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PUBLIC AID TO MOTHERS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

THE ADOPTION OF AN IDEA

The Conference on the Care of Dependent Children—commonly referred to as the White House conference—called by President Roosevelt in 1909, was responsible in large measure for focusing attention on the desirability of conserving the child's own home. In the words of the conclusions of this conference:

Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. It is the great molding force of mind and of character. Children should not be deprived of it except for urgent and compelling reasons. Children of parents of worthy character, suffering from temporary misfortune, and children of reasonably efficient and deserving mothers who are without the support of the normal breadwinner, should, as a rule, be kept with their parents, such aid being given as may be necessary to maintain suitable homes for the rearing of the children.

The first legislative provisions for public aid in their own homes to children deprived of the support of the natural breadwinner were made almost simultaneously by Missouri and Illinois. The Missouri law was promoted by a fraternal organization, and the Illinois law was proposed by Judge Merritt W. Pinckney as a result of his experience in the Chicago juvenile court. After these beginnings the idea spread rapidly, fostered by the Mothers’ Congress and other organizations of women, by juvenile courts, and by child-welfare agencies. So far as legislation is concerned, the principle of “home care of dependent children” has met with more ready response than any other child-welfare measure that has ever been proposed.

The recognition of public responsibility and the ideal that has dominated the movement for providing public aid of a character better fitted to make home life possible for children than the poor relief commonly administered are shown in the following excerpts, the first from the report of the New York State Commission on Relief for Widowed Mothers, and the second from a circular issued by the Pennsylvania State Board of Education when this board was the supervisory agency for mothers' aid:

The normal development of childhood is one of the main functions of government. The best education requires a proper home training, and it thereby becomes the duty of the State to conserve the home as its most valuable asset whenever factors other than the improper guardianship of the parents threaten its destruction.

The [mothers' assistance] law has two reasons for its existence—a humanitarian and an economic one. There are in our communities a large number

---

of women with dependent children who can not maintain their homes without assistance. We have come to believe that as a principle of justice no home should be broken up for poverty alone. * * * Experience has shown that private resources are not adequate, especially in cases of long-continued dependency. The State therefore came to feel responsible for the support of this group. * * * It is actually cheaper in dollars and cents to maintain children in their own homes than to support them in institutions, and "home-made" children, cared for by their own mothers, have the best chance of becoming healthy, normal citizens.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{3}Report of the New York State Commission on Relief for Widowed Mothers, p. 1 (Albany, 1914); circular on Mothers' Assistance Fund issued by Pennsylvania State Board of Education, p. 3 (Harrisburg, 1913).

Provided by the Maternal and Child Health Library, Georgetown University
BEGINNINGS OF THE MOTHERS' AID MOVEMENT

Before mothers' aid laws were enacted a number of States and localities had recognized the wisdom of the principle of such aid and had applied it in a limited way. As early as 1906 the juvenile courts of some counties of California granted county aid to children in their own homes; in 1911 the State began to reimburse counties for such aid given to half orphans. An Oklahoma law of 1908 provided for "school scholarships" to be paid by counties upon recommendation of the school authorities to children whose widowed mothers needed their earnings. A Michigan law of 1911 also authorized payment from school funds to enable children of indigent parents to attend school. Through a resolution by the county board of Milwaukee County, Wis., in 1912, aid to mothers for the care of children in their homes was given through the juvenile court. In New Jersey some aid to dependent children in their homes had been granted from county funds prior to the enactment of a special law in 1913.

The first definite legal provision of aid to mothers of dependent children was passed by the Missouri Legislature in 1911. At first this provision applied only to Jackson County (in which Kansas City is located), but later in the same year it was extended to the city of St. Louis. The first state-wide mothers' aid law was enacted in Illinois in 1911. Colorado adopted by popular vote the "mothers' compensation act," submitted at the election of 1912. During 1913 18 States enacted mothers' aid laws.

The experimental character of much of this early legislation, due largely to the haste with which the idea was adopted, is seen in the revisions and numerous amendments found necessary as the laws were put into operation. The first Illinois act was completely revised in 1913; in five States the laws passed in 1913 were completely revised and in eight others the laws passed at this time were amended in 1915. Other changes in these laws have been made in subsequent legislation, but the majority of the later amendments have been for the purpose of improving the administration of existing laws, of making their application more inclusive, and of increasing the amount of the grant or of the total appropriation available for carrying out their provisions.
Laws authorizing assistance from public funds for dependent children in their own homes had been adopted by 42 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii by January 1, 1928. The following States have such laws, variously termed "mothers' pensions," "mothers' allowances," "mothers' assistance fund," "widows' compensation," "aid for dependent children," "aid to mothers of dependent children," and (in New Jersey) "an act to promote home life for dependent children":

- Arizona
- Arkansas
- California
- Colorado
- Connecticut
- Delaware
- Florida
- Idaho
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Iowa
- Kansas
- Louisiana
- Maine
- Maryland
- Massachusetts
- Michigan
- Minnesota
- Missouri
- Montana
- Nebraska
- Nevada
- New Hampshire
- New Jersey
- New York
- North Carolina
- North Dakota
- Ohio
- Oklahoma
- Oregon
- Pennsylvania
- Rhode Island
- South Dakota
- Tennessee
- Texas
- Utah
- Vermont
- Virginia
- Washington
- West Virginia
- Wisconsin
- Wyoming

Not all these States, however, have carried into actual practice the theory of their mothers' aid laws. The principle of home care for dependent children is generally accepted in this country, but the 17 years' experiment in providing such care has by no means demonstrated that the need has been met. In Maryland (except for two counties) the mothers' aid legislation has become inoperative because of a defect in the tax clause, and in several other States practically no use has been made of the legal provision. In many States excellent work has been done in certain localities, whereas in other localities of the same State the provision has been ignored or made inoperative through lack of adequate appropriations.
STANDARDS FOR MOTHERS' AID LEGISLATION

Although mothers' aid legislation must be drawn with due consideration of the conditions existing in each State or other division of government, and especially with regard to laws on related subjects, certain fundamental standards must be observed if such laws are to be effective child-welfare measures. These standards may be summarized as follows:

1. Application broad enough to permit aid whenever by such means a suitable home may be maintained.
2. Age limitation to conform to education and child-labor laws.
3. Amount of aid to be based on the needs of each individual family, with due regard to other available resources.
4. Inquiry in each case to determine the home conditions and the assistance needed for the proper care of the children.
5. Continued oversight in order that the welfare of the children may be protected and the aid adjusted to meet changing conditions.
6. Provision of safeguards necessary to protect the public treasury against fraudulent or unwarranted claims and against burdens that should be borne by other communities or by individuals legally responsible and able to furnish support.
7. Administration lodged in the public agency best fitted to carry out the provisions of the law as a constructive child-welfare measure.
8. Appropriation adequate to carry out the purpose of the law, with respect both to funds required for aid and to expenses of administration.
9. Some form of general oversight by the State combined with educational activities to develop high standards in the work of the local administrative agencies.

The following section shows to what extent these standards have been carried out in the provisions of existing mothers' aid laws.

---

See A Tabular Summary of State Laws Relating to Public Aid to Children in Their Own Homes (U. S. Children's Bureau Chart No. 3, Washington, 1925).
PROVISIONS OF MOTHERS’ AID LAWS

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH AID MAY BE GIVEN

PERSONS TO WHOM AID MAY BE GIVEN

The central idea in the theory and early discussion of aid to dependent children in their own homes and the most common inclusion in the earlier laws was aid to widows. Gradually the conception has widened, and the trend of legislation in the various States has been toward increasing the application of the law, giving the benefit of the aid to dependent children wherever the circumstances are such that the home should be maintained. By January 1, 1928, only 5 (Connecticut, Maryland, New Jersey, Texas, and Utah) of the 42 States having mothers’ aid laws limited the grant to children of widows, though all 42 included widows, directly or by implication. The prevailing method is either to permit aid to be granted to any mother with dependent children or to limit aid to certain types of cases, including those where the father is dead, deserting, divorced, physically or mentally incapacitated, or imprisoned, with necessary restrictions pertaining to cases of desertion and divorce. (See map 1.)

Eight States and the District of Columbia permit aid to be granted to any mother with dependent children. In Washington the law is applicable to all mothers who are needy; in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island to mothers with dependent children; in Nevada and New Hampshire to mothers dependent on their own efforts to support their children; in Colorado to any parent or other person designated by the court. The Indiana law permits aid for any child found by the court to be dependent or neglected and committed to a county board of children’s guardians, when it appears to be for the best interests of the child to remain with the mother. The law for the District of Columbia permits aid to be granted to the mother or guardian whenever the parent or parents of a child are unable to provide proper care in his own home.

In the other States with mothers’ aid laws aid is limited to mothers in certain types of cases. In 21 States children of deserted mothers and in 9 States children of divorced mothers may be granted aid. Families in which the father is totally incapacitated may be helped in 25 States; 16 States have specific provisions authorizing aid if the father is in an institution for the insane or is feeble-minded, and 22 States if the father is in a penal institution. Michigan, Nebraska, and Tennessee specifically authorize aid to unmarried mothers, and in some other States the law may be so applied.

The Illinois act of 1911 was entitled “Funds to parents act,” and the Colorado act of 1912 included a parent, or parents, who because of poverty were unable to provide properly for a dependent child. In Illinois, however, revision has limited the application of the law to dependent children whose fathers are dead, deserting, or totally incapacitated.
A few States give assistance to relatives or guardians having custody of a dependent child, as follows: Any woman standing in loco parentis to a dependent child or children, in Delaware and Rhode Island; a guardian, in the District of Columbia; a guardian, female relative, or custodian upon whom a child is dependent, in Florida, Idaho, Virginia, and Wisconsin; a woman who has assumed the responsibilities of mother when both parents are dead, in New Jersey; a relative within the second degree of either parent if the mother is dead, in New York; a stepmother, in Minnesota and Virginia; and a grandmother, in Minnesota and Wisconsin. In Colorado, Idaho, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Oregon payment may be made to the mother or other person designated by the administering agency; and in Arizona and California aid may be granted for full orphans as well as for half orphans who are living in private homes.

Aid may be granted to expectant mothers in Colorado, Missouri, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

RESIDENCE AND CITIZENSHIP

Eligibility requirements as to residence and citizenship vary in the different States. Most States do not require citizenship or declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States, but 10 States and the District of Columbia have this requirement. Thirty-nine require a period of residence in the State; 7 of these contain
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no further provision, 16 specify residence both in the State and in the local political unit, and 16 mention county residence only (or residence in other local political unit). Twenty-three specify the length of residence in the State; 14 require 1 or 2 years, 6 require 3 years, and 3 require 4 or 5 years. Thirty-two require from 6 months to 5 years’ residence in the specified local political unit. Five of the 39 States require the father to have been a resident of the State at the time of his death or disability. The District of Columbia requires one year’s residence preceding application for aid.

OWNERSHIP OF PROPERTY

In the majority of the States no specific mention is made of ownership of property, but in several laws there is either a prohibition of such ownership or a more reasonable provision limiting the amount of such property. For example, in the Wisconsin law “the ownership by a mother of a homestead shall not prevent the granting of aid * * * if the rental thereof would not exceed the rental which a family of the same size as the family of such parent, receiving aid, would be obliged to pay for living quarters,” or in the Nebraska law, “a mother shall not receive such relief who is the owner of real property or personal property other than the household goods of more than $2,000.”

FURTHER CONDITIONS

Conditions determining to whom aid should be granted are concerned mainly with the mother’s ability to give the child proper care and with economic need. Examples of good provisions are found among the requirements in the laws of Arkansas, Florida, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming. The following is quoted from the Arkansas law:

Such allowance shall be made * * * only upon the following conditions: (1) The child or children for whose benefit the allowance is made must be living with the mother of such child or children; (2) * * * and when by means of such allowance she will be able to remain at home with her children; (3) the mother must, in the judgment of the court, be a proper person, physically, morally, and mentally, for the bringing up of her children; (4) such allowance shall, in judgment of the court, be necessary to save the child or children from neglect.  

Important items are included in the laws of two States (Pennsylvania and West Virginia) in regard to safeguarding the education of the children receiving aid. Pennsylvania provides that “no payment shall be made on account of any child of proper age and physical ability unless satisfactory report has been made by the teacher of the school in which such pupil is enrolled, stating that such child is attending school.” West Virginia requires that “satisfactory reports must be given by the teacher of the district school stating that the children of the recipient of this fund are attending school, provided they are of proper age and physically able to do so.”

Many of the States qualify the second condition by giving to the administrative authority the right to determine the amount of time the mother may be away at work without injury to her health or neglect of the children.
PROVISIONS OF MOTHERS' AID LAWS

AGES OF CHILDREN WHO MAY BE GIVEN AID

The most important consideration in regard to the age to which a child may be granted aid is that the age limit shall be in conformity with compulsory school attendance and child labor laws. In Colorado aid may be granted to the age of 18 years, and in Michigan and Tennessee to the age of 17 years. Indiana permits aid up to 17 years for girls and to 16 years for boys. In 30 States and the District of Columbia, aid may be granted to children until they are 16 years of age. (See map 2.) Eight of these fix the age at 14 years but provide that under specified conditions it may be continued to 16 years, and 4 permit aid, under certain conditions, beyond 16 years. The States which permit aid to 16 years of age are:


Legend:
- Under 16.
- Under 17.
- Under 16.
- Under 15.
- Under 14.
- No mother's aid law.

* Aid to be continued beyond 16. No age limitation specified. (See map.)
* Aid may be continued to 18 under specified conditions. (See map.)
* Aid may be granted to 16 under specified conditions. (See map.)

MAP 2.—PUBLIC AID TO CHILDREN IN THEIR OWN HOMES AGES UNDER WHICH AID MAY BE GIVEN (Includes legislation in effect Jan. 1, 1928)
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10 PUBLIC AID TO MOTHERS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

INVESTIGATION AND CASE SUPERVISION

The laws of most of the States include a statement relating to investigation of each application to determine eligibility under the law, the character of the home, and the amount of aid required. Continued oversight of the families* granted aid is also provided for, which makes possible the application of principles of social case work. In order to adjust the allowances to changing conditions it has been found desirable in some States to provide for review of the grants at regular intervals—in most instances once in six months.

AMOUNT OF AID PERMITTED

Experience in the administration of mothers’ aid laws has shown that it is desirable to avoid strict limitation of grants and instead to permit assistance to be based upon the needs of each individual family. In determining the amount of the grant required due consideration should be given to the needs of the family as determined by its composition, as well as to the available resources from earnings of members of the family, aid from relatives, and other sources.

The laws of six States (Arizona, Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Virginia) and the District of Columbia do not specify the amount of aid that may be granted to each child or to each family but provide that the amount may be fixed by the administrative agency in accordance with what is needed in each family to provide properly for the children. In New York also the amount is not specified, but the law states that it shall not exceed the cost of institutional care.

In most States providing for a maximum grant this is specified as a given amount for each child. In order to make a comparison possible the maximum amounts specified in the laws of the various States are here reduced to the maximum which might be allowed for a family with three children, grouping the States as follows:

| Maximum, $80-$70 a month: 8 States.—California, Connecticut, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, Ohio. |
| Maximum, $30-$39 a month: 10 States.—Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, and Wisconsin. |

The laws of 11 States specify a maximum amount for a family of any size ranging from $40 to $60 a month—Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Utah, and West Virginia.

*For further discussion see Standards of Aid, p. 5.

A maximum weekly budget is given in detail in the law. This budget provides for the widowed mother (aid is limited to children of widows) and for different amounts for children of different ages.

A special provision relating to Chicago permits $55 a month for three children.

In the city of St. Louis, however, the maximum allowance is $50 a week for each child—approximately $47 a month for three children.

Except in Jackson County.
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Responsibility for the administration of mothers' aid laws has been given to various agencies depending upon when the original law was passed and upon which existing agencies were considered best fitted to undertake the new work. In only 4 of the 42 States having such legislation (Delaware, New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island) has a new agency been established. In 32 States local agencies have charge of administration and in 9 other States they cooperate with a State board having administrative functions. In a majority of these States the local administrative agency has county-wide jurisdiction. In one State (Delaware) administration is solely in the hands of a State agency (see map 3).

Seventeen of the thirty-two States in which State agencies exercise no administrative functions have some form of State supervision of local administration. In eight of these States rather general supervisory powers are given to a State agency; in nine the only provision for State supervision is that the local agency must make annual reports concerning all its work, including mothers' aid, to the State department.

MAP 3—PUBLIC AID TO CHILDREN IN THEIR OWN HOMES
LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES ACTING ALONE OR IN COOPERATION WITH A STATE AGENCY
(Includes legislation in effect Jan. 1, 1928)
LOCAL ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

Chiefly because the mothers' aid movement was in the beginning an outgrowth of the juvenile-court movement, 19 States have placed administration in courts having jurisdiction over cases of delinquent, dependent, and neglected children. The types of local administrative agency in the States having mothers' aid laws may be summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local administrative agency</th>
<th>Number of States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile court</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County poor-relief officials.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County or city board having other functions.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special county board</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local administrative agency</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Juvenile court.

The 19 States in which administration of mothers' aid has been placed in a court having juvenile jurisdiction are:

- Arkansas
- Louisiana
- New Jersey
- Tennessee
- Chicago
- Illinois
- Indiana
- Michigan
- Ohio
- Oregon
- Vermont
- Washington
- Wisconsin
- Connecticut
- Massachusetts
- Missouri (except in St. Louis and Jackson County)
- Nevada
- North Dakota
- Texas
- Utah
- West Virginia
- Wyoming

Poor-relief officials.

The 13 States in which county or town officials granting poor relief administer the mothers' aid law are: California, Connecticut (selectman, warden, mayor, or other local official makes recommendation to State agency), Florida (county commissioners act upon report and recommendation of county board of public instruction), Kansas, Maryland (act operative in only two counties), Massachusetts (in cooperation with State agency), Missouri (except in St. Louis and Jackson County), Nevada, North Dakota, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

County or city board having other functions.

The five States in which a county or city board having other functions relating to child welfare or public welfare also administers mothers' aid are: Arizona (State board also has administrative authority), Indiana, Maine (State board also has administrative authority), North Carolina, and Virginia.

---

12 Except in one other State (Missouri) administration is in the Juvenile court in Jackson County.
13 Aid is granted by courts and supervision of families is by a State board.
14 In St. Louis, Mo., also, administration is vested in the city board of children's guardians. In the District of Columbia administration of the law is in the board of public welfare, which also has duties relative to the guardianship and placing out of children.}
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In Arizona county child-welfare boards investigate applications for aid and report their findings to the State child-welfare board. In addition to their duties in connection with the mothers' aid law, the county child-welfare boards investigate the case of any orphan, waif, or neglected or abandoned child and report conditions to the judge of the State supreme court and also to the State child-welfare board.

Aid to dependent children in their own homes is administered in Indiana by county boards of children's guardians, which are also responsible for placing dependent and neglected children in family homes. In Maine municipal boards of children's guardians having general powers relating to the investigation and prosecution of cases of cruelty or violation of laws for the protection of children make investigations of applications for mothers' aid. They transmit reports and recommendations to the department of public welfare (constituted ex officio a State board of children's guardians) and supervise the families granted aid by the State board.

In North Carolina administration is placed in the county boards of charities and public welfare, which have very general duties. Cases are investigated and supervised by the county superintendent of public welfare (in effect the executive officer of the county board). The State board of charities and public welfare has general oversight of the administration of the law.

Administration of the Virginia mothers' aid law is placed in county or city boards of public welfare, which have general powers as in North Carolina. Where no such boards exist, juvenile or domestic-relations courts serve as administrative agencies. The State board of public welfare has general supervisory authority.

Special board.

The States in which special county, city, or town boards have been created to administer mothers' aid are New York, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island. Under the New York law, county child-welfare boards have been especially created for the administration of mothers' aid, but a law passed in 1922 provides that they may be reorganized and given additional powers relating to dependent children. Pennsylvania has special county boards of trustees of the mothers' assistance fund. In New York the State board of charities and in Pennsylvania the State department of welfare are given general supervision of the administration of the law. City or town boards of mothers' aid in Rhode Island make investigations and administer the law in cooperation with the State bureau of mothers' aid.

School board.

New Hampshire has made local school boards, in cooperation with the State board of education, the administrative agencies.

\*In three counties (Dutchess, Suffolk, and Westchester) administration of the law is placed in boards with other duties in relation to public welfare, in accordance with special legislation.
Administrative agencies. In only 1 of the 10 States in which State agencies have administrative duties has a special mothers' aid board been created. In this State (Delaware) the special board has entire responsibility for mothers' aid administration. In the other 9 States existing State agencies have been designated to act in cooperation with local agencies. (See map 4.)

MAP 4.—PUBLIC AID TO CHILDREN IN THEIR OWN HOMES
STATE ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION
(Includes legislation in effect Jan. 1, 1928)

Special State board. In Delaware a special mothers' pension commission has been established, composed of nine members, three from each county. Application for aid is made to the State commission and referred to the members of the commission from the county of the mother's residence for investigation and report. The commission determines the amount and duration of aid.

State board having other functions. The States in which no special State agency has been created to administer mothers' aid are as follows: Arizona, California, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Vermont. The District of Columbia is also classified with this group.

It has been difficult in some cases to decide on the basis of the law whether the function of the State agency is administrative or supervisory. A State agency has been designated as having administrative functions if, in addition to supervision, it approves grants or visits families receiving aid. In addition to the 10 States listed under this head the laws of Minnesota and Virginia give State departments certain administrative powers, but administrative responsibility has not been generally exercised.
In Arizona the State child-welfare board acts upon reports of county child-welfare boards. In California the bureau of children's aid of the State department of finance works in cooperation with courts or county officials. In Connecticut the widows' aid division of the department of State agencies and institutions acts upon report and recommendation of local officers. In the District of Columbia the home-care division of the board of public welfare administers the law.

In Maine the State department of public welfare is ex officio the State board of children's guardians, and works in cooperation with municipal boards of children's guardians, either especially constituted or composed of overseers of the poor. In Massachusetts the State department of public welfare cooperates with local boards of public welfare. In New Hampshire the State board of education acts upon recommendation of local school boards. In New Jersey the State board of children's guardians under the State department of institutions and agencies supervise the families; aid is granted by courts. In Rhode Island the bureau of mothers' aid, established by the State public-welfare commission, cooperates with local boards of mothers' aid. In Vermont the department of public welfare receives children for care through juvenile courts or overseers of the poor.

The division of authority in these States between State and local agencies may be stated as follows: The State agency determines whether aid shall be granted and the amount, acting upon report and recommendation of local agency, in Arizona, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. In California local authorities granting aid may be reimbursed by the State, within specified limits, the State agency investigating applications for aid and supervising homes where aid is granted. The local agency in New Jersey determines whether aid shall be given and the amount, committing the family to the State board of children's guardians, which pays the allowance from county funds and supervises the family. In Massachusetts and Rhode Island the local agency determines whether aid shall be granted and the amount, the State board being required to cooperate with and supervise the work of local agencies, visit families in receipt of aid, and approve expenditures before the local treasury may be reimbursed from State funds. (For conditions in Minnesota and Virginia see footnote 23, p. 14.)

Supervisory agencies.

The eight States in which the law gives the State agency rather general supervisory powers are: Minnesota, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Wisconsin. 23a

In Minnesota the State board of control is directed to promote efficiency and uniformity in the administration of the law by the juvenile courts, to advise and cooperate with the courts, supply forms, visit and inspect families granted aid, have access to records of courts and other agencies concerning allowances, and require reports.

23a Under the probation law of 1925, which is interpreted as applying to court officers who administer mothers' aid, the State department of public welfare, in Ohio, is beginning to exercise general supervision over mothers' aid work.
In Missouri the State board of charities and corrections has general supervisory power and control, except in Jackson County. It is the duty of the county courts, juvenile courts, county boards of public welfare, and similar organizations to cooperate with the State board and to furnish information when requested. The county clerks must make a complete annual report to the State board.

In New York the State board of charities is vested with general supervision over local boards of child welfare and may require reports and revoke allowances obtained in violation of law.

In North Carolina the law provides that the State board of charities and public welfare shall have general oversight of the administration of the law by the county boards of charities and public welfare, furnish necessary blanks, give advice and help, receive reports on each case, and give approval or disapproval of reimbursement from State funds.

In North Dakota the State board of administration is directed to promote efficiency and uniformity in the administration of the law by local poor-relief officials.

In Pennsylvania the State department of public welfare is charged with the supervision of the special county boards that administer the law. The State supervisor on the staff of this department is to promulgate rules of procedure, visit each county board at least twice a year, and act as general field organizer under the law.

In Virginia the State board of public welfare is authorized to supervise local administrative agencies and city or county boards of public welfare as to methods of investigation, supervision, and record keeping. It may require reports, and is directed to visit and inspect families granted aid and to approve reimbursement from State funds if State appropriations are made therefor. (None appear to have been made.)

In Wisconsin—where the juvenile court is the local administrative agency—the approval of the State board of control is necessary before any county may be reimbursed from State funds.

The nine States in which the only supervision exercised by the State agency is to require that annual reports be submitted to it are Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, and Ohio.

PAYMENT OR REIMBURSEMENT FROM STATE FUNDS

State appropriations to supplement local funds have been made in some States to encourage local grants and to raise standards of relief. States in which the application of mothers' aid laws was originally left to the initiative of local officials have frequently found it desirable to amend the laws so as to make appropriations mandatory instead of permissive and to apply some form of assistance or supervision by the State to carry out the intent of the laws.

In two States (Arizona and New Hampshire) the entire expenditure for mothers' aid is made from State funds. Twelve of the 42 States having mothers' aid laws are authorized to share with the counties or municipalities the expense of aid. In New Jersey the cost of administration is borne by the State, the counties paying all
the allowance. In Delaware, Maine, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont the State divides equally with the county, town, or municipality the expenditures for aid. In California the State furnishes one-half or more of the aid granted. In Connecticut and Massachusetts the State furnishes one-third, and local units furnish two-thirds, of the expenditures. In Wisconsin a portion of the expenditure is from State funds, the amount available being limited by the maximum annual appropriation of $30,000 fixed by law. In Virginia the county may be reimbursed by the State (if appropriations are made for this purpose), but no State appropriation has been made. In Maine and Massachusetts all the aid to families in which the mother has no legal settlement in any town is chargeable to the State.

* The law also limits the maximum State aid permitted, the amount specified being apportioned among the counties on a per capita basis.
AMOUNT OF AID AS RELATED TO STANDARDS OF LIVING

Questions are often asked in regard to the comparative cost of care of a child in his own home and in an institution. Though it can be demonstrated easily that home care—either in a child’s own home or in a boarding home in which he is placed by a child-caring agency—is more economical financially than care in an institution of fairly adequate standards, this should not be the point that is given emphasis. The important consideration is what the lack of home care costs the child. Deprivation of his own home is a very serious thing for any child, and it is in line with the best principles of work for dependent children that every effort should be made to conserve the home.

The most desirable provisions for aid do not limit the amount of the grant for each family but make it possible to supply such aid as is necessary in view of other resources and the budget needed for the proper maintenance of the family. Most families have some resources, such as assistance from relatives, earnings of older children or of the mother, saving of rental through ownership of the house, or reduction in food costs through use of garden products raised by the family. In many instances where the maximum amount of aid is specified in the law it is too small to cover the family’s needs and must be supplemented by aid from some other public or private agency; in more unusual instances it is larger than the family would require if other resources were developed.

The aid given should be sufficient to enable the family, after utilizing other possible resources, to maintain an adequate standard of living. It has been shown in various studies—the most extensive being that made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics—that the living cost in workmen’s families is considerably greater than the amounts generally available for the families of dependent children who are aided in their own homes. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics study, the average cost of living for 1918 was $1,434.37 for a family consisting of father, mother, and three children under 14 years of age. To arrive at the expenses of a family consisting of a mother and three children under 14 (the group taken as the basis of study of the maximum grants permitted by the laws of the various States, see p. 10), the cost of the husband’s food and clothing has been deducted from the $1,434.37, in accordance with

---

27 Ibid., p. 5. (As reported, the average size of families was 4.9 persons.) With the year 1913 as a base the cost of living index for June, 1925, is reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as 173.5, as compared with 174.4 in December, 1918, so that the figure given may be taken as representative of present costs. See “Prices and cost of living,” in the Monthly Labor Review, vol. 21, No. 2 (August, 1925), p. 76.
data contained in the cost-of-living study cited. The amount thus arrived at is $1,197.78. Assuming that the expenditures for some other items should also have been deducted, $1,000 may be considered as the amount required for a mother and three dependent children, on the basis of actual expenditures reported by more than 12,000 families in almost 100 cities in the United States in 1918.

Such a standard of aid can be maintained in but few of the States under present mothers' aid laws. The maximum expenditures permitted by the laws of 35 of the 42 States having mothers' aid laws would amount to less than $800 a year for a mother and three children. In 20 of these States the amount would be less than $480 a year. Small as are the amounts specified in the laws, the actual grants are frequently much less, either because the appropriations are inadequate or because the officials in charge of the administration of this aid grant a small arbitrary amount without special reference to the needs of the family.

In order to form the basis for a good standard of mothers' aid, therefore, the laws must permit the administrative agency to furnish aid that, in the words of the Massachusetts law, shall "be sufficient to enable the mothers to bring up their children properly in their own homes." When a maximum amount is stated in the law it should be such that the individual family may be provided for in accordance with their need and should never be construed to mean an arbitrary amount to be granted in every case—either the maximum stated in the law or any fraction of it, as is frequently done. It is probable that an actual saving occurs when the law permits such leeway that the administrative agency can apply modern principles of family case work.

Many administrative agencies, under both the general type of provision and the form limiting the grant to a certain arbitrary amount, work out family budgets after careful study of the needs of each family being considered for aid. The grants are then made on the basis of the requirements so far as appropriations make this possible, supplementary aid required being secured from other public or private agencies. It is only in this way that the welfare of the children can be assured, and it is found that economy in the use of public funds results when family needs and resources are given proper consideration.
EXTENT TO WHICH MOTHERS' AID LAWS ARE APPLIED

Complete data could not be obtained as to the extent to which aid was given in all the 42 States, as many of the States have no form of State supervision of mothers' aid work. The annual expenditure for mothers' aid, the number of families receiving this assistance, and the number of children in these families for whom aid was granted were obtained, however, from 25 States and the District of Columbia (see the following table).

Annual expenditure for mothers' aid, number of families, and number of children receiving aid on January 1, 1927; 25 States and the District of Columbia

[Mothers' pension data supplied by State officials. Estimated population July 1, 1926, furnished by the United States Bureau of the Census]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Population of State</th>
<th>Annual expenditure for mothers' aid excluding cost of administration</th>
<th>Number of families receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
<th>Number of children receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>4,454,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>8,393</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,059,000</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>$1,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>688,367</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>2,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>522,000</td>
<td>124,800</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>12,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3,124,000</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>1,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>2,390,000</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,919,000</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>$1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>7,651</td>
<td>7,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>4,366,000</td>
<td>1,862,183</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>6,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,651,000</td>
<td>976,211</td>
<td>3,184</td>
<td>10,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>695,000</td>
<td>233,079</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>454,000</td>
<td>27,703</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>1,127,231</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>10,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3,880,000</td>
<td>6,363,337</td>
<td>31,228</td>
<td>13,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>11,300,000</td>
<td>6,353,337</td>
<td>31,228</td>
<td>13,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>2,858,000</td>
<td>43,500</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>1,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
<td>1,208,043</td>
<td>4,104</td>
<td>17,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2,242,000</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>9,314,000</td>
<td>1,030,955</td>
<td>5,565</td>
<td>12,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1,609,000</td>
<td>388,698</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>337,110</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>3,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>4,352,428</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>N. R.</td>
<td>13,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2,319,000</td>
<td>17,329</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2,885,000</td>
<td>1,362,172</td>
<td>5,299</td>
<td>13,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>928,000</td>
<td>142,141</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Includes cost of administration.
2 Average for year ended June 30, 1927.
3 Information regarding mothers'aid is for 62 of the 63 counties.
4 Expenditure not reported; $180,194 appropriated.
5 Estimate, based on average number of children per family (2.86) in families receiving aid for which the number of children was reported.
6 Total for year ended October 1, 1926.
7 Expenditure not reported; $123,000 appropriated by 5 of the 6 parishes that grant mothers'pensions.
8 Total for year ended June 30, 1926.
9 Includes children boarded in their own homes by State board of children's guardians.
10 Reports from separate counties at close of their fiscal years.
11 Total for last half of 1926.
12 Information regarding mothers' aid is for 31 of the 36 counties for November, 1926.
13 For 54 of the 64 counties for year ended July 1, 1926.
14 For 54 of the 64 counties for year ended July 1, 1926.
15 Population Jan. 1, 1925; decrease 1910 to 1920.
16 For year ended July 1, 1926.
17 Information regarding mothers'aid is for the one city and the one county that grant mothers'pensions.
18 Total June 30, 1926.

All but four of these States (Montana, Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Dakota) had some form of State supervision or were required to report to a State agency. Details were not obtained, however, as
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to the extent of the application of the mothers' aid laws within each of these States; a few of the reports definitely state that only some of the counties in the State were profiting by this type of assistance.

In considering the comparatively small number of children in relation to the total population for whom aid was granted in certain States, it must be taken into account that in some sections of the country not only the need for this form of public assistance, but also the need for the care of dependent children in institutions and by child-placing agencies is less prevalent than in others. On the other hand, the lack of appropriations by State or local boards was responsible in some localities for the failure to carry out the provisions of the law, although aid may have been needed. Even in the States reporting the highest proportions aided, the possibility of constructive application of this form of aid has by no means reached its limits.

It is estimated that at this time, on any one date, approximately 200,000 children are receiving public aid in their own homes. If estimate were made of the total number of children in the United States for whom aid should be granted in their own homes, it would be closer to 400,000 and probably even beyond this if all types of more or less permanent family disability were included.

Since the standards of administration in large cities are more nearly uniform, data in regard to the extent of care given in cities of at least 100,000 inhabitants are more valuable for comparative purposes than data from the States as a whole. Information in regard to annual expenditures for mothers' aid, the number of families receiving this assistance, and the number of children in these families for whom aid was granted was obtained from 61 cities of at least 100,000 or counties containing such cities. In the 44 localities included in the following table mothers' aid was administered on a county basis. In some of these counties the city is coextensive with the county; in others the city, though territorially smaller than the county, contains a large proportion of the population; whereas in a few counties the city includes less than half the population of the county.

Annual expenditure for mothers' aid, number of families, and number of children receiving aid January 1, 1927, and estimated population of certain counties granting aid to mothers

[Mothers' pension data supplied by county officials with the exception of those for Tulsa, which were compiled by the author from local records. Estimated population, July 1, 1926, furnished by the United States Bureau of the Census]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Principal city (population over 100,000) in county</th>
<th>Population of county</th>
<th>Annual expenditure for mothers' aid exclusive of cost of administration</th>
<th>Number of families receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
<th>Number of children receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Oakland and Berkeley</td>
<td>409,800</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>146,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>666,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Approximate number or amount.
2 Total for January, 1927.
3 Obtained from county officers.
4 Estimate based on average number of children per family (2.86) in families receiving aid for which number of children was reported.
5 Total for year ending June 30, 1926.
6 Includes those reported by the widows' pension bureau and others receiving aid through the juvenile court.
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### Public Aid to Mothers with Dependent Children

**Annual expenditure for mothers’ aid, number of families and number of children receiving aid January 1, 1927, etc.—Continued**

(Mothers’ pension data supplied by county officials with the exception of those for Tulsa, which were compiled by the author from local records. Estimated population, July 1, 1926, furnished by the United States Bureau of the Census.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Principal city (population over 100,000) in county</th>
<th>Population of county</th>
<th>Annual expenditure for mothers’ aid exclusive of cost of administration</th>
<th>Number of families receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
<th>Number of children receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorado:</td>
<td>Denver...</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td>$97,830</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware:</td>
<td>New Castle...</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>38,565</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida:</td>
<td>Jacksonville...</td>
<td>156,000</td>
<td>30,728</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois:</td>
<td>Chicago...</td>
<td>3,486,700</td>
<td>784,173</td>
<td>1,292</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana:</td>
<td>Fort Wayne...</td>
<td>128,300</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa:</td>
<td>Des Moines...</td>
<td>906,000</td>
<td>5,907</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas:</td>
<td>Wichita...</td>
<td>173,300</td>
<td>45,404</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky:</td>
<td>Grand Rapids...</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>82,605</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana:</td>
<td>New Orleans...</td>
<td>1,480,000</td>
<td>715,961</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>2,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine:</td>
<td>Portland...</td>
<td>307,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland:</td>
<td>Baltimore...</td>
<td>612,000</td>
<td>74,404</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts:</td>
<td>Boston...</td>
<td>542,300</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan:</td>
<td>Detroit...</td>
<td>228,600</td>
<td>37,486</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota:</td>
<td>Minneapolis...</td>
<td>476,300</td>
<td>74,404</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri:</td>
<td>Kansas City...</td>
<td>424,300</td>
<td>74,404</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska:</td>
<td>Omaha...</td>
<td>119,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York:</td>
<td>Albany...</td>
<td>376,000</td>
<td>65,346</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio:</td>
<td>Columbus...</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>60,346</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma:</td>
<td>Oklahoma City...</td>
<td>127,100</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon:</td>
<td>Portland...</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania:</td>
<td>Pittsburgh...</td>
<td>223,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>11,15</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee:</td>
<td>Memphis...</td>
<td>274,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>11,15</td>
<td>2,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas:</td>
<td>Dallas...</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>112,712</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah:</td>
<td>Salt Lake City...</td>
<td>177,000</td>
<td>247,741</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington:</td>
<td>Seattle...</td>
<td>235,000</td>
<td>247,741</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin:</td>
<td>Milwaukee...</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>247,741</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Approximate number or amount.
2 Number receiving aid June 1, 1927.
3 Estimated by the author from local records.
4 Population 1926.
5 Total for April, 1927.
6 Not reported whether this excludes administrative expenses.
7 Total for the year 1926.
8 Total for December, 1926.
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Mothers' aid is administered by cities or towns in three of the States (Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island) from which city information was obtained (see the following table). In addition to the 14 cities in these States, 3 cities in States where aid is usually administered on a county basis were also reported as having municipal administration.

Annual expenditure for mothers' aid, number of families, and number of children receiving aid January 1, 1927, and estimated population of certain cities of over 100,000 population granting aid to mothers

(Mothers' pension data supplied by city officials with the exception of those for St. Louis, which were compiled by the author from records of the city board of children's guardians. Estimated population July 1, 1926, furnished by the United States Bureau of the Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population of city</th>
<th>Annual expenditure for mothers' aid exclusive of cost of administration</th>
<th>Number of families receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
<th>Number of children receiving aid Jan. 1, 1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>38,199</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>164,900</td>
<td>27,249</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>181,300</td>
<td>74,445</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterbury</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>30,413</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>787,100</td>
<td>746,879</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>3,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>132,000</td>
<td>90,256</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall River</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>43,971</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell</td>
<td>110,295</td>
<td>100,128</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>41,273</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>119,039</td>
<td>48,805</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerville</td>
<td>100,400</td>
<td>40,779</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>146,000</td>
<td>56,681</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>109,400</td>
<td>70,096</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>890,400</td>
<td>43,120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>5,984,000</td>
<td>5,156,446</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>26,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>274,800</td>
<td>79,265</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>189,100</td>
<td>7,595</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Obtained from local officials.
2 Population State census, 1926; decrease 1920 to 1925.
3 Number on April 1, 1927.
4 Number receiving aid at the end of the fiscal year.
5 Total for January, 1927.

If a comparison is made for different localities of the number of children receiving aid, as related to the total population, it is evident that even in these cities there is much variation in the extent to which aid to mothers was granted. In addition to inadequate appropriations, which may be the primary factor in limiting the aid available in many localities, the number of children receiving aid is affected by the legal limitation as to the persons eligible for aid, the ages of the children for whom aid is granted, and the liberality of the policies adopted by the administrative agencies.

A similar comparison of the annual expenditures for aid and the number of children receiving aid indicates that there is much variation in the standards of care given. In some of the localities mothers' aid more nearly resembles poor relief, small grants being made for the maximum number of children who are eligible. In other localities adequate grants and careful case work are provided for a smaller number of children.
Mothers' aid administration offers the most obvious evidence of the seriousness of placing laws on the statute books but failing to make them practically effective through adequate appropriation and proper administration. It is recognized that the chief problem at present in connection with mothers' aid work in most of the 42 States is not to obtain new State legislation or amendments to existing laws but to obtain adequate appropriations and to raise the standard of administration so that the laws may mean adequate care for the children they are intended to benefit.