin with, failure to supply temporary workers when regular workers are ill or on an extended leave of absence. Worker feels Front Office fails to replace experienced workers and to fill up the holes in present staff, that case load is distributed unfairly—that rural workers invariably have more cases than city workers, and are forced to operate under additional handicaps such as distant visits, poor roads, etc. Also feels that ADC and WWA cases offer greater difficulty than OAA and AB cases and should be given to more experienced workers. Department has failed to take advantage of securing part-time services of experienced workers when available and the reason is not understood as the Child Welfare Branch encourages part-time work.

#2 Trends Which Are Viewed With Alarm. The rules and regulations coupled with verbal admonitions of correct social procedure in district meetings, are becoming too complex to be understandable. In addition there is an increasing demand on the worker's time for routine reports, inter-office correspondence, requests for information from individual workers, etc., which could easily be obliterated by intelligent staff work in Augusta. The Manual which is already voluminous is constantly being revised and enlarged and requires too much of the field worker's time in keeping abreast of developments. Since decentralization of field system workers have been harassed by directives from the Augusta Office, issued by top officers with no knowledge of the facts on the complaint of the discontented recipient or applicant. More often than not this results in re-visiting cases which have been checked within the month. This uses valuable time and effort and always serves to annoy the already hard pressed worker. While the individual item above may seem petty the manifestations are becoming progressively worse and are having a debilitating effect on worker's morale.

#3. Restricted Payment Theory. This theory takes all control or effective direction of funds out of the worker's hands. It is considered to be especially dangerous in the field of special allowances. On reflection the lack of control over ordinary budget items is just as bad. Thus, when a worker knows that grants are being misappropriated and badly used by recipients they are generally helpless, short of initiating action to have

children in ADC cases committed to the State. The field workers are convinced that this problem can be solved only on the Federal level since it is a Federal policy. It is thought that a tough, competent, administrator in Augusta could and should take this matter up with the Federal authorities. In years gone by the workers exercised much more control and with good effect, and there was never any trouble with the Federal Government. The worker believes that the department is going way beyond the Federal Law in this belief and would like to see a test made as to whether the various Federal pronunciamientos on this point have the force of law, and if so whether they would be upheld.

#4. Difficulties With Legal Aspects. Workers convinced that with present Headquarters personnel all the legal staff and legislation in the world would not help matters much. The present theory is that the workers are not prosecutors and consequently any recommendation that legal action be taken due to this or that is actively discouraged as poor social practice. As a matter of fact, no such recommendations are ever made as a result of this attitude, and the newer workers just never dare consider such a step. Assuming a change in the Front Office all feel that determined legal action should be taken against responsible relatives to obtain help for applicants and recipients (note present departmental interpretation that law precludes such action against relatives of applicants). Workers decry the obvious frauds perpetrated by death bed transfers of homes by OAA recipients and all deplore the failure of present legal department to set aside such transfers. Department takes attitude that it is water over the dam. Believe that establishment and enforcing of State lien on all property of recipients both real and personal would discourage a lot of fraudulent applications. Another source of irritation, rather dismal, is the apathetic attitude towards ADC husbands and the utter failure of the department to enforce existing court orders. They have been told that it is a strictly municipal problem and know of no way to get action if municipal authorities refuse or neglect to take action. Workers have the belief that they would be criticized for going beyond their duties as social workers if they were to urge action by municipal authorities. Workers also cite difficulties of mothers in paying for necessary legal help to prosecute contempt cases.

#5. Checking of Applicant's Financial Status. All agree that the present administration is actively discouraging checking of bank accounts, property transfers, etc. They believe that while routine checking may not be necessary, it definitely should be done in every case in which the ap-

III

plicant's financial status is not a matter of personal knowledge to the worker. All are convinced that the department's theory that a skillful interview will eliminate the need of such checking is too foolish to merit further discussion. The worker states that even if a check shows an applicant to be ineligible, the worker feels the department is vaguely aware that there are clients but it is not aware that there are people paying the bills and that the worker knows of no effort on the part of the department to collect from a fraudulent recipient, and further adds that 25 to 30 per cent of applications turned down are made with the applicants being aware that they are not eligible but doing it on a chance.

#6. Standard Manual Budget Allowances. Workers were convinced that food allowances were not excessive in that they do not provide more than is needed to feed a child decently. Workers were unable to state, however, that they saw any logic in giving relief to the extent that the person getting it was enjoying a higher standard of living than the person paying for it. The workers realize that in almost every case of ADC the recipient's standard is enormously bettered by the grant. This problem is an acute worry to these particular workers. They realize that at heart the proposition is illogical in many aspects yet they feel that the food budget should not be cut since it does represent a fairly low standard of living. Clothing they admit could be sliced considerably. They believe that much more supervision of spending ADC funds should be allowed and made possible and that much educational work should be undertaken among ADC mothers to enable them to make the most of what they get. The workers are aware that it is this single feature which is coming in for extremely close scrutiny and they are unable to reconcile the fact that people on relief are getting by better than the people who work for a living and help contribute towards the relief. The workers state without reservation that the present ADC setup is undermining the integrity of the people receiving help. They believe that the ADC budgets are so large that they actually discourage people from trying to get off relief by working when they can. It is also found by the workers to be fairly common that recipients who scorn town and city aid consider themselves socially superior when they receive ADC as compared to neighbors receiving direct relief from their communities, in other words, certain classes will accept State Aid whereas they frown on direct relief.

#7. New OAA Application Form. Workers state this form contains little or no information concerning the applicant and complicates worker's job by making it necessary to do extra checking to establish settlements,

citizenship, age, etc. Also elimination of pertinent statutory provisions and lack of necessity to give a thorough statement of assets and certify that the same is true opens the door to fraud. Believe form should be detailed similar to old form previously used.

#8. Workers feel someone should be authorized to order individual medical examination whenever collusion is suspected in cases of inability to work.

#9. **Difficulty With Committal Cases Is Cited.** Worker agrees that Child Welfare Department is useless due to policy in their Front Office against committing children and their only approach is through municipal authorities which is frowned upon by the department.

#10. All workers note the disparity in salaries of field workers and administrative staff. They believe that since worker has almost the entire responsibility of disposing of money they should be paid enough to insure an adequate staff. They feel that present standards are too low to do this and the only reason the big majority of competent workers remain with the job is because they are dedicated to their work. District supervisors cannot check more than one-third of active cases per year and influx of new cases make it a foregone conclusion that certain cases on which money is constantly being paid will never come up for administrative review.

#11. Apparently at variance with the foregoing is the fact that workers are given very little discretion in the conduct of their cases on paper. Actually, as a result of the attitude and the unwritten law of the department, they have virtually none. Despite this the older workers who were taught that common sense is an important factor in their work continue to apply it. Their case reports never report these deviations from department forms, however, for obvious reasons.

#12. Workers indicate that policy is literally crammed down their throats. Although they ostensibly have a hand in its formation, that is not so. One worker stated, "You have to have intelligence to get the job, but woe betide you if you ever use it afterwards."

#13. Cost of administration is increased by unnecessary close checking of local office expenditures as evidenced by considerable travel on the part of Augusta officials to supervise minor purchases of office necessities.

#14. Workers believe that many Front Office jobs are unnecessary and are too highly paid in comparison with the personnel in the field.

#15. Workers feel that salary increases and promotion to more responsible jobs, as well as educational opportunities, are given unfairly and in a manner inconsistent with avowed departmental policy. In some instances workers have been discouraged from taking certain advanced courses in social work because the department heads felt the courses were no good and still State money is being spent to provide such courses.

#16. Department is suffering from female psychology. Female workers and administrators outnumber males approximately four to one ratio and the ratio is even higher among the top jobs and it is a matter of record that only one male has been promoted to a senior welfare worker in the past six years in the department.

#17. It is felt lack of progress among the male workers is due to the fact that they openly criticize particular department policies, although their written reports show no violations of policy in the field work. It is thought male investigators more openly fight grants which they do not believe justifiable on available information they are able to procure. One worker indicated it was better to go along with the pack rather than get into trouble.

#18. Some workers feel discouraged as the only possibility of qualifying for a higher job is to swallow the whole philosophy of present administration.

#19. Workers criticized educational program in that the \$1,000.00 grant to take the nine month schooling puts it out of the question for married men, or women with dependents, and that a much more reasonable program could be instituted in the Maine colleges at night or in spare time to give all workers benefit of further training in welfare work.

#20. Workers bemoan the lack of effective legal action in dealing with recalcitrant responsible relatives particularly ex-husbands in ADC cases who are often under court order to support. This is coupled with a strong department policy against checking relatives over the objection of the applicant or recipient. It is the departmental interpretation of the law that no legal action can be taken, suggested, or advised, by department workers unless applicant is granted relief. This forestalls many golden opportunities to obliterate relief in the first place. With regard to ex-husbands, workers are told it is strictly a municipal problem and that failing action by municipal authorities there is nothing they can do about it. Workers very much oppose the departments discouraging routine check-

ing of bank accounts, real estate transactions, etc. Workers have very little faith in department's belief that they have sufficient skill in questioning to disclose deceitful applicants without using such means. Policy also forbids workers to check on responsible relatives when applicant requests them not to do so or more particularly when applicant will not give consent to their doing so. Workers state that as a matter of policy it is now virtually necessary to take applicant's word for financial status of self and responsible relatives and although not all of this policy is in printed textbook, it is hammered home at district meetings and they have been given to understand that workers are not "checkers."

#21. Workers also expressed dissatisfaction with frequent changes in policy contained in amendments to the Manual. This Manual which is the workers Bible is constantly being revised with entire sheets being reprinted to make a change of one word. Since the workers have to be thoroughly familiar with new changes, immediately upon arrival of same, they have to spend valuable time finding out what changes have been made, only to find in many cases that the change is entirely insignificant. As a result of this type of thing, plus too much correspondence with the Front Office, plus inadequate staff to begin with, workers do not have time to devote to constructive social work and that enlargement of the staff is prejudiced by negative attitude of field supervisors who pass on applicants when new workers are employed in the field. There is a deliberate effort to take away the new workers individual thought and outlook at the outset. Workers also feel discouraged by long hours and conscientious effort in getting their own cases under control. There is a reaction as they are usually assigned to help out in other areas and in many instances their cases in their own territories get out of control and this necessitates redoubled effort on their part to get their territory back into shape. Workers state that with few exceptions the case load per worker will run from well over two hundred cases to in some instances beyond three hundred, and that it is not possible for any worker to do justice where the case load is more than forty ADC or World War Relief Cases.

#22. Workers severely criticize monthly district meetings as a waste of their time and taxpayers' money. The meetings rather than being a sounding board for them where they can present practical field problems and get constructive advice, invariably turn into a series of canned ideological harangues and that rather than being given a hearing when they take exception to policy, they literally catch H— and ruin any chances of advancement they might have had by questioning policy. The workers feel

after such meetings they suffer great drops in morale and would far rather be spending their time in the field where they are needed.

#23. Workers of considerable experience feel somewhat disturbed when upon denying a case it is turned over to a new worker in the department only to have the grant accepted, it being the thought that denial was over-ridden by the unwritten law of the department and had been granted by a worker who had been exposed only to the present regime's philosophy. Experience does not play an important part where the regulations and standards must be adhered to so closely.

#24. Workers indicate they would welcome authority permitting them to use knowledge gleaned through years of experience plus the educational training they have received since starting with the department.

INTERVIEW OF RECIPIENT.

1. Names and ages of recipients :
2. Number children over 16 not attending school
3. Amount of original payment present payment
4. Renting alone with others, if so
with whom
5. Recipient's present living costs, monthly basis :
 - Rent
 - Food
 - Fuel
 - Clothing
 - Medical
 - Misc.
 - Total
6. Amount of outside income
7. Sources
.....
8. Assets :
 - Cash on hand and in banks
 - Money due from others
 - U. S. Bonds and other securities
 - Real estate, description
 -
 - Household furniture
 - Automobile
 - Cash value insurance
 - Total assets:
9. Liabilities :
 - Accounts payable
 - Notes payable
 - what for
 - Real estate mortgage
 - Total liabilities
10. Net Worth
11. Statement by recipient as to why State Assistance was sought :

12. In seeking State Assistance recipient acted on whose advice:
13. Statement of recipient as to what arrangements would have been made if State Assistance had not been furnished:
14. Husband or wifedivorced
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Father
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Mother
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Grandparent
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Child
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Child
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Child
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Grandchild
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
 Grandchild
 Addressoccupation
 Weekly earningsnet worth
15. Are you now willing to pay back to the State the money which it expended in your behalf?
16. I certify that the statements on this and the preceding two pages are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

OLD AGE ASSISTANCE—AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN

- Case
- Interview with relative:
- Name relationship
- Address
1. Do you know that your
(is receiving) (did receive) financial assistance from State?
 2. What arrangements would you have made towards support
if money from the State had not been available?
.....
 3. In the event that money from the State is not available what arrange-
ments can you now make for support?
.....
 4. Present occupation
 5. Weekly earnings
 6. Are you willing to furnish a financial statement?
 7. Assets:
 - Cash on hand and in banks
 - Money due from others
 - U. S. Bonds and other securities
 - Real estate, description
 -
 - Household furniture
 - Automobile
 - Cash value insurance
 - Total assets
 8. Liabilities:
 - Accounts payable
 - Notes payable
 - what for
 - Real estate mortgage
 - Total liabilities

9. Net worth
10. Are you willing to pay back to the State the money which it expended in behalf of your?
11. Are you willing to assume the support of your now?
12. Has anyone from the State talked with you before regarding your care?

I certify that the statements on this and the preceding page are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

.....

Interview with municipal officer:

Name Office

Town or city

1. Do you know that State Aid is being was furnished to
.....
2. To what extent was the case discussed with you by a representative
of the Health and Welfare Department?
.....
.....
3. In your opinion was the original expenditure justified?
.....
.....
4. Do you know of any reason why the benefits should be discontinued
or reduced?
.....
.....
5. Can you give any information concerning responsible relatives?
.....
.....
6. In your opinion is any part of the money which has been expended by
the State in this case collectible?
.....
.....