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House of Representatives,
Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10 a.m., in the Federal Court Building, New York, N. Y., Hon. John H. Tolan (chairman), presiding:


Also present: Robert K. Lamb, chief investigator; James S. Owens, chief field investigator; Ariel E. V. Dunn, field investigator; Edward J. Rowell, field investigator; Henry H. Collins, Jr., field investigator; and Alice Tuchi, field secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We will note the presence of Congressman Sparkman, of Alabama, Congressman Curtis, of Nebraska, Congressman Osmers, of New Jersey, and Congressman Parsons, who is taking care of that great ship America, which will be in here this afternoon, will be here at that time.

This committee was appointed and is holding these hearings under the authority contained in House Resolutions 63 and 491, of the third session of the Seventy-sixth Congress of the United States. These resolutions are as follows:

[H. Res. 63, 76th Cong., 3d sess.]

Resolution

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a select committee of five Members of the House, and that such committee be instructed to inquire into the interstate migration of destitute citizens, to study, survey and investigate the social and economic needs and the movement of indigent persons across State lines, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the House in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall report to the House, with recommendations for legislation, and shall have the right to report at any time. In the event the committee transmits its report at a time when the House is not in session, a record of such transmittal shall be entered in the proceedings of the Journal and Congressional Record of the House on the opening day of the next session of Congress and shall be numbered and printed as a report of such Congress.

That said select committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, by subpoena or otherwise, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192).
Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation and study authorized by H. Res. 63 of the present Congress, incurred by the Select Committee to Investigate the Interstate Migration of Destitute Citizens, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $20,000, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation and study or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Sec. 3. The heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies are requested to detail personnel temporarily to assist the committee or subcommittee upon request of the chairman thereof.

TESTIMONY OF HON. FIORELLA LaGUARDIA, MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

The CHAIRMAN. The first witness will be Mayor LaGuardia. I want to say on behalf of the committee that we think this is very fine of you, Mr. Mayor, to appear here, and you can take your time and give your message to us in any way that you desire.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. May I sit down and be informal?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; you are our colleague anyway.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I consider it fairly timely and helpful that the House of Representatives should give this matter of transients, or migration, attention at this time. It is a problem which concerns the whole country, and every city in the United States in one way or another is affected and vitally interested. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will not make any recommendations today; I will reserve the opportunity, if you will permit me, to present recommendations to this committee which will be the recommendations of every city in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. Just make that notation, that the mayor will be permitted to make his presentation subsequently to become a part of the record.

Mayor LaGUARDIA. You see, we have made a survey of this; that is, the United States Conference of Mayors, which includes the mayor of every city in the country, over 50,000, and so when you have the recommendations you can be assured that it will be the recommendations of all of the cities. We have no division of opinion on it at all.

Now, this question of migrants, and this movement of large bodies of men is not new in our country. It has been accentuated lately, and there are two reasons for that.

REASONS FOR MIGRATION

One is the more convenient and rapid means of transportation.

The other is the technological displacement of labor on the farms.

In the early days there would be several thousand men migrating from one crop area to another, who would find work, and then earn enough to live according to their way for the balance of the year, and then commence all over again in the planting season, harvesting season,
and in the shearing season, and thus they would go from one place to another.

Transportation was slower, employment was greater, and it did not really constitute a serious problem.

In later years, of course, through the use of machinery on the farms, scores are employed now where a thousand were employed before, and we are all familiar with that. Even in the cotton area they are holding back machinery at this moment, and we would have still a greater problem if that were not done.

Now, cities that are more humane are penalized for it, because where provision is made, and care given, it is always an attraction, and therefore you will find that certain cities in the country that are more attractive than others for this kind of people are penalized.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICABLE DISEASE ACT**

Now, gentlemen, the first approach to this problem is the health problem, and you will find that Congress has given attention to the subject in an act of February 15, 1893, chapter 114, section 3. That provides for the repatriation of anyone from one State to another who is afflicted with any contagious or communicable disease, so that you will find your legislative task much easier by reason of the fact that there is precedent for it.

A great many people—may I say to my colleagues I approach this from your viewpoint—a great many of our colleagues in the House, you will find, will view this as impairing the free movement of citizens from one State to another. They do so because they are not familiar with all of the details and danger that it involves, and this precedent I am sure will be very helpful.

In the act of July 2, 1902, you will find that more force was given to this act of 1893 by providing local powers, or powers to the local Federal authorities.

Now, gentlemen, the act is all right, it is sufficiently broad. You may have to include "possessions" in it. I am not so sure, but the method of its enforcement is not clear. All that the act requires are appropriations for the United States Public Health Service. If they have appropriations to carry it out you will relieve many cities of great hospital expense, you will stop the spreading of disease, and you will do a great deal in connection with the very problem you are seeking to solve.

Let me repeat, the act is there. All that it requires is money for the United States Public Health Service to effectuate its provisions. That would take care of tubercular cases and venereal cases, and it would stop the spread, and in the long run every dollar so spent would save $10 in the country somewhere, either for the Federal or for the local governments. I want to commend that act to you. If we could have that act enforced it would be a great relief for us. So you see the Congress has already taken care of people afflicted with communicable disease.

The CHAIRMAN. You would recommend such an appropriation?

Mayor LaGUARDIA. Yes; and you will find no division of opinion on that, among the Public Health Service and among the mayors, and surely there could not be even among the States.
Now, the next group should be treated separately; that is, the seaman group. They are treated separately by the W. P. A., entirely separately. In treating these seamen, I think if you will include them in the unemployment insurance system and provide for their care during times they are not at sea, through the proper Federal agency, you will be helping a great deal. They are in a class by themselves. They are on shore sometimes through no fault of their own, and they should not be treated or provided for under the same general provisions as you will provide for the migrants other than seamen. As I say, they are in a class by themselves. They are easily identified by the records that they have to carry with them, and there are two important considerations: First, they must be cared for at seaports at all times. If they get away from a seaport, I should think that they could be treated as losing their status as seamen. Second, they should be covered into the unemployment insurance system. There is no reason why they cannot, and such a step will relieve a great many. Third, in order to retain their status as seamen, and there would be certain privileges in that status, after they have gone beyond their period of unemployment insurance, and they are still on shore, then they ought to be cared for by the Maritime Commission or such Federal authority as has charge of shipping. We need them. We need to keep them skilled. We don't want them to grow stale, and yet the very calling of their occupation is such that they are “beached” at times. If the ship goes into drydock, the men are “beached” because a great many ships have been taken out of commission.

That disposes of another group.

SPECIAL CLASSES OF MIGRANTS IN NEW YORK CITY

Now, of course, we have the individual cases, gentlemen, of young people who are attracted to the cities. Some think that they are going to be starred at the Metropolitan, and others expect to become radio stars. Some get jobs, and I do not include them at all in this general problem. The problem here is the chronic traveler, the chronic wanderer, those who go in groups, but there is not a city in the country that cannot cope with those cases, which are always dramatic, and which are the exceptional ones.

For instance, during the world’s fair, we had very little trouble. Why? Because we provided for it ahead of time. I established two stations, one at Manhattan, and one at Queens, so that if young people were picked up wandering, and destitute, who had come here hoping that they would find employment, we would not have to book them at the police station at all. We just had this office, this home, and we immediately communicated with their home town, and transportation was furnished by their families to take them home. If the family could not furnish it, we sent them home and we had no problem at all, although some of the experts predicted that we would have thousands and thousands. We just had a few hundred, and there was no problem at all.

Here is another example. There is a certain amateur hour here—talent program. You all know Major Bowes. In the beginning he attracted people to New York, or they said that they came to compete,
not knowing the rules. I took it up with Major Bowes, and I had no trouble at all. If anyone claims that he came to go on that hour, he will send them home, and we have no trouble about that.

In the big cities, of course, we are going to have people who come looking for fame and fortunes, but that is not one of the big problems here.

OPERATION OF FEDERAL TRANSIENT PROGRAM, 1933-35

Now, in New York State, the transient program did not begin to operate under State and municipal auspices in New York City until July 1, 1937. From September of 1935 to July 1, 1937, there was no provision for transient relief as such. They were taken care of by private agencies.

From July of 1933 to September of 1935, there was a Federal transient program under which the Federal Government paid the full expense of transients here.

Now, I want to come back to that in just a minute.

PRESENT CARE OF TRANSIENTS IN NEW YORK

Transients are divided into two groups, in this State. We have those that we call the “State charge” cases. The State of New York provides for them. All the city spends is the administrative costs of the nonsettlement bureau, and the State reimburses us for 40 percent of the salaries of administrative employees. The burden is on us to prove that it is a transient case. They call them “State charge” cases, but in the case of transients we have to prove that they are not residents of the State and City of New York, and they are therefore not entitled to relief under our local plan, and the State pays the entire cost.

Then we have the reimbursable cases. They have a technical name for them, too. They are called “charge backs.” When we have a case in the city of New York, that is, a resident of the State of New York who is not a resident of the city, then the State pays 40 percent, and the city or the locality or the relief district from which the transients came pays the 60 percent.

We are often stuck in that, because our sister cities or towns up-State disclaim any ownership or any proprietary interest in them, and during that time we are stuck with the difference.

Now, with all of that, gentlemen, the cost to the city is $682,000 annually. That is just the administrative costs, and the cost of those cases that we have to pay wherefor nonsettlement is not proved.

From the time the program started in 1937, $5,240,000 has been spent by the State and city. That is, since 1937. That is $5,240,000 by the State and the city.

The cost last year was $1,950,000.

Now, to give you an idea of how this jumps, I wish to point out that in September 1937 there were 597 cases, while in June 1940 there were 4,198 cases, and these were only the “State charge” cases, with no settlement in the State at all. We had 4,773 cases, including charge backs, in all, 3,494 of which were families. These 4,773 cases represented 12,119 people.

Now, this is what we get. Families that come here bring with them their relatives and friends from other sections of the country. They will come here with the families, and we have them.
Now, gentlemen, in a city like New York, the problem is entirely different than what it is in a rural district. If that family is destitute, law or no law, we have them on our hands. If they can't pay rent, we find them on the sidewalk. In a great many cases, gentlemen, this does not represent the entire number of families who come here. The human element always enters into it, and a family will come here to New York and after a few days it is destitute and applies for relief.

Now, it is a very difficult problem.

You will hear from the director of the division of transient care, and he believes that there is some very good material in this group, young, energetic, and willing men and women. They are not of the old type that we used to think of, well, a generation ago, and he believes that they are by no means hopeless material.

Now, in addition to this, of course, you know we have a municipal lodginghouse, where meals are served every day. Very few questions are asked about it, and I would like to have you gentlemen make a surprise call at the municipal lodginghouse. Don't tell us when you are going, because, you know, they are liable to primp up a bit, and I don't want them to do that. I want you to see how it is.

The Chairman. Have you any figures on that?

Mayor LaGuardia. Yes; I have some figures on the homeless; 16,025 cases a month.

The Chairman. Can we have that for the record? Would you just give the high spots?

Mayor LaGuardia. The lodginghouse has 2,300 cases a day, and we are filled. I personally want to invite you to attend it at your own time and convenience. Just look and see what it is.

Then we have, of course, Camp LaGuardia.

The Chairman. Does the city handle the finances of that alone?

Mayor LaGuardia. We get reimbursed 40 percent by the State, and 40 percent on Camp LaGuardia. At the latter, we started off with the idea that we would send middle-aged men and older men where they would have a camp for themselves and do all of the work required and have a chance to rehabilitate themselves. The turn-over is very satisfactory. They find employment in the neighborhood. We raise vegetables there which we send to other institutions there, and we have been successful at everything except in raising rabbits for culture purposes.

Mr. Osmer. If I may interrupt you there, what do you do when the total number of applicants at the municipal lodginghouse exceeds your accommodations for a night's lodging? What do you do with those men?

Mayor LaGuardia. We take them to privately owned commercial lodginghouses.

Mr. Osmer. And the city participates 60 percent in that and the State 40 percent?

Mayor LaGuardia. Yes, sir.

The Chairman. Is it on the increase or decrease?

Mayor LaGuardia. I think now it is holding its own, but slightly decreasing.

Mr. Curtis. I just want to ask a question at this point. These 2,300 per day that are in your lodging quarters, and those people
who come to Camp LaGuardia, what percent of those people are interstate transients?

Mayor LaGuardia. I do not know about that. Of the homeless themselves, only about 2 percent.

Our transients are 2 percent interstate. That brings up another question. They acquire their residence here by coming here, and then going off relief for a year. It seems to me that where the original entry is accompanied by need for relief, some provision should be made to prevent a person from acquiring a right after entering a State under such conditions. You can readily see that they come here, and we care for them, and then they manage to go off, and they account for themselves for a period of a year, and then we get them right back and they are our own.

CARE OF MIGRANTS IS FEDERAL PROBLEM

Now, this question, gentlemen, under our form of government, is entirely a Federal question. There is no other way. Now, I want to anticipate some recommendations that will be made by some of the private social agencies, and that is of giving grants to the States and letting the States care for it. I think that would be most unsatisfactory. It will involve so much administrative costs, and so much exchange of correspondence, and such an involved administration, that it will be very costly. It should be a Federal administration entirely.

One of the recommendations is that the Federal Government provide these grants and then if the State refuses to recognize the residence of the particular individual, some board of the Federal Government should decide.

Can you see the complicated machinery that that would involve? We would have to have thousands of boards sitting all over the country to decide upon the residence of an individual, and then cases could go to Washington on an appeal.

Why, I do not think that it would justify any such expenditure. If the Federal Government has it, it is immaterial whether the individual is a resident of Alabama, Florida, or Maine. It is a Federal problem, and they have to adjust that case as best they can, in the interests of the community and the individual concerned, and that is why I so strongly recommend that it should be Federal administration.

I know that all of my colleagues, mayors of the cities, will concur in that opinion, but as I stated at the opening, we will present formal recommendations as the mayors of this country through the United States Conference of Mayors.

The CHAIRMAN. Right on that point, we are starting out with this idea, that we do not know much about this problem, but we have not only contacted the mayors and the governments of the States that we are going to visit but we are contacting the mayors in every State of the Union, on the theory that it is a national problem, and before we file our report you will receive, Mr. Mayor, a tentative report, consisting of the recommendations, as you can give us your ideas, too.

Now, is there any question?

MR. OSMERS. Well, I have one question in mind that seems to have cropped up in our investigations at New Jersey yesterday. It seems
that in New Jersey, because of the proximity of New York and Philadelphia, that is, New York and Philadelphia, a great many of our destitute migrants or migrants, as soon as they become destitute, either go to New York City or Philadelphia, as the case may be, because in a large city apparently they feel they have a better chance for employment or relief or for whatever benefits they might receive; and there is one point that has struck me through what investigations we have made so far, and that is an exact knowledge of the background, or the residence, or the domicile, or the settlement of the migrant.

There is an absolute lack of information on that subject, and it has occurred to me that we may as a result of our work here, and I would like to get the mayor's opinion on this, find that we are going to have to adopt in this country some sort of universal registration, or internal passports, if you want to call them that, although they would not be passports, so that if you find a man in New York here, wandering about the streets, and he says that he lives in Brooklyn, and he does not live in Brooklyn, that you will have some way of checking on that man, and I wonder what you think of that idea?

Mayor LaGuardia. I think that what you mean is a sort of identification card?

Mr. Osmers. Right.

Mayor LaGuardia. More of an identification card than a formal document, such as a passport?

Mr. Osmers. Yes.

Mayor LaGuardia. Of course, identification is always helpful. It is in large cities. We have that problem several times a day in locating persons who have strayed or been lost, or are injured, and, of course, it is a great help. I do not see how there could be any objection to any system requiring a certificate of identification for everybody. It has got to be for everybody, though.

Mr. Osmers. I mean for everyone. I mean there is so much talk going about today as to subversive activities, just changing the subject for just a moment, and a lack of knowledge as to the exact background of a lot of our citizens, that such a thing might be helpful.

Mayor LaGuardia. Well, of course, if you are looking into background, then you are going beyond the scope of a certificate of identification. In other words, a certificate of identification gives the name and the address and the residence of the citizen, and I do not think that there would be any objection to that. It should not be made an inquisition.

Mr. Osmers. To change the subject there for a minute, in your opening remarks you concentrated on the subject of health, and I think that that is a mighty important phase of the problem. It has been found that a good many of these migrant workers of the State of New Jersey are infected with contagious and communicable diseases. They are only in our State from 2 to 6 weeks, and it is a mighty difficult problem to enforce our very good State laws on communicable diseases because they leave before the treatment has had a chance to take effect. I wonder if you have any suggestions there, whether the Federal Government should keep following them around?
Mayor LA GUARDIA. They have to, and you will find that this statute, if it could only be carried out, would be a good help. Venereal disease would not spread.

Now, there is another side to this, which is rather delicate, and it will bring forth, perhaps, a great deal of controversy and discussion in the House. That is the beet industry.

If the beet industry cannot survive without bringing a large number of people from Mexico, as they used to do when I was in the House, then I think that the soil had better be turned to some other crop. As you go into some of the beet States you are going to find very strong resistance to any control of or any limitation on the large numbers of migrants, because they are dependent entirely upon the seasonal work, and upon very cheap labor. I do not know if it has changed since the time that I looked into it as a Member of the House, but they used to bring just hundreds of families from Mexico, and they would be paid by the ton. They would turn their little children loose in the field and everyone in the family would work. They lived in boxcars and worked during the season, and then were sent back home.

That is not a wholesome condition, and the debate in the House was very bitter on that subject. It is a very delicate subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Mayor, would you say that the type of interstate migrant, such as a potato picker, a beet worker, or something of that kind, where they come through several States to a certain point before knowing definitely that they have a job, and they have an anchor which they can go back to, that State is willing to accept them?

Now, they create some problems of sanitation and health, and now and then some temporary relief, but should that group be dealt with separately from the group of families that have lost their farms or their business, or something, and they are just, you might say, wanderers, and if they are dismissed from the city or the State of New York they have no place to go, no State or locality accepts them as their own?

Mayor LA GUARDIA. I think that that phase of the problem—

Mr. CURTIS. You feel that it is two different problems?

Mayor LA GUARDIA. Yes; and your specific illustration, I think, is susceptible of solution. Assuming that the Federal Government takes cognizance of this as a Federal problem, it can easily provide that for seasonal work, such as potatoes, the community desiring the additional seasonal help simply registers that there is such demand, and the community sending them, or the people who are actually leaving register that they are going for seasonal work. Then provision ought to be made in some way for their return home. Either the wage accepted should be sufficient to include their keep and return home, or should provide that at the end of the season they will get their carfare or bus fare home. That would be an orderly movement.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, have your agencies made any analysis of these families that are not seeking seasonal work, but these other interstate migrants, as to what territories they come from? Can you say that a certain percent come from a certain locality in the South, or some other point?
What I am getting at is that there may be an economic problem in that territory that is dragging people out; that a remedy can be applied there so that those people are not just homeless wanderers.

Mayor LaGuardia. I think that we do that. Our problem is mostly from the South, that is, southern farms. We do not have much from west of the Mississippi.

The Chairman. Mr. Mayor, I think I speak the feelings of the committee when I say that we are very grateful to you for appearing here. You are the first witness in the first hearing to find the facts relating to the migration of destitute citizens, that is, interstate migration.

Now, the figures now available show that we have about 4,000,000 people each year going from State to State—one-third of them children—and your health problem and your educational problem is in there.

Now, they get into those States, and they are foodless and voteless, and why this committee is so pleased to have you as our first witness is this: That you think it is a national problem, and it strikes at the morale of our people, does it not, and we have got to take care of them through national legislation, and we are mighty pleased to have you here, and we will extend this courtesy to you, that you can finish out your statement, and add anything you want.

We shall be particularly interested in your recommendations.

Mayor LaGuardia. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon Mayor LaGuardia was excused.)

The Chairman. The committee will come to order, please. Dr. Lamb, who is your next witness?

Dr. Lamb. Professor Lorimer is our next witness.

The Chairman. Professor Lorimer.

TESTIMONY OF DR. FRANK LORIMER, PROFESSOR OF POPULATION STUDIES, THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, WASHINGTON, D. C., CONSULTANT, NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

The Chairman. For the benefit of the committee and the record, if you please, give your full name, and something about your background and your study of this problem. If you will do that it will help the record.

Dr. Lorimer. I am Frank Lorimer, at the present time professor of population studies at the American University. I was joint author with Frederick Osborn of a book, Dynamics of Population, and was technical secretary to the Committee on Population Problems of the National Resources Committee that prepared the report, The Problems of a Changing Population, and am now a consultant to the National Resources Committee and a consultant to a Virginia population study under the Virginia State Planning Board.

The Chairman. What is your feeling? Do you want any questions asked during the making of your statement or would you rather finish first?

Dr. Lorimer. I will leave that entirely to the discretion of the committee.
Mr. Osmers. If it meets with your approval, I would like to have Dr. Lorimer make a statement of some kind outlining his testimony. (The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF FRANK LORIMER, PROFESSOR OF POPULATION STUDIES, THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY; CONSULTANT, NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

THE BACKGROUND OF INTERNAL MIGRATION

The distribution of the American people shows a constantly shifting pattern. In 1930, 22,000,000 native whites and 3,000,000 Negroes or 23 percent of the total native population of the Nation, were living outside the States where they were born. An analysis of population movements during the preceding decade, 1920 to 1930, shows a pronounced drift from the three northern New England States and Pennsylvania and all the 28 States south of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers or between the Mississippi and the Sierras with four exceptions: Florida and Texas (which received more migrants than they sent forth) and North Carolina and Louisiana (which neither gained nor lost appreciably through migration during this period). (See figure A.) New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, the Great Lakes States east of the Mississippi, and the Far West were the principal areas of attraction. In the Hudson Valley Region, the number of migrants from other States was exceeded by the number of new immigrants abroad, and in Massachusetts and Rhode Island the net loss through interstate migration was more than offset by immigration from other countries. These regional shifts were associated with the rapid growth of cities, and the still more rapid growth of metropolitan rings around large cities. The 96 metropolitan districts absorbed two-thirds of the total national increase between 1920 and 1930. The farm population actually declined by nearly 1½ millions during the twenties, following a smaller decline (somewhat less than one-half million) during the preceding decade.

The 1940 census will tell a different story. Preliminary counts indicate that on the average the larger cities (over 25,000 population) have been growing somewhat less rapidly during the thirties than the Nation as a whole. And the Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that during the decade there has been an increase of somewhat over 2,000,000 people in the farm population, just about offsetting the decrease from 1910 to 1930. It also appears that in general southern and western cities have been increasing more rapidly than cities in the Northeast. The largest absolute increases in farm population have been in the Southeast and Northeast. The Pacific area shows an estimated 20 percent increase in its farm population during the decade, but this accounts for only about a tenth of the total increase of farm population in the Nation.

The direction and volume of migration is controlled by two major forces: (1) Shifts in opportunities for economic production, and (2) regional differences in rates of natural increase. These factors are perhaps equally important, and we will deal briefly with each in turn. We will neglect the movement of persons of independent income, including pensioners and retired workers, who are guided primarily by residential preference, and of those who move for the sake of educational advantages, health, or adventure. (See figure B.)

Changes in economic opportunity are shown by a break-down of occupations into 3 broad industrial groups: (1) Extractive: i.e., agriculture, mining, and forestry; (2) mechanical and manufacturing; and (3) transportation, trade, and service. The trend for the Nation as a whole is similar to that shown for the North Central, or Middle States. The proportion of all workers engaged in extractive industries declined from 45 percent in 1880 to 25 percent in 1930. This is due to the rapid increase in productivity per worker on farms and mines, and to shifts in consumer purchases associated with a rising level of living, and to decrease in the use of farm products in the production of power and commodities, e.g., the substitution of gasoline for hay, increase in meat and dairy products per unit of feed, etc. Actually, the relative decrease in farm population lagged behind the relative decrease in the demand for farm products, so that even in 1930 one-half of the farms, producing only about one-tenth of all the farm products sold or traded, yielded a meager livelihood to operators and laborers. The increase of farm population since 1930 has swelled the ranks of these low-income farm families. The peak in the proportion of workers engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries was reached about 1920, though the absolute number so engaged was higher in 1930.
After 1920, technological displacement of workers in large part offset increased demand for manufactured goods. Opportunities in trade, transportation, and service occupations, on the other hand, have constantly risen, to include 47 percent of all workers in 1930. This division includes some of the most essential phases of economic activity in an advanced economy, and workers in this division cannot to the same extent be displaced by machinery. These shifts in the character of economic opportunity have necessitated changes in the regional distribution of workers. The Northeast, Middle States, and Far West—the areas which attracted migrants during the twenties—hold only about 40 percent of all workers engaged in the extractive industries, but they received about half of the 1,300,000 new workers from 1920 to 1930 in manufacturing and mechanical industries, and nearly three-fourths of the 6,200,000 new workers in transportation, trade, and service—counting only the number entering these fields beyond those needed to replace other workers who retired.

It is also important to take into account the large differences in the ratio of farm population to resources in various parts of the United States. Nowhere in Europe are there great stretches of farms of such high value, but nowhere in western Europe is there such poverty across broad rural areas as in the United States. This contrast affects whole States. For example, in 1930, the average value of farm land at the disposal of each farm worker in Georgia, was only one-tenth that in Iowa. The contrast by counties is even more striking. In many counties (where high pressure of population on resources is shown by the darkest shading) the value of land per worker is less than $250. In many other counties it is well over 10 times that figure. There has been a general trend toward migration from farms—both from high-value areas, in order to maintain large-scale farming or to escape the hazards of drought, and from low-value areas—but in general the migration has been heaviest from the areas where population pressure on limited resources is greatest. In this connection it may be noted that recent migrants from Oklahoma to California have come in greatest numbers, not from western Oklahoma which was in the drought area, but from counties in eastern Oklahoma which suffer from chronic pressure of population on resources. The situation in California is difficult, not because of pressure of population on resources, but because of the peculiar economic structure of agriculture in that State. (See figure C.)

From 1930 to 1940, migration has been in large part a movement from areas of high productivity but heavy unemployment to areas of lower productivity but greater security, provided by poorly paid regular or part-time employment, or through subsistence farming, or both. In other words, it has been the substitution of underemployment for the risk of unemployment. The return to placer mining on abandoned claims in the Rockies is a dramatic illustration. (See figure D.)

But the typical movement has been the retreat to small farms on the outskirts of industrial areas, or in southern Appalachians, Ozarks, Lake States, cut-over lands, the upper Rio Grande Valley, unoccupied lands on the edges of the Willamette Valley, and elsewhere. Millions who have retreated in search of meager security have suffered a severe drop in level of family living, but they have not caused conflict or created special public problems. They have therefore attracted little attention. The same may be said of many young people coming of age in areas of meager opportunity, who would normally have migrated to more favorable situations but have been restrained by fear of failure to find employment.

There has, however, been a counter movement, which has stirred public attention. People have burst forth from areas suffering from the slow rot of economic deterioration, without awaiting the assurance of real economic opportunity elsewhere—only to encounter new types of frustration. These people, fleeing an ever-deepening underemployment, have sought areas of greater opportunity and have, in many cases, found only unemployment. These are the "economic refugees" of our very imperfect economic order. (See figure E.)

In order to understand the forces which have created, and are still creating, the pathological situations of which economic refugees are a symptom, we must give attention to differences in rates of natural increase in relation to economic opportunity. If there were no migration from 1930 to 1960, the growth of farm population through excess of births over deaths would vary from less than 25 percent during this 30-year period in most of the Northeast and some of the Middle States to well over 50 percent in all the Southern States except Florida, and in Utah, Idaho, North and South Dakota.
It is not difficult to foresee that such an increase would, in many cases, be disastrous. Moreover, it has been estimated that at the present time the number of young people coming to productive age each year in the farm population of the Nation is about twice as large as the number who would normally be withdrawn by death or retirement. (See figure F.)

We must bear in mind that the ratio of children to women is, in general, about twice as high in the rural-farm population as in cities. In 1930, this ratio in the native white rural-farm population was 69 percent above that required to replace the parent population, whereas among native whites in cities it was 14 percent below the replacement level. Among Negroes the rural-urban differential in reproductivity is even greater. (See figure G.)

Moreover, the highest reproduction rates are generally found in the very areas where there is already greatest pressure of population on resources. In many of the most prosperous farming areas the number of births each year is just about sufficient to replace the parent population. But in farming areas where income is lowest the number of births each year is from 50 to 100 percent above that which would be sufficient for population maintenance. (See figure H.)

If counties are grouped according to plane of living, a negative relation between economic level and reproductive trend is found within each broad regional division as well as in the Nation as a whole. The index used here is that developed by Goodrich in the study of population redistribution. In those counties that ranked lowest on this plane of living index (one-sixth of all the counties) the ratio of children to women was on the average 77 percent above the replacement level. In the two highest groups it fell below the replacement level.

The significance of these trends for migration is clearly shown by a special tabulation carried out by Dr. Conrad Taeuber of the United States Department of Agriculture. He investigated the situation in 220 counties where the ratio of children to women in the rural population was on the average 100 percent above the replacement level (ranging up from 850 children per thousand women) and which had a rank below 30 on the rural plane-of-living index constructed by Lively, where 100 represents the national average. These 220 counties held a rural population of more than 4,000,000 people in 1920. Between 1920 and 1930 there was a net migration of 630,000 people out of these counties—equal to 16 percent of the original population. This is a high rate of migration though, perhaps because of their isolation and poverty, not quite so high as from some less handicapped rural areas. But in spite of this exodus there were nearly 300,000 more people in the rural areas of these 220 counties in 1930 than there were in 1920. The remarks of the Red Queen to Alice seem peculiarly appropriate. They were running very fast, but they had to run that fast to stay in the same place. If they wanted to get anywhere they would have to run twice as fast. During the depression they couldn't even run that fast, and relatives came back to live with them—until some of them couldn't stand it any longer, and broke out to camp on roadsides in southeast Missouri or to wander from place to place in California in search of jobs that didn't exist.

The situation is further complicated by institutional factors which make for cultural retardation in areas where the proportion of children is highest and where there is greatest poverty—and which thus tend to perpetuate excessive fertility and prevent the most effective use of the limited economic resources that are available. In previous American theory, the health of children is purely a responsibility of individual families, except insofar as their ability to purchase medical services may be supplemented by charity, or their ability to purchase food may be supplemented by relief allowances. Also, in previous American theory, the provision of educational facilities is a purely local responsibility, or at best a responsibility of the individual States. The poorest families, the poorest areas, and the poorest States, where the ratio of children to the supporting adult population is highest, are absolutely unable to provide health and educational advantages equal to those available in more prosperous communities. As a result, the children growing up in rural areas are subject to the demoralization of disease, malnutrition, and inadequate education. It is not surprising, therefore, that they should usually make low scores on intelligence tests, or that they should often appear shiftless. The people who live in more prosperous areas, through their neglect of these matters, have a heavy responsibility for this situation—a situation which sends a constant stream of ill-equipped migrants into American cities, undermines our democracy, and weakens our capacity for national defense. (See figures I and J.)
We are confronted with a vicious circle: cultural retardation, excessive fertility, population pressure, and poverty. We must discover ways of breaking this vicious chain of forces. Such, I take it, is the high responsibility of this committee.

In conclusion, permit me to suggest some lines of approach which, it seems to me, merit your serious consideration. The history of attempts to force redistribution of population, or resettlement, records a series of failures. It would be equally disastrous to attempt to freeze the present inequitable distribution of people in relation to resources. A sustained expansion of industrial, commercial, and service opportunities in the Nation would induce a spontaneous large-scale movement from depressed areas to areas of expanding and stable opportunity. We, as a Nation, are capable of achieving such economic progress, and apart from such general economic expansion there can be no permanent solution of the special problems of American agriculture or of many acute problems presented by particular areas.

There are, however, other lines of advance which need not wait on such over-all economic expansion, but are contributory and complementary to it. Measures which will improve the morale of rural youth and increase the capacity of farm families to make fuller use of the resources at their disposal have already been developed by the Farm Security Administration and other agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with State agencies and county committees. These measures need to be extended and supplemented. I should like to propose for your consideration the following thesis:

"No American community should be permanently dependent on outside subsidy for the maintenance of a decent standard of living. Sound adjustment of population to resources is ultimately dependent on local initiative. But the limitation on long-time Federal action implicit in these statements should not be applied to measures concerned with health, education, or other activities essential for building community morale and for the development of individual capacities. The Nation has a direct and primary interest in the quality of its citizens and in providing equal opportunity to all for the development of their individual capacities."

The stabilization of rural communities in the United States is dependent on the reduction of the excessive fertility now characteristic of families in many depressed areas, to a level at most no higher than that prevailing among prosperous farm families. This in turn is dependent on cultural progress and advance in standards of living. In view of all these considerations it has, I submit, become a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to further advances in health, education, and standards of living which will equip those who remain in areas that are now depressed to achieve economic and social advance in these communities and at the same time equip those who move elsewhere to participate effectively in the economic and civic life of the communities which they enter.

The Chairman. Will you proceed to discuss this statement in your own way, please?

TESTIMONY OF DR. FRANK LORIMER—Resumed

Dr. Lorimer. I am only going to deal with the broad outlines of the picture, in other words, the sort of features that show up in a composite photograph of tens of thousands of people. Obviously, the sort of broad picture needs to be supplemented by the knowledge that the Committee is getting through its personal contacts, and other sources of the more intimate personal details of this pattern.

POPULATION CHANGES, 1920-40

Migration is a conspicuous feature, and always has been, of American life. In 1930, 22,000,000 native whites, and 3,000,000 Negroes, nearly a quarter of all of our native-born population, were found living in States outside the State in which they were born. This chart [see figure A, p. 16] presents an analysis of population movements during the last decade for which we have full census returns.
The white bars show the total population growth of groups of States, the States being grouped so as to represent by one bar those that had similar population trends. Next to the white bar, which shows total population growth, is a shaded bar showing the natural increase of population during the decade by excess of births over deaths. The next bar shows the growth through excess of immigrants from other countries, and the black bar shows the net migration into or out of the State during the period.

If the black bar is above the line it indicates a net migration into the area, and where the black bar is below the line it shows a net migration out.

The bars are proportional to the absolute number of persons involved.

The chart shows a pronounced drift from the three northern New England States, and Pennsylvania and all of the 28 States south of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers, and east of the sea areas, with 4 exceptions, Florida, Texas, North Carolina, and Louisiana, which received as many or more migrants than they sent forth.

Mr. Curtis. Pardon me, at this point, you are basing this on the 1930 census?

Dr. Lorimer. Yes. This is an analysis of the migration between 1920 and 1930.
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Distribution of gainful workers by regions by broad industrial groups, 1880-1930.
We see two States in which there was practically no net migration, North Carolina and Louisiana.

New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, and the Great Lakes States east of the Mississippi, and the far West, were the principal areas of attraction.

In the Hudson River Valley, this group, the number of migrants from other States was exceeded by the number of new immigrants from abroad during the 1920's and in Massachusetts and Rhode Island the net loss through interstate migration was more than offset by immigration from other countries.

Those are the only areas in which migration from other countries was a very important factor.

These regional shifts were associated with the rapid growth of cities, and the still more rapid growth of the metropolitan ring around cities.

The 96 metropolitan districts of the Nation during this decade absorbed two-thirds of the total national increase in population. The farm population during the 1920's declined by 11½ millions, following a smaller decline of about half a million during the preceding decade.

Now the 1940 census will show a different result. Preliminary counts indicate that on the average the cities of over 25,000 population have been growing somewhat less rapidly than the Nation as a whole. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that there has been an increase of somewhat over 2,000,000 people in the farm population, just about offsetting the total decrease of the preceding 20 years. This is in spite of an estimated net migration from farms of 2,000,000 people, due to the larger natural increase of the farm population.

It also appears from these preliminary estimates that in general the southern and western cities have been increasing more rapidly than cities in the Northeast, and the largest absolute increases in farm population have been in the Southeast and Northeast rather than in the West.

The Pacific area shows an estimated 20 percent increase in its farm population during the decade, but this accounts for only about one-tenth of the total increase of the farm population in the Nation during the 1930's.

MIGRATION FOR ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

The direction and volume of migration is controlled by two major forces: (1) Shifts in opportunities for economic production, and (2) regional differences in rates of natural increases. These factors are perhaps equally important, and we will deal briefly with each in turn.

We will neglect the movement of persons of independent income, including pensioners and retired workers, who are guided primarily by residential preference, and of those who move for the sake of educational advantages, health, or adventure.

Changes in economic opportunity are shown by a break-down of occupations into three broad industrial groups:

1. Extractive, i.e., agriculture, mining, and forestry;
2. Mechanical and manufacturing; and
3. Transportation, trade, and service. The trend for the Nation as a whole is similar to that shown for the North Central or Middle States.
FIGURE C—LORIMER
Density of farm population relative to land values.
The proportion of all workers engaged in extractive industries declined from 45 percent in 1880 to 25 percent in 1930. This is due to the rapid increase in productivity per worker on farms and mines, to shifts in consumer purchases associated with a rising level of living, and to decrease in the use of farm products in the production of power and commodities, e.g., the substitution of gasoline for hay, increase in meat and dairy products per unit of feed, and so forth.

Of course, one of the most important of those shifts is the fact that steel mules eat gasoline instead of eating hay, and it is also affected by the increased productivity of bacon and milk and eggs per unit of feed, so that there has been a great decrease in the demand for animal feed.

Actually, the relative decrease in farm population lagged behind the relative decrease in the demand for farm products, so that even in 1930 one-half of the farms, producing only about one-tenth of all the farm products sold or traded, yielded a meager livelihood to operators and laborers. The increase of farm population since 1980 has swelled the ranks of these low-income farm families. The peak in the proportion of workers engaged in manufacturing and mechanical industries was reached about 1920, though the absolute number so engaged was higher in 1930. After 1920, technological displacement of workers in large part offset increased demand for manufactured goods. Opportunities in trade, transportation, and service occupations, on the other hand, have constantly risen, to include 47 percent of all workers in 1930.

I think, parenthetically, we are thinking too much in terms of employment of farm and industry, to the neglect of this largest group of American workers, who are engaged in technical work, in trade, and in the various forms of service, including professional service, domestic service, beauty parlors, tending of garages, and all of that sort of thing.

This division includes some of the most essential phases of economic activity in an advanced economy, and workers in this division cannot, to similar extent, be displaced by machinery. It takes about the same number of nurses to give care to about the same number of sick, regardless of the advances in science. It does not take the same number of farmers or the same number of machine mechanics to turn out a given amount of farm or manufactured products.

These shifts in the character of economic opportunity have necessitated changes in the regional distribution of workers. The Northeast, Middle States, and Far West—the areas which attracted migrants during the 1920's—hold only about 40 percent of all workers engaged in the extractive industries, but they received about half of the 1,300,000 new workers from 1920 to 1930 in manufacturing and mechanical industries, and nearly three-fourths of the 6,200,000 new workers in transportation, trade, and service, counting only the number entering these fields beyond those needed to replace other workers who retired.

The average value of land at the disposal of each farm family in Georgia was about one-tenth the value of farm land available to each farm family in Iowa, and the contrast by counties as shown on this map is perhaps even more striking. In many counties where this
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Changes in farm population, 1930-35.
high pressure of population on resources is shown by the black stippled shading, the value of land per worker in agriculture is less than $250. That is the capital with which he has to work. In many other counties, it is well over 10 times that figure.

MIGRATION FROM FARMS

There has been a general trend toward migration from farms, both from the high value areas and from the low value areas. The movement from the high value areas has come in order to maintain large-scale farming or to escape the hazards of drought, but in general, the migration has been heaviest from the areas of greatest population pressure on resources.

For instance, it is interesting to note that recent migrants from Oklahoma to California have come in largest part not from western Oklahoma, which was within the drought area, but from eastern Oklahoma, where they were suffering from the chronic pressure of population on meager resources with which to work.

The situation in California for farm laborers is difficult, not because of the pressure of population on resources, but because of the peculiar economic structure of agriculture in that area.

UBERN TO RURAL MIGRATION

From 1930 to 1940, migration has been in large part a movement from areas of high productivity but heavy unemployment to areas of lower productivity but greater security, provided by poorly paid regular or part-time employment, or through subsistence farming, or both.

We parenthetically introduce the reference that we also have a trend for people to seek their support through a division of dependence on the resources of two areas, seeking subsistence support from an area perhaps where they have their residence, but then going out to another area to get employment that will give some supplemental income which will, in view of the very limited subsistence which they can maintain from the areas where they are directly resident, maintain them.

This general trend has in other words been a substitution of underemployment for the risk of unemployment.

I think that that is the general characteristic of the migration during the 1930's. The return to placer mining on abandoned claims in the Rockies is a dramatic illustration.

This map (see figure D-1) shows the location of increases in farm population, between 1930 and 1935, the first half of the 1930's. You see the heavy increases occur around cities, and around industrial areas, and in the southern Appalachians, and the Ozarks, the upper Rio Grande Valley, and on the edges of the Willamette Valley where there was still unoccupied production land, and especially in the cut-over areas of the Lake States.

The other map (see figure D-2) which shows the areas having decreases of farm population, has a peculiar concentration in the Delta areas. In general, these maps show a movement to the areas of highest agricultural productivity and also the piling up of farm population in areas of subsistence farming opportunities, including the small parts on the outskirts of cities.
FIGURE E—LORIMER
Expected increase in farm population, on hypothesis of no migration, 1930-30.
Mr. CURTIS. At this point, Professor Lorimer, might the conclusion be drawn that some of those people moving to the farms, the type of farm providing subsistence, are victims of depression in the cities?

Dr. LORIMER. Yes; that is the implication, that they had the choice between staying in the cities, where, if they got a job, they would get large wages, but probably they would not get a job, or going out to a little patch, or to some other little area where they could be fairly sure that they would get something, but they knew it would not be very much.

I will go back to this, if I may. The millions who have retreated in search of meager security have suffered a severe drop in their level of living but they have not caused conflict in the local communities, or created very special problems, and they have, therefore, attracted little attention; that is, whose migration into these subsistence farming areas have attracted little attention, and the same may be said of the young people coming of age in areas of meager opportunity who normally would have migrated to a more favorable situation but have been restrained by fear of failure to find employment. That is, I think, a more serious side of the migration picture—the people who do not come into trouble but who, during this depression period, have either been unable to make the normal adjustment by migration or who have moved to some area of low opportunity.

On the other hand, there has been a smaller countermovement which has stirred public attention. Some people have burst forth from areas suffering from the slow rot of economic deterioration, without awaiting the assurance of any real opportunity anywhere else, only to encounter new times of frustration. These people, in other words, are doing the reverse stunt of moving from deepening underemployment to areas in which they encounter unemployment. These people, I think, may be well characterized as the "economic refugees" of our very imperfect economic order. They flee a situation that has become intolerable, although they know of no opportunity nor do they have any assurance as to work to which they can move.

I wish to turn to the other one of these factors which I mentioned at the start, and in which I am especially interested, the trends in natural increase as they affect migration.

NATURAL INCREASE IN POPULATION

Now, in order to understand the other side of the picture, we need to give attention to the trend in natural increase. If everybody stayed in his place, and there was no migration between 1930 and 1960, the growth of farm population through excess of births would be large, but it would vary in different parts of the country. In some areas there would be less than 25-percent increase in the farm population during this 30-year period through mere natural increase, but in other areas there would be during this 30-year period, if there was no migration, an increase of more than 50 percent in the farm population. (See figure E.) Those are the areas that are across the South, Utah, and Idaho, and the Dakotas. It is not difficult to see that such an increase, if no migration occurred, would in many cases be disastrous. Moreover, it has been estimated that at the present time the
number of young people coming to productive age each year in the farm population of the Nation is about twice as large as the number who would normally be withdrawn by death or retirement of older workers. Now, this is, in part, a matter of rural-urban differential in reproductive tendencies. For the farm population of the Nation as a whole the ratio of children to women of child-bearing age was 69 percent above the number shown by this black line that would be sufficient to replace the number of their parents. (See figure F.)

In the cities, on the whole, even in 1930, the number of children was insufficient to replace the parent population from which they were derived. For the cities as a whole there was a 14-percent deficiency. By this time it is undoubtedly much larger; that deficiency is much larger than 14 percent. This is for the native white population, and the rural-urban differential among Negroes is even greater. That is, the difference between the rural Negroes in reproductive tendencies is even greater than it is in the white population.

Moreover, the highest reproductive tendency is found in the very areas where economic opportunity is low. This map shows the estimated natural increase per generation for each of the counties in the United States. The absolutely white counties, which do not show up very large on the map, but which include a very large population because the big cities are in these counties, are counties in which the net reproductivity is below the replacement level. (See figure G.)

The very dark areas are those in which there are more than 75 percent more children born in each generation than would suffice to replace the parent stock.

The various shadings represent intermediate degrees.

You can see that in general there is a rather striking correspondence between this map and the map on the ratio of population to land values, which was shown earlier. In general, the areas of highest reproductivity appear in Aroostook County in Maine, the southeastern Appalachian area, sections scattered through the old Cotton and Tobacco Belts, the Ozark area, also this eastern Oklahoma area, which we have already mentioned.

The same holds for two adjacent areas, the Spanish-American and Indian areas, in Arizona and New Mexico, and the areas where the Mormon influence is strong, in Utah and Idaho; then North Dakota, where there is a rural population with strong foreign elements, and finally the Lake-State cut-over area which has received a good many migrants during the last decade.

The highest rates of increase are found in areas where the opportunity for effective productivity is already low. These two factors together create the pressure that forces a constant stream of migrants from the poorer rural area.

If counties are grouped according to plane of living, a negative relation between economic level and reproductive trend is found within each broad regional division as well as in the Nation as a whole. The index used here is that developed by Goodrich in the Study of Population Redistribution. You can see that in the Southeast the most prosperous counties have the very low reproduction rate. The same thing is true in all of the other counties.
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Net reproduction rates by counties, 1930.
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Now, for the Nation as a whole shown in the bar at the lower right, when all of the counties are combined, in the one situation of the counties that ranged lowest on this plane of living index, the poorest counties in the Nation as a whole, the ratio of children to women was on the average 77 percent above the replacement level. For every 10 children that they needed to have to replace their parents, they had practically 18 children.

In the two highest groups of counties the reproductivity was below the replacement level.

EFFECTS OF POPULATION PRESSURE

Now, the significance of these trends for migration is clearly shown by a special tabulation carried out by Dr. Conrad Taeuber of the United States Department of Agriculture. He investigated the situation in 220 counties where the ratio of children to women in the rural population was on the average 100 percent above the replacement level (ranging up from 880 children per thousand women) and which had a rank below 30 on the rural plane-of-living index constructed by Lively, where 100 represents the national average.

This, I should say, refers only to the rural population of these counties and the plane of living is the plane-of-living index of rural populations. It is just a comparison between rural people in different parts of the country.

Now, these 220 counties in 1920 had a rural population of over 4,000,000 people, and the very poor counties were high in reproductivity. Between 1920 and 1930 there was a net migration of over 600,000 people out of those counties—equal to about 16 percent of the original population. This is a high rate of net migration, though it is not as high a rate as is sometimes found in more prosperous areas, partly because migration from such communities may be dampened by the very poverty handicaps of the groups living there. However, we did have the migration of 630,000 people, but in spite of this heavy exodus, there were nearly 300,000 more people living in the rural areas of these 220 counties than they had before they started this migration, and in the words of the Red Queen to Alice, in Alice in Wonderland, they were running very fast to get away from their situation, in terms of migration out but they had to run that fast in order to stay in the same place, in order to have the same population, and in fact they did not quite achieve staying in the same place because their population increased. If they wanted to get anywhere, in terms of reduced ratio of population to resources, they would have to run twice as fast.

Now, during the depression, in general, they could not run at all. That is for many of these areas they could not or did not dare to migrate for fear of the risk of unemployment at the other end. Therefore you have gotten during the 1930's, a great piling up of population in these areas where the excess of natural increase is normally drained off by migration, until in some places, the people just could not stand it any longer, and they broke out from this situation of increasing population pressure, to camp on road sides in southeastern Missouri, or wander from place to place in California in search of jobs that did not exist.
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Children of school age per 1,000 adults aged 20-64 years, 1930.
Figure J—Lorimer
Expenditure per pupil for education by States, in relation to net reproduction rates.
The situation is further complicated by institutional factors and conditions which make for cultural retardation in areas where the proportion of children is highest and where there is greatest poverty, and which thus tend to perpetuate excessive fertility and prevent the most effective use of the limited economic resources that are available.

In previous American theory, the health of children is purely a responsibility of individual families—except insofar as their ability to purchase medical services may be supplemented by charity, or their ability to purchase food may be supplemented by relief allowances.

Also in previous American theory the provision of educational facilities is a purely local responsibility, or at best a responsibility of the individual States. The poorest families, the poorest areas, and the poorest States, where the ratio of children to the supporting adult population is highest, are absolutely unable to provide health and educational advantages equal to those available in more prosperous communities. As a result, the children growing up in rural areas are subject to the demoralization of disease, malnutrition, and inadequate education. It is not surprising, therefore, that they should usually make low scores on intelligence tests, or that they should often appear shiftless. The people who live in more prosperous areas, through their neglect of these matters, have a heavy responsibility for this situation—a situation which sends a constant stream of ill-equipped migrants into American cities, undermines our democracy, and weakens our capacity for national defense.

I will just show two charts relating to that. (See figure I.) This is the proportion of school age to the supporting adults in different parts of the country, varying from less than 200 children per thousand adults who carry their support, to over 400 children per thousand adults who must maintain their support. The burden for child care and education is thus more than doubled in some areas of the country than it is in other areas.

This next chart (see figure J) represents expenditures for educational purposes per pupil in the different States, from less than $50 per pupil to over $125 per pupil.

The insert circles represent the natural increase trends, and in general in the areas of the lowest expenditure we usually find the highest rate of natural increase.

You are also, I assume, familiar with the material which shows very strikingly that in many of these areas where there are the most meager educational advances the people in those areas are making fully as heavy a proportional contribution to education, but in view of the limited tax resources of those areas they are simply unable, even though they may make greater effort than other States. They are simply unable to maintain the same level of educational opportunity that prevails in the more prosperous areas.

I believe that we are confronted thus with a vicious circle of cultural retardation, leading to excessive fertility, and excessively large families, leading to increasing population pressure in those local areas.

It is leading toward deepening poverty, which leads again toward cultural retardation, excessive fertility, population pressure, and deepening poverty.
We must have a safety valve which does not operate with such force as to solve the problem but simply to relieve it in a minor degree. I believe that we must discover ways of breaking this vicious chain of forces, and such, I would take it, is a part of the high responsibility of this committee. It is to consider the forces which lie back of the symptoms which we frequently find so distressing.

FORCED RESURRECTION UNSUCCESSFUL

In conclusion, permit me to suggest some lines of approach which, it seems to me, merit your serious consideration. The history of attempts to force redistribution of population, or resettlement, records a series of failures. Most of the ambitious resettlement schemes (I am referring even more to experience in other countries than to experience in our own country; attempts to decide where people should live and moving them there), have usually proved a failure.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not agree with Mr. Hoover and Mr. Roosevelt on that?

Dr. LORIMER. No; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. That is one of his solutions.

Dr. LORIMER. I think that there must be—I am departing a moment—I think that there must be a basis for economic attraction and then I think people will spontaneously move to it. I think that we can do something to control the opportunities, but I think the attempt arbitrarily to move people to particular areas where other people might think that they ought to be usually does not work.

On the other hand, I think it would be equally disastrous to attempt to freeze the present inequitable distribution of people in relation to resources, particularly in view of the fact that this situation is a dynamic one, so that the pressure tends constantly to increase in the very areas of least opportunity.

A sustained expansion of industrial, commercial, and service opportunities in the Nation would induce a spontaneous large-scale movement from depressed areas to areas of expanding and stable opportunity. We, as a Nation, are capable of achieving such economic progress, and I do not accept the defeatist thesis that we have come to the end of our economic progress; and apart from such general economic expansion there can be no permanent solution of the special problems of American agriculture, or of many acute problems presented by particular areas.

RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

There are, however, other lines of advance which need not wait on such over-all economic expansion but are contributory and complementary to it. Measures which will improve the morale of rural youth and increase the capacity of farm families to make fuller use of the resources at their disposal have already been developed by the Farm Security Administration and other agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with State agencies and county committees. These measures need to be extended and supplemented. I should like to propose for your consideration
the following thesis about our policy regarding more handicapped rural areas:

No American community should be permanently dependent on outside subsidy for the maintenance of a decent standard of living. Sound adjustment of population to resources is ultimately dependent on local initiative. But the limitation on long-time Federal action implicit in these statements should not be applied to measures concerned with health, education, or other activities essential for building community morale and for the development of individual capacities. The Nation has a direct and primary interest in the quality of its citizens and in providing equal opportunity to all for the development of their individual capacities.

The stabilization of rural communities in the United States is dependent in part on the reduction of the excessive fertility now characteristic of families in many depressed areas to another level at most no higher than that prevailing among prosperous farm families.

This in turn is dependent on cultural progress and advance in the standard of living in this area.

In view of all of these considerations it has become a primary responsibility of the Federal Government to effect further advances in health, education, and standards of living, which will both equip those who are going to remain in areas that are now depressed to achieve economic and social advance in their own communities and at the same time equip those who must move elsewhere to participate effectively in the social and economic life of the communities into which they move.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Professor—Congressman Curtis, do you wish to ask some questions?

Mr. CURTIS. I would make this observation. I think that the professor has made a valuable contribution to our committee. It occurs to me that there are perhaps some new factors since 1930. There have been some industrial developments in some sections, the so-called Dust Bowl is something that did not exist in 1930, and I hope that he would, after the bulk of these figures are available this fall—that you would supplement your paper at that time with some further deductions.

Now, I think that the committee expects to hold a Washington hearing in November or December, and sufficient census returns will be in at least to show major trends, and I hope that he can give us something at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Sparkman, do you have something?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was glad to hear Mr. Curtis make that suggestion. I was going to make it, too, but I rather doubt the availability of the figures at that time.

Dr. LORIMER. We will have simply the changes in the total population, and we will not be able to have the more detailed analyses. Of course, the census population figures are going to supply the most valuable information that we have ever had on migration, through this question, "In what place did this person live on April 15, 1935," and the number and characteristics of migrants are going to be analyzed in reference to the places from which they come and the places to which they go and the Census is rendering a very valuable service in providing that information, but it will be probably about a year before that information is available.
Mr. Sparkman. I want to say that I think your charts and your statement have been very valuable, and of service to illustrate that vicious circle that you described.

Inasmuch as there is no longer a great amount of unused land in this country, we might as well become used to the fact that this economic pressure that grows out of excessive reproduction in certain areas, and the lack of economic security in those areas, that those factors are going to continue to keep this migration flowing, and that it has become acutely a national problem and one that consideration must be given to in order to arrive at some means, not necessarily of checking it, because I do not believe it can be checked, but of easing up the conditions as much as possible, and as these factors become more forceful the problem will become, probably, even greater.

SLOW MODIFICATION OF SITUATION

Dr. Lorimer. Well, we have at the present time a rather acute situation, in that we have had a damming up to some extent of the natural movement, so that the situation is more acute now. I think that it will exist for a long time.

I think, on the other hand, the factors which are responsible for this situation are subject to slow modification, and I do not think it is a situation that the Nation needs permanently to face. There is, for instance, a tendency toward fairly rapid decrease in fertility in these poorest classes. The pattern of family limitation first began among the most prosperous groups, and then it gradually spread out, and it was very interesting that between 1920 and 1930 the greatest drops in fertility occurred among the groups previously characterized by the highest fertility, particularly the foreign-born in American cities, for which the rates dropped very rapidly between 1920 and 1930, but also in the poor rural areas, there was a drop which was more rapid than in the Nation as a whole.

I think that there is a tendency toward equalization of rates of natural increase in the Nation; and I think that if we set our minds to it we can do something to equalize health and educational opportunities which will facilitate the adjournment through migration and also the improvement of these areas. So that I think that we can slowly break into this vicious circle, but it is going to take decades, and it cannot be done in a year or a day.

(Booklet, compilation of maps and charts, was received in evidence and marked as an exhibit.)

MALDISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION

Mr. Sparkman. May I ask you one more question? What do you mean by saying that it is acute at the present time because of the fact that the natural flow had been to a certain extent dammed up? In what way has it been dammed up?

Dr. Lorimer. Well, for the farm population as a whole, during the preceding 20 years prior to 1930, you had a decrease in farm population, which was a natural adjustment of the relative decrease in economic opportunity of the farm population compared with other sections.
During the 1930's, we had this estimated increase, which wipes out all of the reduction that had occurred during the previous 20 years, leaving the farm population larger, and then when we analyze that in more detail we find that this increased farm population has been mostly not in areas where there were large land values to exploit but in subsistence areas where the incomes were already low, and there has been a damming up during the thirties of the trend toward a natural adjustment in areas like the cut-over area in the Great Lakes States, which were areas from which there was being rapid migration.

Then there has been some piling back of population into those areas, the new areas of low opportunity, and meanwhile the increase has been going on and it has not been adequately relieved by migration, so that we have a situation in which there is a great maldistribution of population today in relation to potential opportunity, and greater than there was 10 years ago.

Mr. Sparkman. Thank you. That is all.

California Agriculture

Mr. Osmer. There was one point in the testimony of Dr. Lorimer that interested me. He cited the large migration from part of Oklahoma, where the per capita resources were very low, to the State of California, where the per capita resources are very high.

Now, just looking at that from an offhand standpoint, one would say that that was a good migration, that people had moved out of a low-resources area into a high-resources area, but you used the words "the peculiar economic structure of California," and I wonder if you would just give us a word of explanation of that peculiarity which has made that migration, from an offhand standpoint, seem a proper one. Why it has worked out so disastrously in California?

Dr. Lorimer. Of course, in California a large portion of the agriculture is on a very highly capitalistic basis.

Mr. Osmer. You mean large owners?

Dr. Lorimer. Very large owners of tracts of land, with very heavy investment in irrigation lands. Very heavy financial investment was necessary for the development of the type that has taken place. And then there is the situation that much of the agriculture is of a highly seasonal character, and that its development has been dependent upon a succession of laborers, first the immigrants from the Orient and then from Mexico, and then finally their places taken by persons whose standards of living has not been very much different, but who are from our own American native stock.

The whole history of land holdings and economic organizations in California means that the opportunity for the exploitation of agriculture is not spread in any equitable distribution among all of those engaged in agriculture.

Mr. Osmer. Would you say a possible future solution of that problem in California would be the development of smaller farms, that is, almost subsistence farms in the State of California?

Dr. Lorimer. I am really not prepared to answer that question. I am rather doubtful about that, and I am not sufficiently familiar with that particular situation to discuss it in terms of solution.
Mr. Osmers. It would seem to me that an individual farmer with 50 or 100 acres would have a very bad time competing with a corporate farm which was run on modern industrial methods.

Dr. Lorimer. I am rather inclined to agree with your implication, that the answer is probably to be found in terms of a better development of the large-scale farming operations, with some regularization of labor opportunities, rather than through a competing type of small subsistence farming development, but that is simply an impression.

Mr. Osmers. I have just two more questions that I would like to ask Professor Lorimer.

TREND TOWARD EQUALIZATION OF BIRTH RATES

Would you say, as a result of your very extensive studies on the population question, that we can look toward a generally lower natural increase of the population, in all classes of the population all over the country?

Dr. Lorimer. I think that in some classes of the population the reduction in size of family which has already gone very far may have reached its limit, but that limit is, for the urban population, far below the replacement level. I think that in the groups now characterized by very high fertility, there will be a trend toward lowering, and I think that the farm families will continue to have a higher rate of natural increase, but a natural increase like that now found, say, in central Illinois, which is about at the replacement level, rather than these extremely large families that are characteristic of the more isolated and handicapped areas. I think that there will be a trend toward equalization of birth rates, but that equalization is going to result in a general trend which will be inadequate for the permanent replacement of the national population, and that will raise some new and large and very interesting questions.

"FRICTIONAL UNEMPLOYMENT"

Mr. Osmers. There is just another interesting thing, in respect to my last question, that has to do with new industries that are developed. I am looking back, well, say, now, to 1900, before they had a radio industry, a motion-picture industry, an automobile industry, an aviation industry, and innumerable others. Have you found in your studies that it takes the population, or the people of the country, from 3 to 4 years to adjust themselves to some of those industries?

In other words, there might be a decrease in the number of livery-stable workers as a result of the automobile, but a great increase in the number of automobile makers, and that those changes which may not be as rapid in the future always take several years to work themselves out.

Dr. Lorimer. You have a certain amount of what the economists call "frictional unemployment," when people are shifting from a declining to an expanding operation.

Mr. Osmers. I have in mind the migration of the textile industry from New Jersey to North and South Carolina and the resultant upset that it has upon the economic situation in New Jersey and Massachusetts, for example.
Dr. Lorimer. But I think that that temporary disability is less serious as a problem than this unemployment trend due to the fact that there has been decline in many industries without any expansion anywhere adequate to absorb the slack. That is the big problem, and I think that if the expansion occurs people will move to and adjust themselves to those opportunities, although there is a certain friction in the process and a certain loss in the process.

POPULATION REGISTRATION SYSTEM

Congressman Osmers, I would like, if I may, to speak of a point which you questioned Mayor LaGuardia about—this matter of the possible development of a population registration system. I have been interested in that for some time and that is a matter in which the statisticians are very much interested. That has been worked out very well in some of the smaller European countries, notably in Sweden and Holland. There they have a system in which every person is registered in a local office. When a birth occurs a new card is made for the individual, and when a death occurs that appears in the register, and then in some countries when a person changes his permanent residence he reports to some office, perhaps a police officer or register's office, in the new area to which he moves, and that area communicates with his home area, and his registration card is sent to the files of the area where he lives, and he also carries an identification card that ties in with his registration card. That is within the system.

Of course, that is very beautiful from the standpoint of statistics; it gives a yearly record of migration from area to area, a very excellent account of the whole movement of population, both natural increase and migration.

So much so that some countries have dispensed with taking a Federal census, and have simply gotten their census result by tallying up these local registration offices, although it is usually supplemented by a census procedure.

That has been associated with the increased services, like our social security service and other community services to the State. Eventually, I think, we probably will want to move in this country toward such a continuous register of the population. It is technically the most beautiful thing. It does, however, involve a good deal of expense and a good deal of difficulty for such a far-flung country as the United States, but I think it is a thing worth serious consideration of the legislators, and whether the time is ripe for it at present I would hate to say. But the study of those European systems is a very interesting thing.

Mr. Osmers. I might interrupt you there by putting a definite type of question. The temper of the American people might be found very much opposed to some sort of registration of that sort, and of course the social security registration, where nearly every wage-earning adult has been registered, has broken that feeling down to a certain extent, and we all have our social security cards now—

Dr. Lorimer. Frankly, I am inclined to feel that the present situation is not the most opportune situation for introducing such a registration system, although it might serve certain real uses in relation
to the emergency. But I am very much afraid that it might be misinterpreted in rather alarmist terms, and I think that in some more normal times, if such a system were developed, and it was understood as the basis for State services rather than as a means of keeping track of individuals, or their subversive activities and their availability for military services, it perhaps might be introduced with a better flavor.

The Chairman. Professor, this committee in its questions does not indicate any decisions on our part. We are just simply a fact-finding body; you know that, do you not?

Dr. Lorimer. Yes.

NEED OF ECONOMIC EXPANSION

The Chairman. And one point that I am quite interested in is that resettlement—and, by the way, you made a very valuable contribution in your entire statement here today—but that as to resettlement, now, ex-President Hoover and Mrs. Roosevelt publicly state that that is one of the solutions, that resettlement.

One of our solutions is industrial expansion, isn't that true?

Dr. Lorimer. Yes.

The Chairman. Is that correct?

Dr. Lorimer. Yes.

The Chairman. Now, you take down in the South, where they plowed that land for hundreds of years and the topsoil has become powdered, and it is blowing away.

Now, personally I cannot conceive how industrial expansion is going to help those people. You have in this country millions of acres being reclaimed and irrigated; in the State of California one-half of that land is owned by the Federal Government, and now, what I would like to get your opinion on is in this industrial expansion. If it does not take place, those people, in the Southern States especially, and in the Dust Bowl area, are going to move; and will it be better for us to have them move voluntarily, as they are doing now, voluntarily, and then we don't know how to take care of them? What is the solution to that condition, do you think, down there?

Dr. Lorimer. Of course, I said economic expansion rather than industrial expansion. I think that that part of this expansion is in terms of expanded services to the people of the Nation, in such things as education and health, and I think that the most important development that might be called industrial expansion is perhaps housing development.

And the housing development should tend to be distributed wherever the people are, or at least where there is any likelihood that they are going to be for some time. It need not be centralized.

I think that much of the expansion that is needed is an expansion which might take place in expansion of economic opportunity, which might be scattered across the Nation and not merely concentrated. However, I think that there are some things that do need to be said and we do need to recognize; that there will be considerable concentration in this economic opportunity, and I think that the thing will happen that did happen during the 1920's, if there is somewhere economic opportunity, people can without great difficulty go thereto.

The situation of these economic refugees that I have referred
to is that they have set forth to get out of places where they were, and they have not had any economic opportunity anywhere to go to. I would like to add one further comment.

The solution as I envisage it follows two lines. One of them is that national economic expansion, expansion of opportunity, wherever it might be economically developed.

**NEED OF IMPROVEMENT OF LIVING CONDITIONS**

The other one is the improvement of living conditions, particularly in matters of health and education, and also in the more effective utilization of local resources, and conservation practices in the poorer rural areas, and I think that we may proceed along those two lines, of developing capacities of people in these poorer rural areas, of giving greater attention to their personal needs, to enable them to make adjustments in those areas, and at the same time for the Nation as a whole, to introduce measures which will make a forward economic progress and expansion of opportunity for productive enterprise.

**DECREASING GROWTH OF CITIES**

The Chairman. Now, Professor, we have several witnesses but for the sake of the record I would like to ask you a few questions here and I know you will be as brief as you possibly can, but I want to get it in the record.

In the first place, you have told us that according to the 1930 census, we are a Nation of city dwellers, and especially of people residing in great metropolitan centers, but according to the preliminary figures you cite the larger cities are not any longer growing rapidly, and their population of child-bearing age are not reproducing in numbers.

Am I right in assuming that you consider this an argument in favor of the encouragement of migration?

Dr. Lorimer. I think that the growth of the cities in the future will be slower than it was prior to 1920. I think we have reached or we have passed the peak of the proper expansion of the cities. Nevertheless, I think that there would normally tend to be some continuous growth of cities, and even some proportional growth of cities, but not at as rapid a rate as in the past, and I think that the slow growth of industrial and commercial areas during the 1930's is in large part the index of the pathological situation and the dampening of the normal, national economic development.

The Chairman. I noticed that you said that this country needs a sustained expansion of industrial and commercial and service opportunities to induce a sustained, spontaneous large-scale movement from depressed areas to areas of expanding and stable opportunities, also where you say that the decreasing demand for labor in manufacturing and mechanical industries is a factor in driving the population back to a subsistence way of life.

What sort of industrial expansion would solve the problem of surplus rural population, or have you answered that?

Dr. Lorimer. I think that that is a pretty large question, and I won't attempt to give any adequate answer to it. I think that the
expansion of economic opportunity which should be both in industry and in service must involve the extension of both public and private enterprise and opportunity and that much of it might logically be developed into expansion of economic opportunity in rural areas, in raising the level of living of the people in rural areas, that is, such matters as rural housing, increased health and educational services, and rural electrification, and then if we develop a program of more adequate nutrition for the Nation, that will give greater employment to farmers.

I think that by any means or anywhere, expansion of economic opportunity serves to meet the problem.

POPULATION PRESSURE IN OKLAHOMA CAUSE OF OUT-MIGRATION

The Chairman. You say that migration is heaviest where population pressure on limited resources is greatest. Then you add that the greatest numbers of Oklahoma migrants to California come from eastern Oklahoma.

What is the economic situation there?

Dr. Lorimer. That, as I have already said, is, of course, as I feel, an area of population pressure. In general, it is the small farming area of general farming cotton, family farming, subsistence farming, and for a picture of the situation one might be referred to the early chapters of The Grapes of Wrath. There is one element in The Grapes of Wrath picture which is not accurate, namely, the operation of the tractors in that situation. I understand in the particular country in which the Joads were located by the author there were, according to latest returns, only two tractors in the whole county. It was not mechanization in that particular area which drove people off, and there were not many tractors running through homes, otherwise, I think, it presents very vividly and quite truthfully the picture of this increasing depression in level of living in an area of high population pressure.

The Chairman. You make an interesting distinction between underemployment and unemployment, and suggest that those who flee from underemployment often find unemployment. You call these people economic refugees.

I take it that you would not want Congress to put a stop to all such movements, even if it could. What measures can you suggest for taking care of these people at their point of origin? Do you favor such measures as are against movements of this kind?

Dr. Lorimer. I think that the attempt to stop migration would be to deal with the symptom rather than with the cause, and in fact would cause ever greater suffering. It would be like giving soothing syrup to a child that needed medical attention, and as to the measures which should be introduced, we have already discussed that to some extent and I will not go into that.

TREND OF FUTURE POPULATION TENDENCIES

The Chairman. I have heard it said that if present reproduction rates, of different groups in the country continue, the population in the year 2030 will be almost exclusively of southern white stock. Does this somewhat fanciful statement reflect a true trend?
Dr. LORIMER. Of course, it is rather an exaggerated picture, but its general tendency has some validity. Of course, there will be a few other groups that are also increasing fairly rapidly, the Spanish and Indian populations in the Southwest, which are multiplying very rapidly, and, of course, the rural Negro population is increasing as rapidly as the rural white population, although, by the way, for the Nation as a whole at the present time the rates of increase in the Negro and white population are just about identical.

If there is a continued movement of Negroes to cities, then I suspect their rate of natural increase may drop below that of the whites. If they stay largely in rural areas they are likely to increase more rapidly.

But in general I think that the picture that the present population, white population, of the Southern States will have made more than their share of contribution to the future of the Nation is very obviously a true picture. But we have there people that have cultural background, congenial to that of the Nation as a whole, and we suppose people of very good stock, but at the present time suffering from very severe handicaps.

The CHAIRMAN. I noticed in the newspapers recently a statement that the New York metropolitan area has grown, according to preliminary figures for the 1940 census, more rapidly than the average for American cities. Have you any information which throws light on these differences?

Dr. LORIMER. I doubt the accuracy of that impression. I think that New York City has grown more rapidly than other cities, and some of the residential suburbs have been increasing rather rapidly, although not much more than other areas, but the industrial suburbs within the new metropolitan area, the New Jersey industrial areas, have not been increasing as rapidly as most of the cities in the United States. I think the continued growth of New York City population during the 1930's, in spite of the decrease in shipping, must be largely interpreted in terms of that tendency to the increasing importance of distributive and technical and educational activities which form so large a part of the activities of this metropolitan population, in contrast to the tendency toward decrease in employment in manufacturing and mechanical industries.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any figures to indicate how many people move each year, either from country to city or city to country, and what ratio to urban or rural migrants?

Dr. LORIMER. About the only figures that are now available, prior to the excellent results which we are expecting from the 1940 census, are the figures on the movement of farm population, where, on the basis of the sample used by the Department of Agriculture, there are estimates of movements from farms to cities, towns, and villages, and from cities, towns, and villages to farms.

Now, the gross movement of population, in both directions, from farms to cities, and from cities to farms, ran over 3,000,000 people, from 1922 through 1932, shifting back and forth, one way or the other, and adding them up.

Beginning in 1933, that shifting back and forth was dampened, and there have been less than 2,000,000 each year thereafter involved, according to these estimates, in shifting back and forth between rural and urban areas, except for 1 year, the year 1932. The balance
was a movement from farms to other cities, but during the latter part of the 1930's the net movement from farms to cities has been only about half as large as it was during the 1920's.

The CHAIRMAN. And this last question, Professor. Would you think it fair to say that these people are migrants but that the popular idea of a migrant was limited to those who get into difficulties while moving?

Dr. LORIMER. I am afraid that that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there anything more?

Thank you very much, Professor. You are very kind and your contribution is very valuable.

(Dr. Lorimer was thereupon excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MISS BERTHA McCALL, GENERAL DIRECTOR, NATIONAL TRAVELERS AID ASSOCIATION

The CHAIRMAN. Miss McCall, will you give your name and address, and something of your present occupation and your background on this subject?

Miss McCALL. My name is Bertha McCall. I am the general director of the National Travelers Aid Association. I am here because our association, together with a number of other private national organizations, has been interested for many years in the problem of what we call "moving people." We are interested in this problem because we see the individuals, and go from the specific back to the general. You have just heard of the general, and we start with the specific and go to that general.

I have been associated with Travelers Aid in one position or another for 20 years, and so I have seen the individuals who move about this country for one cause or another. I am very glad to come to the committee today to give such information and knowledge of this subject as those of us in the national agencies have gained in these years. You may think the knowledge is quite limited, because at the present time we are quite lacking in a good many facts.

BACKGROUND OF TRANSIENT RELIEF

The national private agencies of the United States have used such terms as "nonresident," "transient," "migrant," "migratory workers," "immigrants," "travelers," "strangers," "nonsettled," "dislodged"—these are all terms that we apply to people who are without roots in a community. This group of national agencies has been interested in this problem, as I said before, for many years, but in 1932, when the depression seemed to be almost at its height, this group formed a committee known as the "National Committee on the Care of Transient and Homeless." This committee had on it a number of interested individuals but was made up primarily of individuals from the following agencies: American Public Welfare Association, American Red Cross, Child Welfare League of America, community chests and councils, Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Council of Women for Home Missions, Family Welfare Association of America, International Migration Service, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, National Council of the Young Men's