

Y3. W89/2:
13/
H-7



8671

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION
Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator

Corrington Gill
Assistant Administrator

Howard B. Myers, Director
Social Research Division

RESEARCH BULLETIN

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

REASONS FOR CLOSING RURAL RELIEF CASES
MARCH-JUNE AND JULY-OCTOBER, 1935

March 30, 1936

H-7

INTRODUCTION

This bulletin analyzes the reasons for closing relief cases in nine agricultural areas during the period March through June 1935 by residence and area, and during the period July through October 1935 by residence.

It is one of a series of bulletins concerned with various aspects of the rural relief situation. The basis is data collected periodically by the Survey of Current Changes in the Rural Relief Population from the relief records of 138 sample counties. These counties are so distributed as to be representative of nine principal farming areas in the United States.

In these counties, 40,724 rural relief cases were closed during the period March through June 1935 and 36,750 rural relief cases were closed during the period July through October 1935. The sample counties contained 8.7 percent of all rural cases on relief in the nine areas in February and 8.3 percent of all rural cases on relief in the same areas in June. The areas in turn contained more than half of all rural relief cases in the United States in February and June.

The term rural as used here applies to the open country and to villages of from 50 to 2,500 inhabitants.

Prepared by
Daniel D. Droba
under the supervision of
T. J. Woofler, Jr.
Coordinator of Rural Research

Summary

Approximately 1,813,000 rural relief cases were closed in the United States during the eight months from March 1 through October 31, 1935, exclusive of the transfers from relief to the Rural Rehabilitation Program of the F.E.R.A., and later to the Resettlement Administration, which took place during that period. The latter amounted to about 240,000 additional cases so that in all some 2,053,000 separations from the rural relief rolls took place. The net reduction in cases on the rolls was only 878,000 however, since there were 1,175,000 accessions of new and reopened cases during the period.

In the sample of closings secured in the Survey of Current Changes in the Rural Relief population the reasons for closing during the eight months were distributed as follows:

Reason	Percent		
	March- June	July- Aug.	Sept- Oct.
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Household became self-supporting	57.4	52.1	38.9
Household found other support	13.1	7.8	4.7
Administrative policy	12.6	14.1	9.5
Client moved or failed to report ^{a/}	11.3	9.3	7.6
Works Program	-	8.2	34.2
C.C.C.	1.7	6.6	8.6
Other	-	1.6	25.6
Miscellaneous	3.9	8.5	5.1

^{a/} For relief order or for work.

Economic factors, such as planting and crop season, increase in crop prices, increased industrial employment, etc., were the most important influences effecting closings in the first period, but from July to October emergency governmental agencies, chiefly the Works Program, were of increasing importance. The Works Program became the

most effective single governmental factor during September and October. The ratio of cases closed, owing to the fact that they obtained employment, increased from 37 percent in July-August to 60 percent in September-October. This change was wholly due to an increase in the proportion of cases employed under the Works Program from 8 percent in July-August to 34 percent in September-October.

In both periods proportionately more village than open country cases were closed because they had obtained private employment. In the period July-October, a larger proportion of open country cases than of village cases were closed because of C.C.C. employment, while a larger proportion of village cases found employment in other Works Program projects. In both periods, as would be expected, closings due to marketing of crops, increase in crop prices or advances by the landlords, were concentrated in the open country.

Data showing marked area differences are available for the period March through June. During these four months the proportion of cases closed because they became self-supporting was highest in the Lake States Cut-Over, Hay and Dairy, and Ranching areas. Almost half of the closed cases in these areas were able to obtain private employment. The proportion employed in agriculture was highest in the two Cotton areas. The ratio for manufacturing and mechanical industries was highest in the Hay and Dairy area, and for transportation and communication industries in the Winter Wheat area. Employment in mining was highly concentrated in the Appalachian-Ozark area and employment in forestry and fishing was still more highly concentrated in the Lake States Cut-Over area.

REASONS FOR CLOSING RURAL RELIEF CASES
MARCH-JUNE AND JULY-OCTOBER, 1935

Approximately 1,813,000 rural relief cases were closed throughout the United States, during the eight months from March 1 to October 31, 1935, exclusive of the transfers to the Rural Rehabilitation Program of the F.E.R.A., and later to the Resettlement Administration, which accounted for an additional 240,000 cases. During this period, however, there were approximately 1,175,000 accessions, resulting in a net decrease in the rural relief load of 878,000 cases as indicated in Table A.

Of the 1,813,000 general closings 900,000 were closed in the first four months. Of the 913,000 cases closed during July-October, 528,000 were closed in July-August, and 385,000 in September-October. The slackening rate of separations owing to the declining opportunity to find private employment, and to market crops as the winter period approaches, was more than compensated for by the increasing number of persons assigned to the Works Program (see Table B).

Table A. Net Change in Rural Relief Load,
March 1 to October 31, 1935

	Closings			Accessions	Net Change
	Total	General	Transfers to Rehabilita- tion and Resettlement		
Total	2,053,000	1,813,000	240,000	1,175,000	-878,000
March-June	1,130,000	900,000	230,000	655,000	-475,000
July-August	536,000	528,000	8,000	271,000	-265,000
September-October	387,000	385,000	2,000	249,000	-138,000

Table B. Reasons for Closing Rural Relief Cases,
March 1 to October 31, 1935

Reason	Percent		
	March- June	July- August	September- October
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Household became self-supporting	57.4	52.1	38.9
Household found other support	13.1	7.8	4.7
Administrative policy	12.6	14.1	9.5
Client moved or failed to report ^{a/}	11.3	9.3	7.6
Works Program	-	8.2	34.2
C.C.C.	1.7	6.6	8.6
Other	-	1.6	25.6
Miscellaneous	3.9	8.5	5.1

^{a/} For relief order or for work.

The rate of separations for self-supporting families fell from 57 percent to 39 percent, and for families securing support other than relief, from 13 percent to 5 percent. Administrative closings and closings due to moving or failure to report for a relief order or for work declined less markedly. Works Program closings, accounting for only 8 percent of the July-August closings, accounted for one third of the closings in September-October.

I. March-June Closings

The forces operating to produce the great volume of separations from March through June were largely of an economic nature. Planting and crop season, increase in crop prices, increased opportunities in rural industries, and similar factors, were found to be the most important influences. Governmental agencies other than the F.E.R.A., particularly the A.A.A., had an important but largely indirect effect on relief turnover, while the review of cases which took place during that period, and which resulted in the closing out of the cases of those who were found to be no longer eligible for relief and in the transfer of those considered unemployable to local agencies were secondary influences^{1/} (Table I).

Reasons for Closing Cases Classified by Area. Fifty-seven percent of the closings were due to the cases becoming self-supporting. The proportion of cases closed for this reason was highest in the Hay and Dairy, the Lake States Cut-Over, and the Ranching areas. This can be ex-

^{1/} The Rural Rehabilitation Program had taken over many rural relief cases, but for the purposes of this study such cases were not included in the detailed tables. From February to June 1935 the number of Rural Rehabilitation cases under care increased from 135,000 to 364,000.

plained mainly by the fact that almost half of the closed cases in these three areas (49, 47, and 49 percent, respectively) were able to secure private employment. The proportions securing such employment were lowest in the Western Cotton and the Wheat areas, due largely to the severe effects of the drought during recent years.

Three fourths (74 percent) of the cases securing employment were engaged in agriculture, manufacturing and mechanical industries, and in transportation and communication industries. Seven percent of the cases were engaged in extracting minerals, and the remaining 19 percent in domestic and personal service, trade, forestry and fishing, public and professional service, and in unknown industries (Table II).

Variations from area to area in the proportions securing employment in the different industries were striking. The percent employed in agriculture was highest in the two Cotton areas. In the Western Cotton area 72 percent of the cases, or about twice the average number, were employed in agriculture, while in the Eastern Cotton area 61 percent of the cases found work on farms. The proportion was lowest in the least agricultural areas, namely, the Lake States Cut-Over, the Appalachian-Ozark, and the Hay and Dairy areas.

Employment in manufacturing and mechanical industries for closed cases was most important in the Hay and Dairy area where 33 out of every 100 closed cases were employed mainly in building and construction and iron, steel, machinery, and vehicle industries. The Winter Wheat area contained the highest proportion of households (39 percent) employed in the transportation and communication industries, chiefly in street and road construction and maintenance. This area also contained the highest

proportion of cases (9 percent) in trade and in domestic and personal service (8 percent). Employment in mining was highly concentrated in the Appalachian-Ozark area. Here the number of cases securing jobs in the mines equaled 31 percent of the total. Cases that secured employment in forestry and fishing were still more highly concentrated in the Lake States Cut-Over area where 29 out of every 100 cases found such jobs.

Practically all cases closed as a result of obtaining advances from the landlord during the planting season were found in the Cotton areas. The marketing of crops and increased crop prices were most significant in closing cases in the Hay and Dairy and Spring Wheat areas.

The Western Cotton area contained the highest proportion (15 percent) of cases closed because they received benefits from government agencies in the form of Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments, Farm Credit Administration loans, and advances from the Commodity Credit Corporation. This was due to the fact that the highest proportion of closed cases whose usual occupation was in agriculture resided in that area. In the least agricultural areas, closings were only very slightly affected by the above agencies (Table 1).

Thirteen percent of all closed cases were no longer eligible for relief, according to state and local administrative policies. These cases were closed because they refused Rural Rehabilitation, refused to work, were found physically handicapped, because private employment was thought to be available for them or for other reasons of like nature.

The proportions of closings caused by loss of eligibility for relief were highest in the Winter Wheat area and in the two Cotton areas, due to the fact that most of the states in these areas had issued orders to re-examine all relief cases in order to determine which ones could be referred to the Rural Rehabilitation Program and then closed. The largest percentage of cases closed because clients moved or failed to report for work or for a relief order was found in the Spring Wheat area.

Reasons for Closing Cases Classified by Residence. Proportionately more village (63 percent) than open country cases (55 percent) were taken off relief rolls because they became self-supporting (Table III).

Households securing private employment were significantly concentrated in villages. Fully 51 percent of the villagers found jobs while only 23 percent of the open country cases were included in this group. This is to be accounted for by the greater opportunities in villages for employment in non-agricultural industries.

Farm tenants and croppers who left the relief rolls because the landlords furnished their subsistence accounted for 13 percent of all open country closings and for less than 1 percent of all village closings^{2/}. Nine percent of the open country closings and 1 percent of the village closings were due to the marketing of crops.

^{2/} Practically all of these cases were in the two Cotton areas where they accounted for 27 percent of all open country closings and 3 percent of all village closings.

Fourteen out of every 100 open country cases and 11 out of every 100 village cases that left the relief rolls did so because they received loans or benefits from government agencies, were transferred to other agencies, or were given assistance by relatives and friends. Almost all of the cases receiving A.A.A. payments, F.C.A. loans, and advances from the Commodity Credit Corporation lived in the open country. However, more village than open country cases were transferred to other types of assistance such as county poor relief, mothers' aid, old age pensions, and private agencies. Relatives and friends assisted slightly more cases in villages than in the open country. Enrollment in the Civilian Conservation Corps accounted for about two percent of the closings of both village and open country cases.

The open country contained a higher proportion of cases closed as a result of administrative policy than the villages (14 percent and 9 percent, respectively). Failure to report for work or for a relief order and migration from the county were of about equal importance in both residence groups. Miscellaneous reasons such as "closed in error" "no relief work available", and "deceased", accounted for the same proportion of closings in each residence group.

II. July-October Closings^{3/}

Although private employment continued to play an important part during the July-October period in causing the great volume of separa-

^{3/} Results for July-October closed cases are based on preliminary data.

tions, emergency governmental agencies became equally important in influence. During September-October the Works Program was the most important single factor effecting relief turnover. Administrative policies of the states, loans, and pensions were secondary influences^{4/} (Table IV).

Changes from July-August to September-October. Forty-eight percent of the total number of cases closed from July through October secured employment in private organizations or under the Works Program. However, this ratio was by no means constant during the four-month period. From 37 percent in July-August it increased to 60 percent in September-October. This change was due wholly to an increase in the proportion of cases employed under the Works Program. While the proportion of cases closed because private employment was obtained decreased slightly, the percentage of cases closed because of employment under the Works Program increased from 8 percent in July and August to a figure more than four times as large (34 percent) in September and October (Table IV).

The proportions of cases closed for all reasons other than employment either decreased or remained constant. The ratio of closings due to administrative policy decreased from 14 to 10 percent, the proportion of closings due to marketing of

^{4/} Approximately 10,000 rural relief cases were taken over by the Resettlement Administration from July through October 1935 but for the purposes of this study such cases were not included in the detailed tables.

crops or to an increase in crop prices decreased from 14 to 4 percent. The percentage of cases closed because they received assistance from governmental agencies other than the E.R.A., from relatives or friends, from local agencies or through pensions decreased from 8 percent in July and August to 5 percent in September and October.

Reasons for Closing Cases Classified by Residence. Important differences exist between the closed open country and village cases as to employment and marketed crops or increased crop prices. The percentage of cases obtaining private or Works Program employment was higher for the village (57 percent) than for the open country cases (42 percent). This difference was mostly evident in private employment. As many as 37 percent of the village cases secured such employment whereas only

21 percent of the open country cases were able to find such jobs.

A higher proportion of open country than of village cases found employment in C.C.C. camps (9 percent and 5 percent, respectively), while a higher proportion of village than of open country cases (15 percent and 13 percent, respectively) were employed in other types of Works Program projects. A combination of all closings due to Works Program employment does not reveal any marked difference, however, between the open country and the village cases.

Almost all of the closings due to marketing of crops or to an increase in crop prices were naturally found in the open country. Cases closed for the remaining reasons were about evenly distributed between the open country and the villages (Table V).

Table I. Rural Relief Cases Closed from March 1 through June 30, 1935,
Classified by Reasons for Closing and by Areas

(137 counties representing 9 agricultural areas)^{a/}

Reason for Closing	Total	Western Cotton	Eastern Cotton	Corn Belt	Hay and Dairy	Appala- chian Ozark	Spring Wheat	Ranch- ing	Lake States Cut-Over	Winter Wheat
All reasons: Number	39,884 ^{a/}	10,280	6,192	6,042	5,798	5,090	2,358	1,576	1,340 ^{a/}	1,208
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Household became self-supporting	57.4	54.5	52.8	53.4	76.8	53.4	45.6	68.0	76.6	34.7
Secured private employment	31.2	22.5	32.7	27.7	48.9	30.3	14.5	48.6	46.6	22.2
Advances from landlord ^{b/}	9.4	27.6	14.9	-	-	0.2	0.1	-	-	0.2
Crops marketed-Increase in farm prices	6.3	0.5	2.2	8.3	16.5	3.4	14.7	6.6	10.6	8.4
Other reasons	10.5	3.9	3.0	17.4	11.4	19.5	16.3	12.8	19.4	3.9
Civilian Conservation Corps	1.7	0.3	2.3	0.7	1.6	4.8	1.8	0.5	3.0	1.8
Household found other support	13.1	20.3	12.9	12.7	8.1	7.9	14.2	11.2	3.4	14.1
Governmental assistance other than E.R.A. relief ^{c/}	6.1	14.5	6.4	5.0	0.2	0.8	5.4	1.3	-	3.8
Transfer to other agency ^{d/}	4.4	3.2	3.9	5.7	6.1	2.6	6.9	6.9	1.2	7.8
Aid from relatives and friends	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.0	1.8	4.5	1.9	3.0	2.2	2.5
Administrative policy ^{e/}	12.6	17.4	16.7	12.6	5.7	13.5	1.0	3.4	4.8	22.8
Client moved or failed to report ^{f/}	11.3	7.0	8.1	18.2	5.1	12.9	35.5	10.4	6.0	15.5
Miscellaneous	3.9	0.5	7.2	2.4	2.7	7.5	1.9	6.5	6.2	11.1

a/ Data not available for Pine County, Minnesota. Total closings amounted to 40,724.

b/ To farm tenants and croppers.

c/ Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments, Farm Credit Administration loans, and Commodity Credit Corporation advances.

d/ County poor relief, mothers' aid, old age pensions, and private agencies.

e/ Cases refusing rural rehabilitation, refusing to work or to cooperate with relief officials, cases with no employable member; cases for whom private employment was thought to be available, etc.

f/ For relief order or for work.

Table II. Rural Relief Cases Closed from March 1 through June 30, 1935, Classified by Industries Responsible for Closing and by Areas

(138 Counties Representing 9 Agricultural Areas)

Industry Responsible for Closing	Total	Western Cotton	Eastern Cotton	Spring Wheat	Ranching	Corn Belt	Winter Wheat	Hay and Dairy	Appalachian-Ozark	Lake States Cut-Over
All Industries: Number Percent	12,384 100.0	2,312 100.0	2,024 100.0	328 100.0	738 100.0	1,672 100.0	262 100.0	2,836 100.0	1,544 100.0	668 100.0
Agriculture	36.8	71.8	61.0	37.1	35.5	31.3	20.8	15.7	13.0	7.5
Manufacturing and mechanical	19.4	3.3	19.9	11.5	8.7	22.7	12.1	33.1	24.0	15.9
Transportation and communication	17.9	5.2	5.0	24.8	27.4	25.8	38.5	29.7	15.2	16.5
Extraction of minerals	6.8	1.2	0.5	4.8	9.5	3.3	2.3	3.7	31.0	11.1
Domestic and personal service	3.2	2.2	3.0	3.6	4.1	3.2	8.0	3.5	3.1	3.6
Trade	3.0	1.3	1.6	6.7	1.6	4.4	8.6	3.7	3.8	2.1
Forestry and fishing	2.6	0.1	1.8	0.6	2.4	0.2	0.0	0.5	3.1	29.2
Public service	1.4	0.4	1.3	5.5	6.2	1.1	2.3	0.7	0.6	2.4
Professional service	1.1	0.5	0.7	3.0	0.8	0.8	1.7	2.3	0.4	1.2
Workers over 64 years of age ^{a/}	2.5	2.5	2.0	0.6	1.9	1.9	1.1	3.4	2.2	6.3
Unknown	5.3	11.9	3.2	1.8	1.9	5.3	4.6	3.7	3.6	4.2

a/ Industry not tabulated.

Table III. Rural Relief Cases Closed from March 1 through June 30, 1935.
Classified by Reasons for Closing and by Residence
(137 Counties Representing 9 Agricultural Areas)^{a/}

Reason for Closing	Total	Open Country	Village
All Reasons: Number	39,884 ^{a/}	28,296	11,588
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Household became self-supporting	57.4	54.9	63.3
Secured private employment	31.2	22.8	51.1
Advances from landlord ^{b/}	9.4	13.1	0.6
Crops marketed - Increase in farm prices	6.3	8.6	0.8
Other reasons	10.5	10.4	10.8
Civilian Conservation Corps	1.7	1.7	1.6
Household found other support	13.1	13.9	11.3
Governmental assistance other than E.R.A. relief ^{c/}	6.1	8.3	0.5
Transfer to other agency ^{d/}	4.4	3.3	7.4
Aid from relatives and friends	2.6	2.3	3.4
Administrative policy ^{e/}	12.6	13.9	9.3
Client moved or failed to report ^{f/}	11.3	11.7	10.6
Miscellaneous	3.9	3.9	3.9

^{a/} Data not available for Pine County, Minnesota. Total closings amounted to 40,724
^{b/} To farm tenants and croppers.
^{c/} Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments, Farm Credit Administration loans, and Commodity Credit Corporation advances.
^{d/} County poor relief, mothers' aid, old age pensions, and private agencies.
^{e/} Cases refusing rural rehabilitation, refusing to work or to cooperate with relief officials, cases with no employable member, cases for whom private employment was thought to be available, etc.
^{f/} For relief order or for work.

Table IV. Rural Cases Closed from July 1 through October 31, 1935,
Classified by Reasons for Closing and by Month^{a/}

(138 Counties Representing 9 Agricultural Areas)

Reason for Closing	July- October	July- August	September- October
All Reasons: Number	36,750	22,456	14,294
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Household became self-supporting	45.5	52.1	38.9
Secured private employment	27.0	28.4	25.6
Advances from landlord ^{b/}	0.5	0.7	0.3
Crops marketed - Increase in farm prices	9.3	14.3	4.1
Other reasons	8.7	8.7	8.9
Works Program	21.0	8.2	34.2
Civilian Conservation Corps	7.6	6.6	8.6
Other	13.4	1.6	25.6
Household found other support	6.3	7.8	4.7
Governmental assistance other than E.R.A. relief ^{c/}	0.4	0.6	0.1
Transfer to other agency ^{d/}	2.3	3.0	1.6
Aid from relatives and friends	3.6	4.2	3.0
Administrative policy ^{e/}	11.9	14.1	9.5
Client moved or failed to report ^{f/}	8.4	9.3	7.6
Miscellaneous	6.9	8.5	5.1

^{a/} Preliminary data.

^{b/} To farm tenants and croppers.

^{c/} Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments, Farm Credit Administration loans, and Commodity Credit Corporation advances.

^{d/} County poor relief, mothers' aid, old age pensions, and private agencies.

^{e/} Cases refusing rural rehabilitation, refusing to work or to cooperate with relief officials, cases with no employable member, cases for whom private employment was thought to be available, etc.

^{f/} For relief order or for work.

Table V. Rural Cases Closed from July 1 through October 31, 1935,
Classified by Reasons for Closing and by Residence^{a/}

(138 Counties Representing 9 Agricultural Areas)

Reason for Closing	Total	Open Country	Village
All Reasons: Number	36,750	18,542	18,208
All Reasons: Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0
Household became self-supporting	45.5	44.2	47.7
Secured private employment	27.0	20.8	36.5
Advances from landlord ^{b/}	0.5	0.8	0.1
Crops marketed - Increase in farm prices	9.3	14.8	0.8
Other reasons	8.7	7.8	10.3
Works Program	21.0	21.5	20.1
Civilian Conservation Corps	7.6	9.0	5.4
Other	13.4	12.5	14.7
Household found other support	6.3	6.3	6.3
Governmental assistance other than E.R.A. relief ^{c/}	0.4	0.6	-
Transfer to other agency ^{d/}	2.3	2.1	2.8
Aid from relatives and friends	3.6	3.6	3.5
Administrative Policy ^{e/}	11.9	12.6	10.8
Client moved or failed to report ^{f/}	8.4	8.7	8.1
Miscellaneous	6.9	6.7	7.0

^{a/} Preliminary data.

^{b/} To farm tenants and croppers.

^{c/} Agricultural Adjustment Administration payments, Farm Credit Administration loans, and Commodity Credit Corporation advances.

^{d/} County poor relief, mothers' aid, old age pensions, and private agencies.

^{e/} Cases refusing rural rehabilitation, refusing to work or to cooperate with relief officials, cases with no employable member, cases for whom private employment was thought to be available, etc.

^{f/} For relief order or for work.

COUNTIES SURVEYED AND AREAS REPRESENTED BY THE SURVEY OF
CURRENT CHANGES IN THE RURAL RELIEF POPULATION

EASTERN COTTON

Alabama: Bullock, Calhoun, Conecuh and Winston; Arkansas: Calhoun, Craighead and Pike; Georgia: Chattooga, Dodge, Heard, Jenkins, McDuffie, Madison, Mitchell, Pike and Webster; Louisiana: Concordia, Morehouse, Natchitoches and Webster; Mississippi: Lawrence, Tippah, Washington and Winston; Missouri: Pemiscott; North Carolina: Cabarrus, and Sampson; South Carolina: Allendale, Calhoun, Fairfield and Pickens; Tennessee: Henderson.

CORN BELT

Illinois: Scott, Whiteside, and Woodford; Indiana: Fountain, Hancock, Morgan and Shelby; Iowa: Black Hawk, Calhoun, Guthrie, Ida Nahaska, Page, Marshall and Washington; Kansas: Smith and Wabaunsee; Missouri: Ray and Hickory; Nebraska: Hall, Hitchcock, Johnson and Pierce; Ohio: Clinton and Putnam; South Dakota: Brookings and Hutchinson

APPALACHIAN-OZARK (Self-Sufficing)

Arkansas: Madison; Georgia: Lumpkin; Illinois: Franklin; Kentucky: Johnson, Knox, Lee and Muhlenberg; Missouri: Shannon; North Carolina: Jackson and Wilkes; Tennessee: Cocke, White and Williamson; Virginia: Lee, Bedford and Page; West Virginia: Boone, Marion, Nicholas and Pendleton.

HAY AND DAIRY

Michigan: Sanilac; Minnesota: Benton, Olmstead and Otter Tail; New York: Broome, Livingston, Oneida and Washington; Ohio: Geauga and Stark; Pennsylvania: Bradford, Wayne, and Wyoming; Wisconsin: Chippewa, Sauk and Walworth.

WESTERN COTTON

Oklahoma: Jackson and Lincoln; Texas: Bastrop, Cass, Collin, Houston, Karnes, McLennan, Montgomery, Shelby, Terry and Wilbarger.

RANCHING

Colorado: Archuleta, Garfield and Routt; Montana: Garfield, Madison, Meagher, and Granite; Oregon: Baker and Crook; Utah: Garfield, Grand and Piute.

SPRING WHEAT

Montana: Chouteau; North Dakota: Burke, Emmons, Hettinger and Ramsey; South Dakota: Corson and Edmunds.

WINTER WHEAT

Colorado: Sedgwick; Kansas: Pawnee and Saline; Oklahoma: Harper and Kingfisher; Texas: Carson.

LAKE STATES CUT-OVER

Michigan: Gogebic, Oscoda and Schoolcraft; Minnesota: Pine; Wisconsin: Forest and Sawyer.

AREAS REPRESENTED AND COUNTIES SAMPLED

SURVEY OF THE RURAL RELIEF SITUATION

JUNE, 1935



