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CHAPTER I

THE HISTORY OF GENERAL ASSISTANCE IN THE
UNITED STATES AND ILLINOIS

The specific program of the Catholic Charity Bureau under consideration in this study is General Assistance. The term is a modern one and has evolved in the historical development of public welfare. Today a working definition of general assistance would be: financial assistance given to those in need who do not qualify for public aid under any of the categories.

In getting an historical conspectus of general assistance we must go back to the times when there were no categories, when people in great need were given poor relief. It is apparent, then, that the history of general assistance, as it is called today, is the history of poor relief. This first chapter of our study will present the history of poor relief in the United States from colonial times until the depression of the 1930's, and then the history of poor relief in Illinois for the same period. It was during this depression that the present general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau was set up. This history will bring us up through the development of the categories to the present day, and will enable us to see the Catholic Charity Bureau program in its historical setting and enable us to evaluate it more truly. In a historical sketch like this, where the span of time covered is so long, one can only hope to highlight the development. And actually
that is all that is necessary to give us the background desired.

Our earliest colonists brought with them from England English
laws, traditions and ideas. Care of the poor in America has been recognized
from early colonial days as fundamentally a function of local government.

The system of local poor relief was transplanted root and
branch to the Eastern seaboard from Elizabethan England... and
was later carried by pioneer settlers across the continent.
This English heritage made poverty a disgrace, branded the poor
man as unworthy and shiftless; and attached to relief an
indelible stigma.1

Poor relief in this country followed the Elizabethan pattern of
local responsibility, legal family responsibility and restriction of aid to
those having legal residence. The almshouse was the main means of giving
assistance, and all classes of the poor and destitute were relegated to them.

Along with the idea of local responsibility was the notion of
residence or settlement. The idea of residence was that "you are one of us
or you are not." This was a protection against unwanted residents, even
though it was at a time when mobility was beneficial to the country. The
settlement or residence requirement for poor relief recognized that relief
was a local responsibility and was a means of determining which jurisdiction
must pay the bill.

Non-resident paupers in some locals were warned to get out of
town and were even punished, sometimes by whipping, if they did not comply.
A person that was ill, needing financial aid, was sometimes removed bodily by

1 Josephine Chapin Brown, Public Relief, 1929-1939, New York,
1940, p. 3.
local townsmen, occasionally under cover of night and deposited in their own county or township. In March of 1683 New York City Council passed a law requiring a constable of each ward and division within the city to carry out periodically a strict search and inquiry "after all strangers that shall come, reside or inhabit" therein. Then a list of names and information was given to the mayor so that potential public charges could be removed before gaining settlement.

Paupers for whom settlement could not be found were considered provident or state poor. This was the beginning of the state assuming responsibility for the financial needs of its citizens. Care for these people grew out of the conditions following the colonial wars and the American Revolution. At first it was for refugees and veterans, but gradually it included immigrants and finally non-residents without settlement anywhere.

The first poor law of the colonial period was passed in Plymouth Colony in 1642, and merely provided that towns were to take care of the poor. Pennsylvania passed a general poor law in 1705 and made the township the administrative unit.\(^2\) Connecticut passed the first tax law for the support of the town poor in 1687.\(^3\) Characteristics of New England laws around 1700, and more specifically of Massachusetts laws, were town tax for the support

---

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 5.

of the poor, provision for appointment of an overseer of the poor, punishment for idleness, authority to farm out the poor and responsibility of relatives.

Almshouses were not used in the earliest days, the first municipal almshouse coming in in Philadelphia in 1731. They were for the impotent poor and for the able-bodied. They are contrasted to workhouses in that the workhouse was for the able-bodied and was more of a punitive measure. The first workhouse was established in Boston in 1750.

Besides provision for the poor in almshouses and workhouses, outdoor relief in some measure was given to paupers in their homes. This was gradually done away with, but when it was given in early days it was usually given in kind rather than in cash and it might have been cattle, groceries or even a house.

Some poor were "farmed out" to the lowest bidder who might undertake the care of a single pauper or contract for the care of all the paupers of a given locality. Indenture or a "lending out" was also used. This was more a form of apprenticeship and usually involved children.

There were two important reports on poor relief made in the 1820's that shed light on that period. The first was the Josuah Quincy Report of 1821 on the pauper laws of Massachusetts. This report was concerned with the fact that local authorities had no means of determining whether a person was poor or how poor he was. It therefore recommended the use of almshouses in poor relief as the most economical and constructive remedy. Work was to be provided for every degree of ability and thus the able-bodied could
provide for themselves and partially for the impotent poor.

The second report was the Yates Report on the relief and settlement of the poor in New York. Mr. Yates was Secretary of State of New York. This report, made in 1824, showed some knowledge of underlying causes of poverty and recommended the use of almshouses as the best method of educating the children of paupers. This report also recognized that the cost of settlement and removal was more than the cost of supporting the poor. It made recommendations for new poor laws and sought more humane treatment of the poor, greater economy, employment of the idle and the stopping of begging.

Colonial principles of poor relief were carried westward by pioneers and formally recorded in the statutes of the Northwest Territory in 1790, and of the Missouri Territory in 1815. Ohio, Michigan, Nebraska, Illinois and other mid-western states passed laws based on these statutes.1

Highlighting of the history of poor relief as it developed into what we call public welfare today will help us to see the narrowing of poor relief from being coextensive with public welfare to present day general assistance. In 1769 the first hospital for the insane brought the expansion of public welfare activities, and the narrowing of poor relief. Free dispensaries were established in Philadelphia in 1766 under the impetus of Benjamin Rush, sometimes called the Father of American Psychiatry. Medical aid was given out as a form of poor relief.

---------------

1 Brown, Public Relief, p. 5.
In 1854 the United States Congress passed a law at the petition of Dorothy Dix, granting land to the states for hospitals for the indigent insane. President Pierce vetoed the bill, and, in giving his reason, set the general policy and attitude of the federal government towards poor relief from that time until 1933. Pierce said that the tax power of Congress did not give Congress the power to provide for the indigent insane, nor for any indigent persons. He said, "that if Congress is to make provision for such objects, the fountain of charity will be dried up at home, and the several states—may—become suppliants for the bounty of the Federal Government, reversing their true relation to this union."5

In summing up local poor relief in the early part of the 20th Century, Josephine Brown says that methods used in local poor relief offices between 1911 and 1932 revealed practices and attitudes which had evidently changed but little in two or three hundred years. She says there was no recognition that special qualifications were needed for those dealing with dependent people. Relief was administered depending on the terms of the state law, by county commissioners, by the county court, by grand juries, by township trustees, by justices of the peace; or overseers of the poor or poor commissioners might be elected or appointed to serve full time.6 These officials were usually indifferent to their work. Their general objective


appeared to be to conserve the public funds by keeping down expenditures. They did not investigate the circumstances of applicants. Relief was given on the basis of the personal knowledge of the deputed officer, however scanty that was. They made very few visits to the homes of the poor. They emphasized the distinction between the "worthy" and the "unworthy" poor, but both received the stigma of dependence as soon as they received emergency or temporary relief. Moreover it was necessary to be absolutely destitute in order to be eligible for relief, and in many localities a "pauper's oath" was required.

There continued the conviction that relief should be so disagreeable to the recipient that he would be persuaded or forced to devise some means of self-support in order to get off the relief list as soon as possible. This deterring policy was the only early poor relief method of rehabilitation. It also served to warn the poor not on relief to practice thrift and keep off relief.

The most common way of making relief distasteful was to make the grants smaller than the lowest wages which the recipient could possibly earn, if he really exerted himself and got a job. This was the doctrine of "less eligibility," inherited from the English poor relief system. It has probably had more to do with keeping relief standards on a low level in this country than any other one factor in three hundred years of relief history.8

7 Ibid., p. 15.
8 Ibid., p. 17.
The history of the whole development of public welfare would not be to our purpose, so the development of state boards of charity is omitted other than to mention that the Massachusetts State Board of Charity was created in 1863 to supervise the activities of cities and towns in public relief towards safeguarding the state treasury against improper requests for reimbursement and had powers of visiting the institutions.

In the early part of the 19th Century the states began to assume responsibility for the institutional care of certain classes of paupers formerly cared for on a local level. The almshouses had cared for dependents handicapped or disabled in various ways: the insane, sick, infirm, deaf, dumb, crippled and even criminals. These included adults and children of both sexes and of all ages. "The establishment of state institutions for special classes of these handicapped people was in effect the beginning of categorical relief." This action by the states was taken because there were usually too few inmates in any one category in a single town or county to make a local institution feasible, and also, because the type of care needed for each category was ordinarily more costly than local government was prepared to assume.9

The founding of institutions for the insane, the deaf and dumb and delinquents has already been mentioned. Massachusetts established a school for feeble-minded and idiotic youth in 1843. New York opened an institution.

9 Ibid., p. 21.
for the crippled in 1863 and one for the blind in 1865. It should be noted, however, that New York had been paying for the care and instruction of blind pauper children in a private institution for thirty-four years prior to this. Ohio established a state institution for epileptics in 1894. Wisconsin established a state institution for epileptics in 1894.

Wisconsin established aid to the blind in 1907 and by 1931 eleven states had it. Illinois provided mother's aid in 1911 and by 1931 forty-two states had it. In 1923 Montana and Nevada provided aid for the aged and by 1931 twenty-eight states were doing the same; only sixteen of which, however, were using state funds.

This brief description of the rise of the categories is sufficient to give meaning to our definition of general assistance, namely, assistance given to those in need who do not qualify for public aid under any of the categories. And this concludes the highlights of the history of poor relief as the predecessor of general assistance in the country up to the depression. The history of general assistance or poor relief in Illinois for the same period now comes under consideration. It is seen most clearly and succinctly through a quick review of its poor laws.

Illinois was admitted to the Union as a state on December 3, 1818. It took over the 1795 poor law of the Northwest Territory of which it had

10 Ibid., p. 27.
been a part. That law recognized public responsibility for the poor and adopted the principle of local administration. Besides containing a residence requirement, it provided for the farming out of the poor at auction. Boys up to twenty-one and girls up to eighteen were bound out as apprentices. Dependent persons were moved to their last place of residence and relatives were expected to contribute care within the family unit. The overseer could assess taxes of a specified amount on private property within the township for support of the poor. This law was revised in 1828 and simplified. It abolished township overseers and gave the function of administering to the poor to the county. Family responsibility was retained. Children were bound out, and persons unable to earn a living were to receive aid from the county treasury. Residence requirements were eliminated.

An amendment to the law passed in 1833 made persons unable to earn a living because of idiocy or lunacy eligible for assistance if their relatives were unable to support them. This requirement was reduced to six months in 1839.

In the same year a plan of indoor relief (almshouses) was set up.

---

11 Laws of the Northwest Territory, 1788-1800, Poor Relief, 1795, Appendix A.

12 Ibid., pp 216-232.


15 Laws of Illinois, 1835, p. 66.
The county commissioners were authorized to secure a poorhouse with a farm. A property tax was authorized to raise money for support of the poor, which support was to take place in the poorhouse only. The county board alone could make exceptions to this. The care of the poor was transferred from the County Commissioners to overseers of the poor. In counties having no poorhouse, a justice of the peace and one other person were appointed by the County Board to care for the poor. In 1841 the residence requirement was reduced from six months to thirty days.

The law of 1845 was a codification of existing laws. Those poor unable to earn a living due to unavoidable causes were to obtain help from relatives first. Those having no relatives were to be placed in charge of some other person who would receive his labor plus cash from the county where necessary, or else they were to be placed in a county home.

The constitution of Illinois was changed in 1846 to allow the counties to choose to retain the old county form of poor relief. Where the township plan was adopted, the township supervisor was to administer relief and be paid by the county. The apprenticeship law was reenacted in 1854. The township supervisor was to bind out pauper children or minor children. Educational requirements were established. Children were to learn reading, writing and arithmetic. The township had the responsibility of protecting children.

16 A Proposed Public Assistance Code, p. 66.
17 Ibid., p. 67.
The county residence requirement was again extended to six months in 1861 and grants for poor houses were raised from $2,500 to $10,000. The law took notice of possible mistreatment.

The Illinois Public Assistance Laws Commission sums up the forms of administration of Illinois poor law for the period of the second state constitution (1848-1870) as follows:

Briefly, there were then four forms of administration, that by the city, town or village; that by the county not under township organization; and two forms for the counties under township organization, those vesting taxing authority in the townships, and those vesting it in the counties.18

The law of 1870 did not contain authority for cities and towns to levy taxes for, and administer, poor relief. Thus this form of administration was discontinued. The changes of this law left administration with counties under the following different patterns:

1. Counties with commission form of government: the county commissioners in these counties had total responsibility for the administration of poor relief designating either a justice of the peace or other suitable person in each precinct to direct oversight of the poor.

2. Counties with township system of organization:
   a) Those counties which voted to finance poor relief by towns left the total responsibility with the township supervisor or overseer of the poor, but retained as a county responsibility the operation of the poorhouse.

18 Ibid., p. 68.
b) Those counties which financed poor relief from county funds, but left the principle administrative responsibility with the township supervisor or overseer of the poor.\(^19\)

The pauper act of 1874 was a combination of the new governmental measures contained in the constitution, the previous act as amended through the years, and the additions setting forth the methods of administration more exactly. This act was not amended, except for minor details, up to 1931. There was in the act a miscellaneous provision which indicated a growing attempt to classify paupers and individualize their needs. It was the provision allowing county boards to pay a just and equitable sum of money for the tuition of pauper children residing in county poorhouses and attending district schools.

There were only three significant additions to this law prior to 1931. One, in 1889, provided for the increase in the number of months on which chargeability was determined from six to seventeen. The second one, in 1919, prohibited the placement of males under the age of seventeen and females under the age of eighteen in poorhouses. It also prohibited the placement of any feeble-minded girls or women under forty-five in poorhouses. The third one, added also in 1919, provided for filing a copy of the overseer’s account or report to the county clerk with the State Department of Public Welfare.\(^20\)

Throughout the history of public welfare in Illinois the principle of local responsibility has been most apparent. The interests of the state in the needy and unfortunate were at first limited to providing

\[^{19}\text{Ibid., pp. 68, 69.}\]
\[^{20}\text{Ibid., pp. 70, 71.}\]
state institutions for certain groups. The state did not exercise supervision over local administration until 1932. Many state institutions were established in Illinois down through the years. Each type of these institutions had signaled out a group of people whom the ordinary social and economic structure of the local community, counting the poor law, had not benefited in a manner specifically suited to their condition. These persons benefit either by special education or treatment so that they may return to the community as self-supporting members or be housed and cared for in a self-respecting manner away from the community for its protection. These institutions include asylums for the education of the deaf and dumb, hospitals for the insane, psychopathic institutions, homes for the blind, reform schools, penitentiaries, homes and institutions for the feebleminded, for epileptics, and children's hospitals. The rise of the categories as we call them today can be seen from a listing of these institutions.

A milestone in categorical assistance was reached when a new type of service was undertaken in 1903 with the passage of the Blind Relief Law. This law authorized counties to pay pensions of $150 a year to blind persons having annual incomes of less than $250. The aid was given in cash grants to blind persons in their own homes. The amount given was increased from time to time and in 1927 it was set at $365, and the State was to contribute one half of this to the counties. This was the beginning of state grants-in-aid to localities in meeting the costs of public assistance to needy persons in their own homes. There was at this time no state supervision, however, of these expenditures by the counties. The law
continued in effect until 1944 at which time a state- and federal-financed Blind Assistance program took over the care of all needy blind persons formerly assisted under the Act of 1903.

The second main category developed in Illinois was the Mother's Pension program. The first law, known as the "Funds to Parents Law" was passed in 1911. It gave aid to boys under seventeen and girls under eighteen who were without resources and whose welfare would best be served by keeping their homes together. The law of 1913 defined beneficiaries as mothers who were widowed or whose husbands were permanently incapacitated and their children, usually up to the age of 14. The grants were meager.

As a result of a report made by a special committee on the Mother's Aid Program, of the Juvenile Court, the maximum benefit per family was removed in that year and a maximum per child was substituted. State funds were finally added to county funds in 1929, not to exceed one half of total cost. Despite this help, the mother's pensions were limited in amount in some instances, to the extent of frustrating the purpose of the law. There were never sufficient funds to meet the needs of all eligible families in each county. This program was in effect until 1942 when a state- and federal-financed program took over the care of these children.

In 1925 a law was passed establishing a Bureau of Public Welfare in all counties of more than 500,000. This meant Cook County and so one actual county unification of administration was achieved. It brought together the administration of Pauper Relief, Blind Relief, court services and many other related activities. Though legally unemployment relief is still
under the authority of the Bureau, actually the Bureau stopped administering this program in 1936 when the State, through the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, stopped administering unemployment relief directly, thus making relief once more the function of the cities and townships.

In looking over the history of poor relief in Illinois we see the following significant elements of it. Aid to the needy was recognised as a public responsibility towards residents demonstrating inability to support themselves or to receive aid from their family. In general aid was locally financed and administered, occasionally enjoying a sharing of financing by the state, eventually with state supervision, where complete state financing and direct state administration was had, local groups advised local state offices. Townships later in the history of Illinois poor relief emerged as a unit for levying taxes to support the poor. Today programs are on a county or township basis. Among the methods of granting general assistance were "farming out," indoor relief and outdoor relief. Today outdoor relief is the main method of care, and it is usually in cash. Indoor relief is restricted to the infirm, chronically ill and to those unable to adjust to normal community living.

Early in the history, particular groups of needy or handicapped persons began to be singled out from those aided under poor relief laws and other provisions were made for their care. This "categorisation" reflected the first recognition of social, economic or medical causes of dependency. Since 1821 public responsibility for those sick unable to meet medical and hospital costs have been included in the law. These people are recognised as
a special category distinct from other poor persons, but they are cared for by poor relief officials, while responsibility for the other categories has been placed with the state. During the early 1930's unemployment due to business conditions was recognized as an unavoidable cause of dependency. Out of the temporary unemployment relief programs of that decade developed an extensive pattern of federal and state participation in programs for the needy. Influenced by this movement poor law practices and concepts altered, though the law remained substantially that of 1874.

Looking back now, this chapter has presented a brief history of poor relief as the predecessor of general assistance in the United States and in Illinois from earliest times until the depression. The following chapter will present a history of the rise of the private charities or agencies and their role in the history of poor relief as it evolved into general assistance.
CHAPTER II

PRIVATE AGENCIES AND GENERAL ASSISTANCE

This chapter will attempt to present the role and the contribution of private agencies or private charities in relation to the public agencies in the history of poor relief. The first chapter, a history of poor relief up to the emergence of general assistance, was actually a history of public administration of poor relief and of public agencies. We will now consider the significant movements of private charities in the history of poor relief and then, from a consideration of the attitude of people toward poor relief in earlier days, look to the role of the private charities as compared to public poor relief administration. It will then be time to introduce the Central Charity Bureau, Catholic Charities of Chicago, as it fitted into the picture of the private agencies in 1933 when it began its present program of administering general assistance as an agent of the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission.

Private charities might, from the start, be divided into two groups, the sectarian and the non-sectarian. The sectarian group can further be divided into Catholic, Jewish and Protestant agencies. A brief description of each group, their spirit, purpose, function and procedure will be given in so far as this is practical when putting all agencies of one
denomination under a single heading. Such a general history of the private charities is thought to be justified in its presentation as background for picturing the general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau, because, while general assistance is today a very narrow and technical term, historically it was very broad and all inclusive, antedating categorical assistance.

In describing the rise of private charities we must realize that much of the present-day social work springs from the charity of Christianity. The Christian teachings which enjoined the giving of alms to the poor, shelter to the homeless, and comfort to the sick, placed a spiritual premium on the expression of these charitable impulses. Though this charity was largely an individual matter, still it was quickly moulded into institutional forms through the efforts of organized churches, monasteries and convents. With the dissolution of the monasteries in England during the time of Henry VIII, more and more of the services they provided were assumed by individuals or church congregations.

It is easy to see how this private charity existed without organization or coordination of efforts. The Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601 was a legal attempt to bring order to the chaos of public relief in England, but private charity remained unorganized for another century. The earliest organized system of private charity came from Germany and was called the Hamburg-Elberfeld system. The influence of this system was to be felt in England and America. A central bureau was established in Hamburg to supervise all work among the poor and to bring together all charitable agencies
under one management. The city was subdivided into districts small enough to enable a citizen-visitor to investigate the condition of all paupers and semi-paupers. Work facilities were provided for the able-bodied poor. The visitors served without pay and were under the direction of public officials known as supervisors of the poor.

As the work expanded from its beginnings in Hamburg in 1711 to its elaboration in Elberfeld after 1788, additional services were established. A free lodging house was instituted for transients, improved dwellings for the poor were secured by placing responsibility for such services on a housing supervisor, and in 1801 an infant school was opened.

The Hamburg-Elberfeld system early enunciated principles which underlay the later Charity Organization movement in England and America. Turning first to England, the English Poor Law revision of 1834 made poor relief restrictive and punitive. As a reaction to this laissez-faire philosophy, some recognized that there were forces outside the individual which produced poverty, ill-health and even crime. This reaction found a partial expression in the establishment of the London Charity Organization Society in 1869.¹

careful investigations of appeals for help and a city-wide registration of applicants. 2

The C.O.S., as it came to be called, embodied the idea of a central committee to whom district committees would be answerable. The district committees acted as a clearing house and central registration bureau. They relieved, after thorough investigation, such distress as fell outside the Poor Law. Working with Poor Law officials, they avoided overlapping or duplication of services. This society thus became a pioneer for other cities, principally in the United States. 3

The scene now shifts to America. The first notable non-sectarian group in this country was formed in 1817. The New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism was formed by a group of men in New York, including some Quakers. These men aimed to attack the problems of destitution, then increasing rapidly in the city. The Society divided the city into small districts manned by two or three visitors. Measures were taken to prevent begging on the streets and to restrict saloons. Savings banks and employment bureaus were established. Life insurance and benefit societies were promoted and Sunday schools were encouraged. Materials were even supplied for home workers. Finally, means were sought to create one channel for all charitable giving in the city. 4

------------

3 Fink, The Field of Social Work, p. 15.
Thus we see the beginnings of community-wide private organizations to solve the problem of destitution in a non-institutional way.

Another significant development along this line was the founding in New York of the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor in 1843. This association was created to counteract grave social conditions, to integrate the increasingly large numbers of small, mushroom-like private agencies which had sprung into existence to meet the crises of the period. In form and in spirit the Association became the dominant charity agency of its kind for the thirty years following its inception.

A "visitor" system was used, dividing the city into twenty two districts, these in turn being divided into 225 subdistricts. A visitor could easily call from each subdistrict at the home of each applicant for assistance. The methodology of the Association was seen in the pledge of the visitor. He was to withhold all relief from unknown persons, to visit the homes of the clients "who appeared to require benevolent services, and, by discriminating and judicious relief combined with admonitions to prudence, thrift, diligence, and temperance, to help them to discover those hidden springs of virtue within themselves from which alone their prosperity might flow."

The Association itself gave no money and only such items of food and clothing which would be least liable to be abused. Any financial aid was given by other agencies, by relatives of the needy person or by the visitor personally. Recipients had to abstain from drink, send their young children

---

5 Ibid., p. 46.
to school and place their older children in foster homes.

By 1875 twenty-nine cities had programs patterned after the Association in New York. The Children's Aid Society, (1854), the Workmen's Home, and the Society for the Relief of the Ruptured and Crippled were largely products of the influence of the Association.

As the Association developed, it lost a great part of its reforming and altruistic zeal and became more characteristically a relief-granting agency. Some of the fundamental principles on which the Association operated became a lasting part of social work practice. They were: relief ought to be based on an inquiry into the needs of the recipient; a distinct system equipped with local workers, including volunteers, offers the best method of relief distribution. Certain conditions, such as temperance, school attendance, and vocational training, should be insisted on. Beggars and the wilfully dependent should be deterred by making their lot less comfortable than able-bodied workers.6

The next significant private charities movement in the United States was the Charity Organization movement, brought over from England. The C.O.S. came to America in 1877. It was the depression of 1870 that pointed up the still distressing condition of the poor and the deficiency of existing machinery for their care. The Charity Organization movement was an

6 Ibid., pp. 16, 47.
attempt to modify this condition.\textsuperscript{7} It was introduced in Buffalo by an Episcopal rector who had served on one of the district committees in London. Although earlier societies, such as the Associations for Improving the Conditions of the Poor, mentioned above, united charities and relief societies, had used the methods of investigation and case records, they had not used the district conferences. The new movement displaced some of these older organizations, combined with others, and spread over unorganized urban communities with great rapidity.\textsuperscript{8} It followed the district plan of the Association for Improving the Conditions of the Poor, dividing the city into eight districts which were administered by male district committeemen. These men were assisted by women from the wealthier groups, called "friendly visitors."

The society stressed its function as one not endangering the existence of other agencies. It aimed to build on what already existed. It declared that it would be impartial in the treatment of its cases, making no distinctions as to religion, nationality or politics. Nor would it administer financial assistance directly to any client, but made referrals to such agencies as could aid the client directly. To have done otherwise would have brought the Society's career to a speedy and ignominious ending.\textsuperscript{9}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{7} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 47.
  \item \textsuperscript{8} Bruno, \textit{Trends in Social Work}, p. 98.
  \item \textsuperscript{9} Stroup, \textit{Social Work}, p. 48.
\end{itemize}
The Society was against outdoor relief, and through its efforts the appropriations for this purpose were decreased in three years (1877-1879) from $100,000 to $28,000. The charity organization movement spread from Buffalo to New Haven, Pennsylvania, Brooklyn, Boston, Indianapolis, Detroit, Cincinnati, Baltimore, Washington, New York, Newark, and many other places.

As this movement grew, it took on new features. In these new features we can see reflected the beginnings of the trend in welfare work toward specialized care for special groups, toward categorical assistance, away from the all-inclusive poor relief of Elizabethan Poor Laws. The new features were:

1. In a number of cities loan departments were established as a better aid to the poor financially than pawnshops.

2. The need for creating living quarters for homeless men and women was recognized. Thus these folk would not be forced to sleep out-of-doors, in jails or elsewhere.

3. The societies learned that disaster relief should become a part of their programs.

4. Publications, like *Survey Graphic, Survey Midmonthly*, were put out to bring intelligent information to the public and the social workers.

5. As private welfare organizations firmly grew, the need for the inter-relating of various agencies in the field was recognized. The Council of Charity Officers was one of the first supra-agency organizations founded

---

to meet the need. This was followed on a national level by the American Association for Organizing Family Social Work, and later, the Family Welfare Association, now the Family Service Association of America.

6. In certain localities strong measures were taken to enforce existing legislation on bad housing and to encourage new legislation to improve housing.

7. Efforts were made to provide separate courts, workers and institutions for juvenile delinquents.

8. Efforts were made to provide health education, medical examination and medical care for those who suffered tuberculosis.

9. Recognizing that in certain instances the needs of clients could be better served through detailed legal services, the societies endeavored to cooperate with the legal aid societies existing in numerous cities.

10. Training programs for social workers were initiated, some growing into several present-day graduate professional schools.

11. The method by which the social worker approached the client was modified.

Today there are private agencies interested in child care, agencies for placing children in foster homes, agencies for handling the educational problems of children, agencies for aiding the handicapped, child

11 Ibid., pp. 49, 50.
guidance clinics and so on.

Now we turn to the sectarian group, and consider the three main
groups of private sectarian charities or agencies. As was true in England,
religious groups, as private organizations, assumed a major share of the
charity in earlier American history. In carrying out this function, they
were taking up the teachings of Christianity and were supported by the then
current social and political philosophy. A church, as the center of
community life readily assumed the role of administering charity.
Communities moreover, in colonial America were more homogeneous from the
religious viewpoint than our modern urban communities, thus aiding in the
administration of church charities.

Speaking in general of the methods used by church leaders in
earlier days, the leaders did not feel the need to make rigorous investi-
gations of the needy. They knew first hand the needs of their community and
its members. And later on, when in expanding communities there was need for
investigation, they did not change their ways. Hence their efforts were
meager where they were made at all. Much of what was done was done on the
basis of sympathy, and this characterizes the sectarian social work of those
days. It should be noted that religious workers gave assistance in the
home. They might not aid persons of different religious affiliations or
those who repeatedly neglected moral admonitions of the worker. Church
charity was obviously limited because its funds came entirely from its own

12 Ibid., p. 42.
resources.

The first main group to be considered is the Catholic Church. Catholics consider their welfare work, and hence their work in dispensing general assistance, as an obligation imposed by their religion, by the teachings of Christ. Concern for the poor is an obligation laid on each individual and so dispensing of charity is primarily a matter of each parish, of which there are over 11,000 in this country. The bishop of each diocese has the largest obligation to care for the poor of his flock so the parishes are organized in their efforts on a diocesan level.

Catholic agencies are represented nationally by the National Conference of Catholic Charities. This Conference has been active since 1910 in bringing together all groups interested in Catholic welfare work. Under a bishop appointed by the Hierarchy of the United States, the Conference seeks to bring about an interchange of views on the theory and practice of Catholic welfare work; to encourage and publish literature pertaining to this work, such as the Catholic Charities Review; to aid in the discussion of standards in relief and prevention work, and to assist in organizing additional Catholic welfare facilities where the need exists.

The conference has held an annual meeting since 1920 to help in the attainment of these objectives.

As has been indicated, within each of the 117 dioceses the bishop plans and directs the welfare activities. Usually the bishop's responsibility is delegated to a trained priest who is called a director of charities or a similar title, and he is responsible for almost all welfare
work carried on in each diocese.

An important group in Catholic welfare work and pertinent to this study later on is the St. Vincent de Paul Society. Founded in 1833 in France, it was inaugurated in the United States in 1845. While the Society was composed of Catholic laymen, operates on the parish level, it is not entirely identified with the diocesan programs of welfare work. It maintains its own organization structure, extending from the local parish to the Superior Council of the United States. The chief work of the Society is the visitation of the poor and unfortunate in their own homes. The visitors are unpaid workers who are supervised by paid, trained workers.

Among its activities, the Society includes: religious counseling, supplementing family income, help in the religious training of children, assistance in obtaining dental or medical care, the maintenance of rest rooms, lodging homes, homes for transient and homeless men, visitations to hospitals and penal institutions, work on behalf of Catholic seamen, support of boarding homes for working boys, and the placement of dependant children in free foster homes. They may do this work independently or in conjunction with a local Catholic Charities. It will be seen later that St. Vincent de Paul workers assist Catholic Charity Bureau of Chicago in dispensing general assistance.

Other Catholic organizations active on a national basis are:

Diocesan Council of Catholic Women, Ladies of Charity, Christ Child Society,
Catholic Daughters of America, Catholic Big Sisters and Sword of the Spirit.13

The next main group in private charities are the Jewish welfare agencies. Stroup says of them, "In the main, Jewish social work lacks a highly integrated form of central coordination and management."14 Jewish welfare work is most extensive and organized in New York City where almost half of the 5,000,000 Jews of the United States live. It consists of many kinds of service, but one of the stronger elements of it is family social work.15

There is a National Jewish Welfare Board which consisted in 1948 of a membership of 311 local organizations and 450,000 individuals. This is one of the most effective of the national, coordinating Jewish social work organizations. Founded in 1917, it promotes the creation of Jewish community centers and Y's, gives counsel to such agencies and correlates their activities, cooperates with other organizations for the promotion of Judaism and good citizenship, and contributes to the social welfare of members of the armed forces.

Other Jewish organizations on a national scale are: The National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare, the Council of Jewish

---

14 Stroup, Social Work, p. 57.
15 Ibid., p. 57.
Federations and Welfare Funds, and, for overseas work the United Jewish
Appeal.

Turning now to the third main group in private charities, we
will now consider briefly Protestant welfare work. Herbert Stroup says
that it is not easy to trace the full scope of Protestant welfare work or
its exact social meaning. 16

Such organisations as the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, and the
Salvation Army further confuse the definition of Protest-
tant social work. These organisations owe allegiance to no
particular denominations, but are largely supported by
Protestants, although a nonsectarian program is generally
offered. Furthermore, a large number of agencies which
formerly were rather distinctively Protestant in their
founding and direction have more recently become nonsec-
tarian in personnel, composition and in client constituency. 17

While Protestants may not have developed casework services to
the extent other groups have, they have created and maintained notable
institutional service. Though institutional service in private charities
is not too pertinent here, for the sake of completing the picture of
private charities, Protestant works in this line are listed briefly. They
include: settlement houses, institutions for dependent and neglected chil-
dren, day nurseries, foster home programs, counseling, summer camps,
schools and colleges. Homes for the aged and hospitals abound in
Protestant welfare activities.

----------------

16 Ibid., p. 58.

17 Ibid.
The question now arises, where have these private agencies fitted into the historical picture of poor relief as it evolved into outdoor relief and then into general assistance? Briefly the picture was this. In England practically all charity was private up to the "Elizabethan poor laws." In 1869 the C.O.S. was the main relief-giving organization in London and it worked in cooperation with poor law officials.

The New York Society for the Prevention of Pauperism was a vital force amidst the destitution of 1817 in New York City. By 1843 there were a large number of "small mushroom-like private agencies" that had sprung up to meet the crisis of the time.18 And by 1875 twenty-nine cities had programs similar to the Association for Improving the Condition of the Poor of New York, whose aim was to integrate the increasingly large numbers of small mushroom-like agencies.

It is informative to know that public outdoor relief was cut off in the winter of 1879 in Philadelphia and Brooklyn, admittedly because "it was prostituted to political ends."19 This charge against public agencies was made vociferously up till about 1915, and little attempt was made to deny it. Josephine Brown attributes the quick rise of the private charity organization societies to a reaction "to the spread of abuse and corruption in public relief which followed the depression of 1873," and

---

18 Confer above, p. 22.

19 Brown, Public Relief, p. 11.
that this resulted in the abolition of public outdoor relief in eight of
our largest cities, not again undertaken to any degree until the depression
of 1929.20

The depression of 1893-94 revealed the strength of the private
agencies at that time. They had outstripped the public agencies in the
interval since the previous depression.21

In 1897 it was reported at the National Conference of
Charities and Correction that "the state assists more widows, orphans,
defectives, prisoners, aged persons and sick than all church and private
persons combined." But note the inclusion of prisoners and recall that
such a statement was based on unrefined statistics that tell nothing of the
actual amount and quality of services rendered to these recipients. Up to
the depression it was always in the kind and extent of services rendered to
each individual that private charities outstripped the public agencies.
Private agencies handled the bulk of outdoor relief up to the early 20's,
while the dispute over public outdoor relief was carried on from the time
of Malthus (1834) up to the depression. The dispute represented an attempt
to get more public outdoor relief.

From 1910 to 1935 the rate of increase in public relief

20 Ibid., p. 40.

21 Leah H. Feder, Unemployment Relief in Periods of
Depression: A Study of Measures Adopted in Certain American Cities, New
York, 1936, p. 126.
expenditures was more rapid than the growth in population and was much
greater than the rate of increase of all governmental expenditures combined.

what little public outdoor relief was carried on was on the
local level. Actually private family welfare societies assumed the task of
"socializing" the local public welfare departments.23

The social work world was dominated by private agency attitudes,
philosophy and methods. It was a shock, then, to all social workers, public
and private, when the Bureau of Social Statistics revealed that in 1928 71.6%
of all relief in 15 important cities was from public funds. And they had to
swallow this shock when the 1929 returns to the Bureau confirmed the earlier
report in showing that "the lion's share of the rising burden of relief in at
least twenty-two American cities, is born by the taxpayers."24

During the first two years of the depression, 1929-1931, private
agencies made a valiant attempt to carry staggering loads and, under the
greatest pressure, to justify the faith of their leaders in the superiority of
their methods over those of the public system. But in the midst of their
losing struggle to raise adequate funds and to care for the growing army of
unemployed, they had to acknowledge government responsibility and push for
public funds.

22 Anne E. Geddes, Trends in Relief Expenditures, 1910-1935,
Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration.

23 Brown, Public Relief, p. 52.

24 A. W. McMillen, "Taxes and Private Relief Funds," Mid-monthly
Survey, November, 1930.
Looking back over the history of private charities, we find that they have made the following contributions to the welfare of the nation. They have saved the taxpayers vast sums of money by raising private funds and providing the services of trained personnel, office space and general overhead. They have given initiative and social achievement to the welfare of the people, representing "a consciousness of the rights and privileges of a community by its own members. They have represented a deep and more personal interest in insuring the welfare of a community by those who are a part of it."25 They have nourished individual moral responsibility in a group of people undertaking to solve a problem or meet an emergency without running to the state for money.26

The contributions of private charities in methodology have always been recognized, even by those who were arguing for public outdoor relief. For example:

In the relief field the substitution of a scientific budgeting procedure for the earlier system of haphazard doles is largely a product of private agency effort.27

Their high standards and organization stood out in the days when political abuse and corruption made a farce of what public outdoor relief was given. The superiority of their personnel was always acknowledged but never more

25 Revérend Bernard M. Brogan, The Catholic Philosophy of Child Care, Chicago, the Catholic Charity Bureau, N.D.

26 The reader is referred to Paul McGuire, There's Freedom for the Brave, New York, 1949, for a fuller treatment of this line of thought.

fully than when the federal government, suddenly faced with the huge task of administering unemployment relief during the depression, had to turn to the private agencies for personnel and help in setting up the program.

Public and private agencies have not always worked well together, but during the depression when private charities were forced to acknowledge government responsibility in outdoor relief and to petition the federal government to take action, this problem was largely dissolved. At least the controversy over public outdoor relief was ended, and any dissen-
sion between public and private agencies revolves now around a division of work. And it was at this time that the Catholic Charity Bureau, then the Central Charity Bureau of Chicago, turned to the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission for funds to carry on their general assistance program. Now to the Catholic Charity Bureau, dispensing general assistance as an agent of the Chicago Welfare Department.
CHAPTER III

THE GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF THE CATHOLIC CHARITY

BUREAU: ITS HISTORY AND ADMINISTRATION

This chapter is a study of the general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau of Chicago, Family Division, Public Case Section. It is essential to see this section of the Catholic Charities program in its proper setting. Charity towards one's neighbor in need is an individual responsibility imposed on all by Christ in His teachings. Still, in each diocese set up by the Holy See, charity to the poor is the responsibility, not merely of the individual Catholic layman, but also of the parish priest and his assistants, and most especially of the bishop of a diocese as pastor of his flock. Accordingly then, all organized charity in any given diocese is centered in one responsible head, the bishop, with the individual members of the Church obligated by their religion to help the bishop, officially or unofficially, minister to his poor. Responsibility for charity is personal and corporative.

The Chicago Archdiocese was the first to organize its Catholic charitable activity. This it did in 1918, two years ahead of the organization of the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York.

The characteristic feature of the plan was the creation of a double organization, one for financing, and the other for operation, coordination and supervisory control. As far as is known, this unusual division of responsibility is not followed by the organized Catholic Charities or any other
The first of these organizations is known as the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago, Incorporated. It was chartered by the State of Illinois on January 21, 1918, as the Associated Catholic Charities of Chicago, receiving its present name when the charter was amended on May 12, 1925. According to its by-laws, "the purpose of this organization shall be to combine and place under central control the collection of money for the Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Chicago." Besides centralizing the collection of funds for use of designated Catholic charitable agencies, Catholic Charities represents these combined agencies in negotiations with civic fund-raising organizations.

The second organization under the Cardinal Archbishop in Chicago is the Catholic Charity Bureau. Unincorporated, it was established by the Archbishop of Chicago in March, 1918, the same month the Associated Catholic Charities drive for funds began, and until 1939 was known, as the Central Charity Bureau. "It is the office for charity of the Archbishop, a department for the administration of charitable affairs under the direct control of the Archbishop."

------------------

1 Personal interview with Msgr. V. A. Cooke, Archdiocesan Supervisor of Charities, July 3, 1951.

2 Ibid., pp. 25, 26.

3 Article II, By-Laws, Catholic Charities of Chicago.

4 Service Report, Catholic Charity Bureau, 1951, Forward.

5 Interview with Msgr. Cooke, July 3, 1951.

6 Service Report, Forward.
The Archdiocesan Supervisor of Charities, a priest appointed by the Archbishop, is the executive of the Bureau.

His duty and the function of the Catholic Charity Bureau, is to distribute the funds raised by Catholic Charities, to coordinate and supervise the social programs of Catholic agencies and institutions, and to determine the need for the extension of charitable work in the Archdiocese...7

It should be noted that the individual Catholic agencies and institutions are, in general, autonomous, while the function of the Catholic Charity Bureau is to provide each agency with "direct and helpful interest in problems, and assistance in meeting them. Thus it establishes a close relationship to the central organization."8 This unique plan of dual organization, providing for two agencies working in close and complete harmony, has worked well over the years.

Decentralized as to administration, with responsibility and initiative remaining in each institution and agency, centralized as to effective coordination, general supervision and public acceptance, a very great volume of charitable work of inestimable social value to the community is represented by the Catholic Charities and the Catholic Charity Bureau.9

We must further break down the function of the Catholic Charity Bureau to get a better picture of how it is the operating agency; coordinating, supervising, and distributing funds to the various agencies, institutions and its own operating programs. In this way we will come to see just where the general assistance program fits in. First of all, to tie things together,

---

7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
it should be mentioned that the Archdiocesan Supervisor of Charities is the liaison officer between Catholic Charities and the Catholic Charity Bureau.

This point, as well as other points of organization to be discussed below, is pictured on the attached organizational chart of the Catholic Charities Program of Chicago. Note that there is no direct administrative connection between the two bodies.

At this point, we must introduce the St. Vincent de Paul Society. This society, operating on a parish level, is a volunteer organization, completely distinct and separate from the Catholic Charity Bureau, though working in closest relationship with it. Once again the Archdiocesan Supervisor of Charity is the connecting link between the two organizations, as he is also the spiritual director of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. Their close relationship might be exemplified by the following. "Since 1933 the assistance of the St. Vincent de Paul Society and the Catholic Charity Bureau has been accepted by the public authority in caring for Catholic families on public relief."\(^\text{10}\)

The St. Vincent de Paul Society has its own special works,\(^\text{11}\) but its biggest activity in Chicago since 1933 has been participation in the Catholic Charity Bureau general assistance program. A look at the organisational chart will show how the two organizations cooperate. There is no direct administrative connection between them until the two join forces in

\(^{10}\) Interview with Msgr. Cooke, July 3, 1951.

\(^{11}\) Confer Chapter II, p. 29 above.
administering the general assistance program. The part of the Vincentians in
the program will be described in more detail further on and different
evaluations of their work in relation to the whole program will be presented
in Chapter IV.

In reading the rest of the organizational chart, it must be kept
in mind that the Catholic Charity Bureau is a coordinating and supervisory
agency, while the individual Catholic agencies and institutions are,
generally speaking, autonomous. Thus, when we consider the whole program of
the Catholic Charity Bureau according to the type of care given, we can dis-
tinguish that care given by institutions, agencies and volunteer organiza-
tions (other than the St. Vincent de Paul Society) under the supervision of
the Catholic Charity Bureau from the care of clients given directly by the
Bureau. We are more concerned here with care given directly by the Catholic
Charity Bureau. And we find that "the major activity of the Catholic Charity
Bureau is the care of Catholic families in need of or receiving public
relief."12

The function of the Family Division is "to render services to
individuals and to families who are unable, without help, to meet the demands
of every day life in a manner which is socially acceptable and satisfying to
the individual."13 These services may be financial, medical, legal, housing,
counseling, psychiatric and psychological, employment and so on. The needs

12 Interview with Msgr. Cooke, July 3, 1951.
13 Service Report, p. 10.
CARE OF FAMILIES
Responsibility for care of family is shared or one organization assumes exclusive responsibility.

Private Funds: Funds of Parish Conference and funds budgeted for relief and service the Catholic Charity Bureau.

**Public Funds: Vincentians and C.C.B. act as cooperating agency in care of Catholic families receiving public relief in the City of Chicago.

*Vacation Care for Poor Families
*Settlement and Social Centers
*Protective Care

*Autonomous institutions and agencies under the coordination, supervision and with the financial help of the Catholic Charity Bureau.

**Focal Point of the study.

---

SYMBOLS

- Financial Assistance
- Coordination and Supervision
- Liaison for Cooperation
may be those of an aged person or of a minor, of an individual or a family. The financial needs of the client are met by the Private Case Section or the Public Case Section, depending on his eligibility or non-eligibility for general assistance. Both sections render not only financial help, but casework services, if needed.\textsuperscript{14}

It can now be repeated with meaning that the study at hand is of the general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau of Chicago, Family Division, Public Case Section. The way is now clear to describe in some detail the establishment of the general assistance program in the Catholic Charity Bureau, and the functioning of that program today in connection with the Chicago Department of Welfare. An evaluation of the program will follow in Chapter IV.

From 1918 until the depression, the only funds used by the Central Charity Bureau, as it was then called, were funds raised directly by the Catholic Charities, principally through contributions by Catholics. The Central Charity Bureau used these funds to meet the needs of Catholic institutions and the needs of Catholic poor families.\textsuperscript{15}

The impact of the depression was felt early by Cook County. By April of 1930, eleven percent of the workers in the county were unemployed and by January of 1931, the figure rose to twenty-nine percent. Up till this time the care of dependent families in the County rested mainly on five private family welfare agencies and two public relief agencies. The private

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., p. 11.

\textsuperscript{15} Interview with Msgr. Cooke, July 3, 1951.
agencies were the Jewish Social Service Bureau, Central Charity Bureau,
United Charities, American Red Cross and the Salvation Army. The two public
relief agencies were the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, and the
Mother's Aid Department of the Juvenile Court. These agencies were unable to
carry the burden. Governor Emerson, anxious to meet the crisis, established
in October of 1930, the Governor's Commission on Unemployment and Relief.16
The objective of this Commission was to raise private money in Cook County
for unemployment relief and to supervise its expenditures. The funds it
raised were to be expended "through designated agencies to meet the extra
burden caused by the unemployment emergency." It was up to the agencies
themselves to raise "their normal annual budgets."17 At this time the
director of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare reported that his
agency was giving supplementary relief to practically all families assisted
by the united Charities, Jewish Social Service Bureau and Catholic Charities.
This was a separate service to the needy, however, and did not represent
direct help to the private agencies.

16 George J. Klupar, Commissioner of Welfare, City of Chicago
Welfare Administration, "The Historical Background of the City of Chicago
Welfare Administration," address given Saturday, May 19, 1945, to a general
assembly of the staff of the Welfare Administration at City Council Chambers.
Typewritten, in files of Chicago Welfare Department.

17 Minutes of Governor's Commission, Executive Committee,

18 Minutes of Advisory Committee, Cook County Bureau of Public
Welfare, October 30, 1930.
The private funds of the Governor's Commission were, for the most part, given to private agencies, including Central Charity Bureau. They were exhausted by July 18, 1931, while unemployment continued to rise at an alarming rate.

In August of 1931, under the initiative of the Council of Social Agencies, a committee was formed to develop a plan for a joint fund-raising campaign for the year 1931-1932. The new fund was to be known as the Joint Emergency Relief Fund of Cook County. The aim of the new fund was:

1. To raise a community fund sufficient to underwrite and supplement, as necessary, the normal budget of the major family relief and service agencies.

2. To contribute to the maintenance of essential collateral service of other agencies "in an effort to conserve family life in Chicago on the basis of health standards." 19

In October of 1931, The Joint Emergency Relief Fund set up twelve Joint Emergency Relief Stations. These stations gave a separate relief service for the unemployed, thus expediting the service to this group and permitting the family agencies to continue with their regular work. The plan was that these stations should serve only the families of the unemployed whose situation was not complicated by other problems.

By January, 1932, the caseload of these relief stations was almost 35,000 and the financial commitments of the fund over $1,300,000. They were on the brink of closing. This situation seriously threatened the private

19 Minutes of the Governor's Commission of Unemployment and Relief, Executive Committee, August 17, 1931.
agencies, which were already straining under their overloads. Had the Joint Emergency Relief Stations closed, the private agencies would have been crushed under the added burden. It was at the height of this crisis that the Illinois legislature, on February 6, 1932, created the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission to receive and allocate state funds for relief. At the same time the legislature allocated $20,000,000 for the Commission to carry out the provisions of the act.

The Illinois Emergency Relief Commission avoided administering relief directly, allocating funds to selected agencies on the basis of emergency need over a limited period of time. The Commission stated that "wherever possible these agents shall be selected from the local established relief agencies, and where satisfactory standards of relief administration are maintained, the relief from the State funds shall be administered by the public agency." On March 1, 1932, the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare took over the Joint Emergency Relief Stations. Organised as the Unemployment Relief Service, these stations assumed the responsibility for furnishing

20 House Bill No. 1, Third Special Session, 57th General Assembly.
21 House Bill No. 2, Third Special Session, 57th General Assembly.
23 Ibid., p. 7.
relief to the unemployed,\textsuperscript{24} while the Field Service of Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare assumed responsibility for certain types of cases requiring long term treatment.\textsuperscript{25}

To carry this plan into effect, the Joint Emergency Relief Fund of Cook County, Incorporated...is hereby instructed to advise the five major family welfare agencies...to transfer as rapidly as practicable to the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, for complete relief, families in need of relief primarily because of unemployment now carried by them.\textsuperscript{26}

This letter cut off from the private agencies all state funds for unemployment relief and the Central Charity Bureau began at once to transfer these cases to Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare.\textsuperscript{27} In the meantime it continued to receive, until January 1, 1933, from the Joint Emergency Relief Fund, now called the Emergency Welfare Fund of Cook County, money for problem cases.\textsuperscript{28} These funds were partly private and partly allocations from the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission.

\textsuperscript{24} Letter of the Secretary of the Joint Emergency Relief Fund to Catholic Charities, March 10, 1932. Copy on file at CCB.

\textsuperscript{25} These included cases of persons sixty years or older, veterans, supplementation of mother's pension and blind pension, and cases involving difficult social situations. Confer Minutes of Advisory Board of Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, February 19, 1932.

\textsuperscript{26} Letter of the Secretary of the Joint Emergency Relief Fund to the five major family Welfare Agencies. Copy on file at CCB.

\textsuperscript{27} Interview with Mr. Frank Carey, Associate Director of Family Division, Catholic Charity Bureau.

\textsuperscript{28} Letter of the Secretary of the Emergency Welfare Fund to the President of Catholic Charities, March 20, 1933. Copy at CCB.
In the early part of July, 1932, the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission said that state funds for relief in Cook County would be exhausted by the end of the month. In the middle of July, 1932, Federal legislation was enacted to provide Federal Funds for relief purposes. In conformity with Federal legislation, Governor Emerson announced the reappointment of the existing members of the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission to receive and distribute Federal funds, and added three State officers ex-officio members. This was designated Illinois Emergency Relief Commission (Federal). IERC was originally to lapse July 1, 1933, but it was extended to August 1, 1935, by legislation.

The Central Charity Bureau from the first objected to turning over unemployment relief cases to the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare. It eventually appealed over the head of the Emergency Welfare Fund to the IERC (Federal) for the restoration of this function. In a meeting of September 16, 1932, the Commission voted 8 to 1 to modify the principle of distributing government funds only through government agencies. On October 14, action to implement was deferred until the chairman and the executive secretary could make recommendations as to whether the Commission should act as the administering agency.

29 Klupar, "The Historical Background..."

30 Emergency Relief and Construction Act, Title I, quoted by Brown, Public Relief, p. 124.

31 Minutes of IERC, September 16, 1932.

32 Ibid., October 14, 1932.
On November 11, 1932, a motion was made and carried by a vote of 8 to 2:

...that subject to the rules and regulations and decision of the Commission, in addition to the status it now has, the Central Charity Bureau, operating under the Emergency Welfare Fund of Cook County, is authorized to administer relief to Catholic families in Cook County in need of relief, and that all Catholic families now receiving relief, if they so request, be transferred to the Central Charity Bureau.33

At this time the Emergency Welfare Fund agreed to accept allocations from the Commission for the Central Charity Bureau. 34 The Fund was notified of the arrangement of the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission with Central Charity Bureau in a letter of the Executive Secretary of the Commission to the Secretary of the Fund.35 In referring to the action of the Commission, the letter said:

The application of the foregoing action, expanding the responsibility of the Central Charity Bureau, is necessarily contingent upon allocations against which the Bureau may incur obligations for relief, and subject to standards of relief administration on a qualified case work basis and the assurance of satisfactory control of relief commitments.

The Emergency Welfare Fund of Cook County is hereby requested to consider and prepare recommendations with respect to allocations and the necessary administrative procedures to make the foregoing action effective, in accordance with the duties of the Fund as agent of the Commission.

33 Ibid., November 11, 1932.


35 Dated November 15, 1932. Copy on file at CCB.
In a return letter, dated December 9, 1932, the Secretary of the Fund informed the Executive Secretary of the Commission that the Emergency Welfare Fund must have a statement of procedure from Central Charity Bureau in accepting new cases and an account of the standards of relief extended to them. He also wanted the plan of accounting of Central Charity Bureau to differentiate charges applicable to the Emergency Welfare Fund from those chargeable to the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission.

With these measures determined upon and approved by the Executive Committee of the Emergency Welfare Fund, it will then be in order for the Central Charity Bureau to submit a budget covering their anticipated relief load for both classifications to the Emergency Welfare Fund for approval.

Central Charity Bureau, according to the Secretary of the Emergency Welfare Fund, did not provide the proper division of cases and the Emergency Welfare Fund informed the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission that it assumed that all relief work of Catholic Charities was unemployment relief and as such was to be financed entirely by the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission. The Secretary of the Fund said this arrangement was accepted by Catholic Charities, representing the Central Charity Bureau, and was approved by the Commission. After January 1, 1933, the Emergency Welfare Fund operated on that basis.

36 Copy on file at CCB.

37 This gives us a good picture of how the Emergency Welfare Fund acted as agent of the IERC for Central Charity Bureau and of how it continued to dispense private funds to the private agencies for their problem cases of relief.

38 Letter to Mr. George Warren and Miss Lula Jean Elliott, of the Family Welfare Association of America, March 27, 1933. Copy on file at CCB.

39 Ibid.
A disagreement arose between Catholic Charities, again representing the Central Charity Bureau, and the Emergency Welfare Fund over funds allocated to it from October, 1932, through February, 1933. As a result, Catholic Charities proposed a division of cases and the Secretary of the Fund called upon the Family Welfare Association of America to conduct an audit and survey of the relief work of the Central Charity Bureau. The report was very favorable to the work of the Central Charity Bureau and will be referred to at length in the next chapter. The point here is that for the time being the Emergency Welfare Fund accepted the findings of the report and worked more harmoniously with the Central Charity Bureau.

The Federal Emergency Relief Act was passed in May, 1933. Harry L. Hopkins was made Federal Administrator on May 22 and the next day approved grants to five states, including Illinois. In a letter sent to the various states in June, 1933, Mr. Hopkins stated that public funds should be administered by public agencies. This ruling brought into question once again the arrangement between Illinois Emergency Relief Commission and Central Charity Bureau. In the Rules and Regulations of the FERA there was a provision for personnel loaned by private agencies. A public agency could make use of such personnel, provided:

1) ...it becomes for the time being an integral part of the public agency. The public agency must assume full responsibility over personnel loaned by the private agency.

2) That visible evidence of the integration into the public agency is provided as follows:
   a) the name of the public agency clearly set out on the office door so that clients may know that they are applying to a public agency for relief.

40 Issued on June 23 as the first section of Rules and Regulations, No. 1, effective August 1, 1933.
b) all order forms must be those of the public agency; receipts must be made out to the public agency; identification cards of relief workers must be as staff members of public agency and relief workers at all times in handling unemployment relief clients must report themselves as public agents or officials.

c) all bills for direct relief, wages for work relief, service or administration costs must be paid directly to the public agency; e.g., when grocery orders are issued by relief workers the bills must be paid by the public agency directly to the grocer and not through the private agency.

d) it is expected that on other matters than the determination of relief there will be cooperative relationships established between public agencies and private agencies, but the public agency shall not pay for supplemental services so rendered by private agencies.\[1\]

A meeting attended by representatives of IERC, Central Charity Bureau and the FERA was held on July 28, 1933, during which Harry Hopkins was consulted by telephone. Out of the meeting came the following agreement.

That as of August 1, 1933, in accordance with title (c) of the rules and regulations reading "use of personnel loaned by private agency," such part of the personnel...of the Central Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society as are now engaged or hereafter may be engaged in the distribution of relief for which funds are made available by the Commission, shall become, "for the time being an integral part" of the staff of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare.

That Mr. Joseph L. Moss, Director of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, shall assume, under the wording of paragraph 1 of said title (c) "full responsibility over personnel loaned" by the Central Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society and personnel so loaned shall serve without change unless Mr. Moss shall find their service to the needy unemployed unsatisfactory. In such case change shall be made only after consultation with and full opportunity for adjustment through Monsignor Cummings, Diocesan

\[1\] Rules and Regulations, No. 3, of the FERA, p. 2.
This arrangement continued in effect until 1936. In January of this year Federal funds were withdrawn for direct relief purposes and state funds were used entirely. Bills passed by the State legislature in February and April terminated the IERC as a relief dispensing body on July 1, 1936. The responsibility for the administration of relief after June 30, 1936, was placed on the City of Chicago and on the township supervisors outside of Chicago. This took relief work out of the hands of the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare, thus terminating that Bureau's arrangement with the Central Charity Bureau in relief work.

In the meantime, the Chicago City Council created the position of Commissioner of Relief for Chicago and appointed Mr. Leo M. Lyons, the Executive Secretary of the IERC, as commissioner. The new administration took over all the existing services from the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare. Mr. Lyons confirmed the arrangement with the Central Charity Bureau in a letter dated August 28, 1936.43

Therefore, in line with the general program of reduction and consolidation to conform to the laws of the State of Illinois, the Central Charity Bureau service will hereafter be considered as a part of the Family Service Division of the Chicago Relief Administration which, under present laws, is entirely separate and distinct from the Cook County Bureau of Public Welfare.44

---

42 Agenda, Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, Meeting of July 31, 1933.

43 Letter to the Supervisor of Charities, Central Charity Bureau, from Mr. Leo Lyons, Chicago Commissioner of Relief, August 28, 1936.

44 Ibid.
This administrative structure is still operating today and is seen on Form Adm-103, revised August, 1950, of the Chicago Welfare Department on the next page. Bulletin No. 2326 of the Chicago Welfare Department, issued August 16, 1950 breaks down the Family Division into four units; the Field Section, the Service Unit, the Catholic Charity Section and the Veteran's Relief Section. In reference to the Catholic Charity Bureau it states:

Catholic Charity Section receives applications for assistance from Catholic adults and families who elect to receive assistance through this unit. Determines eligibility for assistance on the same basis as does Application Division. Determines continued need and eligibility for assistance of recipients under care and provides assistance and services on the same basis as do Field Sections.

The actual procedure of the general assistance program of Catholic Charity Bureau today is very simple. The Family Division of Catholic Charity Bureau, Public Case Section, may be considered a branch office of the Family Division of the Chicago Welfare Department. Catholic Charity Bureau uses the same forms, the same procedures, the same budget standards in computing grants as does Chicago Welfare Department. Eligibility requirements are the same. There is one significant difference; Catholic Charity Bureau can accept only Catholic clients. On the other hand, Catholic clients are free to apply for relief either at Chicago Welfare Department or through the Catholic Charity Bureau. Here is how the program is operated through the Catholic Charity Bureau.

The need of poor families is usually first made known through a direct appeal to the parish priest. In Chicago, the priest will usually have two members of his parish Conference of the St. Vincent de Paul Society visit
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a family bringing with them a Chicago Welfare Department application for relief. This application is also an affidavit. The Vincentians, organized into groups of ten or fifteen laymen in a parish, have as their objective personal sanctification through helping others. They travel in pairs. In visiting poor families they act as accredited agents of the Chicago Welfare Department, serving without pay. The poor family is assisted in filling out the application for relief and the necessary home investigation is made at this time. The application is then sent to the Catholic Charity Bureau, where it is studied in accordance with the current policy of the Chicago Welfare Department.

This study and investigation usually takes one calendar week. Those cases taking longer and requiring immediate material receives emergency and temporary assistance from the St. Vincent de Paul Society.

When the necessary investigation is completed and the client accepted, a budget is prepared for the family. The budget includes the following items; recurrent--food, rent, fuel, gas, light, water, household incidentals and personal incidentals; variables--clothing, medical care, hospitalization, burials, transportation and moving, special items.

This monthly budget is sent to the Accounting Department of the Chicago Welfare Department where a cash relief check is drawn, payable, to the head of the family on relief. This check is sent to the Catholic Charity Bureau, and is then forwarded to the parish Conference whose members bring it
to the family while making their weekly visit.

Families in need in parishes where there is no parish Conference are directed by the priest to the Catholic Charity Bureau. Their application for relief is considered in the same manner by the investigation and is made directly by the Catholic Charity Bureau. Emergency and temporary help required by these families is given by the Catholic Charity Bureau from its own private resources. When these families are accepted for relief, the workers from the Catholic Charity Bureau visit the family and bring the check, or else the client comes to the Catholic Charity Bureau to pick up his check.

It is noteworthy that the volunteer workers, the Vincentians, do not attempt to handle difficult families requiring the care and service of trained personnel. It is also important to stress the point that no public subsidy is received either by the Catholic Charity Bureau or the St. Vincent de Paul Society in administering this general assistance program. The Chicago Welfare Department issues a check drawn payable to a particular family. The Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society do not benefit by this check; they merely pass it on to the family in need.

In former years, under the FERA and in the years immediately following the founding of the Chicago Relief Administration, the Catholic Charity Bureau did receive funds for the salaries and other expenses incurred by the Bureau in handling public relief cases, but this practice has been
discontinued to the further saving of government funds. The Bureau now supplies all services other than the relief grant itself at its own cost.\(^5\)

This is not a statistical study, but one can see what part of the Chicago Welfare Department general assistance program the Catholic Charity Bureau carries by comparing the number of cases handled by each, and the money given in grants by each, during May and June, 1951. In May the Catholic Charity Bureau carried 2.7% of the cases handled in the entire general assistance program of the Chicago Welfare Department, or 468 of the 17,313 cases. In June it carried 2.66% or 438 of the 16,422 cases handled that month. This is shown on table 1 below.

### TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>May, 1951</th>
<th>June, 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Welfare Department</td>
<td>17,313</td>
<td>16,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charity Bureau</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For May the Catholic Charity Bureau paid out a trifle more than 2.7% of the money spent by Chicago Welfare Department for grants in general assistance. In June it paid out 2% of the money spent by Chicago Welfare Department.

TABLE II

EXPENDITURES OF CHICAGO WELFARE DEPARTMENT FOR GENERAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May, 1951</th>
<th>June, 1951</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Welfare</td>
<td>$1,106,621.34</td>
<td>$1,265,670.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Charity</td>
<td>30,376.52</td>
<td>25,426.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actually, then, the work of the Catholic Charity Bureau is very little in relation to the whole general assistance load of the Chicago Welfare Department. This may be surprising in view of the high percentage of Catholics in the city of Chicago, but it should be remembered that only those Catholic families receive public relief through the Catholic Charity Bureau who elect to do so. Catholics are free to apply directly to the Chicago Welfare Department for relief, which many families do. And others may get relief from the Chicago Welfare Department through the Veterans' Section.

Furthermore, the Catholic Charity Bureau does much more extensive work with Catholic families not eligible for public assistance. The Private Case Section of the Family Division has averaged around 1800 cases for the last several months. Of 1813 such cases had in April of this year, only 3½ persons needed financial aid. The rest were given care and service in working out their social problems.

Getting back to the actual general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau, there remains but one point to complete our picture, and that has to do with the source of funds. Briefly the general assistance
funds given to Catholic families through the Catholic Charity Bureau come from the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois. The City of Chicago levies a tax "for relief of needy persons." It then submits a budget of its anticipated relief needs through the Chicago Welfare Department to the Illinois Public Aid Commission. This Commission is the successor of the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission (Federal) and has the following functions. It is to cooperate with counties, townships and any other municipal corporations charged by law with the duty of poor relief and with other local relief agencies. It does that in this way. It administers the categorical programs and supervises the local agencies dispensing this aid. Finally the IPAC as agent of the State for receiving and distributing Federal funds or commodities for relief purposes. In the general assistance program of the Chicago Welfare Department, after the Commission approves OWID's estimated budget, it allocates funds on a deficit basis. In 1945, for example, the deficit was 43.2%, amounting to $3,513,343.47 But this varies each year.

This concludes our presentation of the general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau, acting as agent of the Chicago Welfare Department. Chapter IV will give various evaluations of this program.

------------------

47 A Retrospective Report, City of Chicago Welfare Administration, 1945, p. 35.
CHAPTER IV

AN EVALUATION OF THE GENERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
ADMINISTERED BY THE CATHOLIC CHARITY BUREAU

There are many possible ways of evaluating the general assistance program administered by the Catholic Charity Bureau. There are numerous aspects of the program that could be considered and compared. For example, one might compare the standard case load of the workers from Chicago Welfare Department with that of workers from the Catholic Charity Bureau. Or the average length of time cases are active at both organizations might be compared. But in view of all the factors that would have to be considered and weighed in such a manner of evaluating, it seems evident that conclusions drawn would be at best merely probable. Consider for a moment the standard case load at Chicago Welfare Department. It is 125 active cases. At the Catholic Charity Bureau it is 115. But at Chicago Welfare Department, when the average case load rises to 133 or better, new workers are taken on, thus lowering the average case load. When the case load drops below 117, workers are laid off or transferred, thus raising the average case load. At the Catholic Charity Bureau, on the other hand, the case load could go as high as 135 active cases and stay there without new workers being taken on. Or it could drop to 95 or less without workers being laid off. Clearly, then, a statistical study would be necessary before one could conclude that over a ten-year period one organization had done a more effective job on the basis
of caseload. Even then the general conclusion could be very misleading, if, for example, it was found that for four years the case load at Catholic Charity Bureau was around 100, and for six years it was around 135, while the case load at Chicago Welfare Department remained between 117 and 133 for the whole time.

As for a comparison of the average length of time cases remain active, the author was told at Chicago Welfare Department that there were no figures that could be used for a true comparison. Cases that are closed and reopened later on complicate the picture as these may be listed as active for one year while actually they were inactive for six months of that year.

These two examples serve to show that a detailed comparison of various aspects of the general assistance program at the Catholic Charity Bureau and Chicago Welfare Department would be highly speculative and not to our purpose in this thesis. More to our purpose would be an overall evaluation of the Catholic Charity Bureau Program by the Catholic Charity Bureau itself, by the Chicago Welfare Department, and by some outside, impartial organization. Fortunately for our purpose there is on file at the Catholic Charity Bureau a study by the Family Welfare Association of America evaluating the general assistance program when it was first set up in 1933. This study was made at the request of the Emergency Welfare Fund.¹ Though this study was made over seventeen years ago, it evaluated the program, not

¹ Letter of the Secretary of the Emergency Welfare Fund to George Warren and Lula Jean Elliott of the Family Welfare Association of America, March 27, 1932. Copy on file at CCB.
only as it was then operating, but also in its potential. The program has remained essentially unchanged over the years. It worked well then, it is working better now, and this for the simple reason that case workers are more highly trained today and newer methods are being employed.

The first evaluation will be that of the Family Welfare Association, because, as was mentioned, this study evaluated the program in its potential and as it was operating in 1933, a crucial time in social work. Also, this was the first evaluation made.

In a letter of transmittal to the secretary of the Emergency Welfare Fund, Mr. George Warren, one of the authors of the study, says:

As you will see from the report we interpreted your letter of March 27... as authorization to study and appraise the work of the Bureau with an open mind and in the hope that helpful suggestions might be developed of value not only to the Bureau but to the community at large. In making the study we were impressed with the significance of the present organization, the degree to which it has been successful in developing its corps of volunteer workers, and the distinct possibilities which the Bureau presents for developing an agency which may well in the future provide an interesting pattern of organization. 2

In analyzing the significance of the organization and the work of the Central Charity Bureau, the report had this to say:

A study of the work of the Central Charity Bureau offers an opportunity to observe probably the most serious attempt on the part of any social agency in the United States to organize volunteers on a large scale for service to families in need. Unfortunately, in the past comparisons have too often been made between the effectiveness of volunteer and trained workers in relief work based on the erroneous assumption that either one or the other group should preempt the field.

2 Copy on file at CCB
...The outstanding fact to be emphasized is that the challenge of the depression has intensified the need that has always existed that volunteer and professional find that happy unity of effort that would give full play to the different, valuable and needed contributions of both...

The community at large should be better acquainted with the spectacle of four thousand men visiting weekly approximately eight thousand families in which State and private funds are maintaining life. This frequent visitation is not only a guarantee that funds are being carefully administered, but what is more important, that through the organization of such a corps of workers those families are receiving a stimulus, an encouragement, a friendly hand in meeting the problems of living in a time when all too many are giving way to despair. 3

After describing in detail the procedure of administering general assistance through the Central Charity Bureau, the report goes on to say:

It is obvious from the above that the Central Charity Bureau exercises supervision and leadership over the work of the individual Conferences. This supervision is carried on through correspondence, through personal conferences, and through attendance, particularly by Monsignor Cummings, at Conference meetings and at general meetings of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. The Bureau, therefore, influences to an appreciable extent the work of the Conferences.

The relations between the Bureau and the Conferences in the performance of different functions in the cases in which joint action is required seem to be extremely sympathetic and cooperative. In general it appeared that the leadership of the Central Charity Bureau was accepted by the Conferences and that the suggestions and advice made by the Bureau received effective responses from the Conferences. This wholehearted acceptance of the leadership of the Bureau provides the Bureau with an unusual opportunity for mobilizing and applying the energies and resources of this substantial body of volunteers

to the problem of social care in Catholic families in Chicago.4

Further on, in appraising the intake policies of the Central Charity Bureau, the report points to the underlying philosophy of a Catholic general assistance program.

Considerations of these policies should begin with the underlying philosophy of the Bureau and of the St. Vincent de Paul Society... Generally speaking, the Bureau, the pastors, and the Conferences are expressing in their efforts the maternal concern of the Church for the spiritual and economic welfare of its members.

This basic fact explains the broad and inclusive interest which the Bureau has in all kinds of family need in Catholic families. It further explains the desire of the Bureau to champion the needs of Catholic families when the efforts of the agencies of the community fail to win sufficient organization in the community at large to produce minimum security and provision for families in need.5

The report points to an effective check on the general assistance intake in the Catholic Charity Bureau system. Where the family applies to the parish priest for help, he "through his knowledge of the parish population, eliminates those who, in his judgment, are not qualified for assistance from the Conference."6 The Conference itself adds further checks peculiar to itself in "the preliminary investigation which, within the same week, is passed upon a third time by the Conference meeting..."7 The report

4 Ibid., p. 10.
5 Ibid., pp. 12, 13.
6 Ibid., pp. 17.
7 Ibid.
then adds, "Inasmuch as this procedure of intake is still further conditioned
by the standards of relief administration...the authors of the report feel
that a reasonably efficient intake policy finally results." The statement
is all the more forceful when we consider that it was made to the Emergency
Welfare Fund when that organization was challenging the intake policy of the
Central Charity Bureau.

The report finds of further value in the system of the St.
Vincent de Paul Society, the information available to Conference members as
neighbors of the families seeking relief.

Each parish has an annual census of its membership. An
applicant not appearing on the existing parish rolls would
precipitate an inquiry in the parish of which he was formerly
a member. The great majority of parishes have parochial
schools which the children of the families attend. This
attendance makes available to the Sisters teaching in the
schools, to the priests, and to the Conference a certain
knowledge of the family acquired previous to the application.
The individual Conference members live in the immediate
neighborhood of the applicant and acquire as neighbors, a
certain amount of information and judgment about the individual
families which is rather difficult to estimate or appraise.

Here we might make the observation that, as neighbors, the
Conference members are more quickly aware of any employment a client might
obtain as well as of other things removing eligibility of the client for
relief. This cuts down considerably the possibility of fraud, and to some
degree may explain why some Catholic families, getting relief through the
Catholic Charity Bureau, will transfer to the Chicago Welfare Department.

8 Ibid.
9 Ibid., p. 17.
10 Ibid., p. 6.
Before returning to the report itself, by way of a prelude, it should be mentioned that in 1933 trained workers were comparatively few. Experienced workers were more skillful than volunteers, but they were not trained workers. The Central Charity Bureau had at that time a staff of around twenty-one experienced workers, and apparently practically no trained workers. The report of the Family Welfare Association on several occasions appealed to the Catholic Charity Bureau to introduce into its staff "trained Catholic workers who believe whole-heartedly in volunteer service." The need for trained workers was pointed up by what the report called "little knowledge of the real underlying problems which caused the family to come to the attention of the Bureau." It continued, "the most apparent difficulties are given consideration as they arise, but their relationship to the basic problems is not generally seen." Another reason for urging the Central Charity Bureau to engage trained Catholic workers was that the voluntary efforts of the individual Conference members might receive more skillful leadership, supervision and direction.

While admitting that the individual Conference members were (and are) limited in the time they could give to their work and in experience with the refinements of social problems, the Family Welfare Association felt

10 Ibid., p. 6.
11 Ibid., p. 25.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid., p. 30.
that the same efforts then being expended could be more intelligently and effectively directed so that greater usefulness and results could be secured in the welfare of the families treated.

It is the firm belief of the authors that if in time, preferably as soon as possible, such trained workers were placed in the staff at those points in which the supervisory contacts with the Conferences occur, the Central Charity Bureau of Chicago would present to the country at large an outstanding and conspicuous example of social machinery which might well, if developed in its possibilities, become a pattern of social organization to be followed by many other communities.14

To make this recommendation more meaningful in evaluating the present day program, it is of prime interest to us to know that in the Public Case Section of the Family Division at the Catholic Charity Bureau, both supervisors are fully trained and all of the present case workers have had some formal training. Furthermore, the present employment policy at the Bureau is to hire new workers on the condition that they will work for a year at the Bureau, go to school for a year, work another year and then take their final year of schooling, obtaining a Social Work degree at the end.15

Finally the report urges "that one trained person be chosen to undertake a general educational program for the Conference members..."16

14 Ibid., pp. 31, 32.

15 Telephone Interview with Rev. Bernard Sokolowski, Associate Director of Family Division, Catholic Charity Bureau, July 17, 1951.

16 The Family Welfare Association, Study of the CCB, p. 32.
This is now being done on a modest scale by the Rev. Gilbert A. Carroll, M.S.W., Associate Director of the Family Division, Catholic Charity Bureau.\(^{17}\)

This concludes the overall evaluation of the general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau by the Family Welfare Association of America. We now turn to an evaluation of the program by the Catholic Charity Bureau. This evaluation was presented by Monsignor Vincent W. Cooke, Archdiocesan Supervisor of Charities, in a personal interview, July 3, 1951.

Monsignor Cooke feels that the value of this whole cooperative general assistance program, from the viewpoint of the Church, is that the Church is able to continue to know her poor, to visit them regularly, to assist them spiritually and in emergencies to give them the necessary additional material assistance. He says it would be impossible for the Church to care for these families, since $529,070.02 was necessary for this care in 1950. Catholic people, he said, are taxed to support the public relief program and Catholic poor are entitled by law to receive public relief. In offering the services of the Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society for the care of Catholic families, admittedly, an unusual, perhaps unprecedented arrangement was proposed. But Monsignor Cooke added that the Church has thus been enabled to continue to know, visit and help its poor and has not been forced to deny them help and send them to the State. He further pointed out that a duplication of work has been avoided as has a double taxation for charity similar to the double taxation which Catholics bear in their support of both

\(^{17}\) Interview with Fr. Carroll, July 3, 1951.
Catholic and public schools. He said:

Some arrangement such as our present program became necessary when the calls for assistance increased so enormously. The Church did not wish to limit its care for the poor to service without material assistance. The Church could not compete with the State. Instead, by this arrangement the Church cooperates with the State.

Monsignor Cooke also considered the value of this program to the State. He said:

The value of this arrangement to the State is that it brings the donated services of a large body of responsible citizens to the work and enables the Catholic families to be visited by them far more frequently and regularly than could be done by the state employees. The State also considers it of great value to have the understanding and the knowledge of its program shared by so many citizens.

It is felt that the amount of relief currently given to families by the Chicago Welfare Association is not adequate, but Monsignor Cooke hastened to add that it is not far short of adequacy, and it is far above the amount the Central Charity Bureau was able to give poor families in the years before the depression. He said that all medical needs of families on relief were well and adequately met, without charge, through the Medical Service of the Chicago Welfare Department.

The relationship developed with the Chicago Welfare Department was described as friendly and well established. Extreme dissatisfaction with this arrangement has been freely expressed by many other private agencies in Chicago. The contention is that it is not sound in principle for a private agency to cooperate so closely with a public agency and to distribute public funds. Monsignor Cooke pointed out, however, that many of these same agencies cooperate even more closely with the Chicago Welfare Department in
caring for children and minors of relief families.

He said that the position of the Catholic Charity Bureau is that only those families should be cared for by private agencies which cannot obtain public relief. But Catholics are not asked to provide funds to care for families that can receive care from the public authority.

Monsignor Cooke continued:

The position of the private agencies in Chicago is that a certain number of selected cases, (determined by the funds they have to dispose of,) should be cared for by them, even though these families are eligible for public aid. To finance their program for these favored families, private agencies seek and obtain Community Fund support.

The Catholic Charity Bureau feels that the Church is in no position to choose from among the many Catholic families for special care. The Catholic Charity Bureau under its present program does not duplicate the work of the public agency. It does not avail itself to use its own resources in the care of families where public funds can be had. It uses its resources in the care of families that cannot receive public support.

When it was pointed out to Monsignor Cooke that even today there are many Catholic families receiving their public aid from the Chicago Welfare Department directly, he answered:

There are a number of reasons that may explain this situation. It can be safely said that very many Catholic families are not aware that they can transfer to the Catholic Charity Bureau. Many more at the time they applied for relief were not aware that they could apply to the Catholic Charity Bureau or to their parish priest. In 1931 there were over 28,000 Catholic families receiving relief through Central Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society. The tremendous volume of work required to care for them, not only at the central office but in every parish house in the city, is very vividly remembered. No attempt has been made to publicize widely among our people the cooperative arrangement with the Chicago Welfare Department in order to bring back the great number of Catholic families not under the care of the Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society at
the present time. In general our parish priests are satisfied with the present arrangement since it makes it possible for any Catholic family that wishes to come to the Church for help, to be received and given permanent assistance.

In general, then, the Catholic Charity Bureau is very satisfied with its present general assistance program in cooperation with the Chicago Welfare Department. This satisfaction is not complacency because we find that the Catholic Charity Bureau is striving at all times to improve its methods wherever possible and is now insisting on the latest training for all new workers. Rather, this satisfaction is had in knowing that the present arrangement with the Chicago Welfare Department was a program sound in principle, well thought out in its initial stages, and smoothly executed through the years. The Catholic Charity Bureau has nothing but praise for the City of Chicago and the Welfare Department for the smooth cooperation and friendly relationship it has established and maintained through the years. This, of course, is the keynote to the success of the Catholic Charity Bureau general assistance program.

Turning now to the Chicago Welfare Department for an appraisal of this program, we find an evaluation that is necessarily more limited than the two previous ones. As was pointed out at the very beginning of this thesis, our government considers only the material needs of an indigent person and does not consider his spiritual needs. Therefore the purpose of a general assistance program, as far as government agencies are concerned, is confined to providing for the material and social needs of a client. In an interview of July 20, 1931, Commissioner A. E. Rose of the Chicago Welfare Department, set forth the purpose of the general assistance program in
Chicago as follows:

Mere relief is a mistake. We give assistance, assistance to help people get back to self-sufficiency. The first dollar we give is an assistance dollar. If possible we try to make it the last dollar. With every dollar given out, staff assistance goes with it. Each client is given a medical examination. We try to rehabilitate the clients physically. We spend approximately $1,000,000 a year in our medical program.

A good welfare program is just as necessary for the community as a fire department and a police department. We are a protective agency. Our program is geared to make the whole community healthier, happier, safer. Turn our 29,000 relief clients loose in the city and you will have disease, crime, low morale in the community.

Our program is not only humanitarian, but it is also a protective program for the community. This alone justifies the expenditure of relief money.

In the light of this purpose Commissioner Rose was asked what the Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society contributed to the general assistance program of the Chicago Welfare Department. In reply he made two points. The first point, strangely enough, was not the financial saving to the City, but the individual care the St. Vincent de Paul men were able to give each client. Commissioner Rose said;

The Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society are an integral part of our program. They are not only trying to carry out part of our program under the law, but they are hitting the ideal almost. The St. Vincent de Paul workers are closer to the clients. They are individualizing more. Thus they are in a better position to get a client back on his feet quicker. Individualisation in treating cases means greater success in rehabilitating clients. This is difficult for us to attain where, as happens in some cases, the worker can contact a client only two or three times a year.

The Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul workers are making a real contribution in this respect. We would like to know all our cases as well as they know theirs.
Furthermore, in the Catholic Charities system, there is less likelihood of fraud. Where friendly relationship is established with a client, as it is in their system, the applicant is less likely to deceive the worker.

Then Mr. Rose acknowledged the tremendous saving to the taxpayer through the Catholic Charity Bureau general assistance program. Last year the Chicago Welfare Department made out checks to clients of the Catholic Charity Bureau totaling $529,070.02. Taking the administrative costs at Chicago Welfare Department as 12%, this means a saving to the City of Chicago of $70,000 or better for last year. Commissioner Rose felt this figure was a fair computation.

When asked if the Chicago Welfare Department favored the agent arrangement with the Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society, Commissioner Rose said:

It has been a good working arrangement and has saved us quite a bit of money. As an administrator, however, my opinion is that all people eligible under the same law to receive assistance should receive that assistance from the governmental body set up to administer it. This is based on principle.

If the same arrangement were had with the 225 welfare organizations in the City of Chicago, administrative control of the program would be complicated and shabby. When we had nineteen district offices, for example, it was almost impossible to get consistent application of policy and procedure.

The agent arrangement is had with only two private agencies. This arrangement has worked so well that it has posed no problem and the saving has been great. Two agent arrangements functioning smoothly are acceptable to us, but to extend this arrangement to more agencies would be administratively impractical.

Commissioner Rose was asked whether he thought there was any possibility of this agent arrangement being taken up in other cities. He
replied:

Not the way public welfare is moving today. It is becoming more and more accepted that the care of needy persons is the responsibility of the government. So we in the public welfare field must feel that where someone else is taking care of the needy, we are not discharging our full responsibility.

Because of this, and because we feel more and more confidence in our ability to discharge our full responsibility, there is little likelihood of this agent arrangement spreading to other cities.

This concludes Commissioner Rose's evaluation of the general assistance program of the Catholic Charity Bureau in conjunction with the Chicago Welfare Department. There is little that can be added to the three different evaluations presented above. They all speak for themselves. The conclusion to be drawn from the three, and from our own presentation of the functioning of the program is that the Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul Society are continuing to do an efficient, productive job.

Commissioner Rose of the Chicago Welfare Department raised one serious question, one difficult to answer. If those engaged in public welfare are convinced more and more that they are not discharging their full responsibility when a private agency is allowed to participate in a public program, how long will the present arrangement with the Catholic Charity Bureau last? As long as the Catholic Charity Bureau and the St. Vincent de Paul workers continue to do an efficient, productive job in their adminis-
tering of general assistance, there is no reason why the program should not continue as is. This agent arrangement is firmly established and is functioning well. People are slow to change something that is working so well. If a conflict is brought into the open by the growing conviction that "people eligible under the same law to receive assistance from the government should receive that assistance from the governmental body set up to administer it," the same argument will prevail that prevailed in 1933. The Catholic Charity Bureau, in administering general assistance, is a governmental body; it is a part of the Chicago Welfare Department, the body set up to administer general assistance in Chicago. If, however, the St. Vincent de Paul workers ever lose their religious motivation and zeal so that they grow careless and slothful in their investigations of clients and in their weekly visits to homes of the clients; if the Catholic Charity Bureau ever grows lax in its supervision and direction of the St. Vincent de Paul workers, then there will be a real danger of the City of Chicago terminating the agent arrangement with them.
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