

# State Public Assistance Legislation, 1955

by MARGUERITE WINDHAUSER and GEORGE BLAETUS\*

*While most State legislatures met in 1955, the changes voted in the public assistance programs were few in comparison with those enacted in other recent years. No definite trend was apparent; there was relatively little legislation extending the programs and little of a restrictive nature.*

THE legislatures of 46 States and of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands met in regular or special sessions during 1955. Twelve of the 45 States that held regular sessions also met in special sessions during the year, and one other State called a special session of its legislature. Most of the State legislatures meet in regular biennial sessions in the odd-numbered years, a few hold their sessions annually, and in a few States regular sessions are held only in the even-numbered years.

In comparison with the last 2 major legislative years, 1955 saw few State laws enacted in the field of public assistance. The 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act had been an identifiable stimulus to State legislative activity in 1951 and 1953, but this stimulus was lacking in 1955. In general, the public assistance laws adopted in 1955 can be characterized as reflecting a balance between extremes. Few States moved constructively to extend the assistance programs, and few passed restrictive measures.

This survey of the 1955 provisions is based on information available to the Bureau of Public Assistance as of November 15, 1955, from various sources. Although some data are included for most of the States, the information for each State is not necessarily complete.

## New Programs

Before 1955, all States but Nevada had State-Federal programs of aid to dependent children. After Nevada enacted legislation in 1955 establishing a program for aid to dependent

children under title IV of the Social Security Act, this potent force for strengthening family life was making itself felt throughout the Nation.

Another new program established by law made Nebraska the forty-fifth State giving assistance to the permanently and totally disabled under a State-Federal program. The Nebraska law excludes persons whose disability is due solely to mental deficiency or mental disorder. Maine's program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, authorized by 1954 legislation, began operations in 1955.

Texas took an important step toward establishing a program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled when the legislature acted to submit for popular vote a proposed constitutional amendment that would empower the legislature to establish such a program.

## Eligibility Factors

*Residence requirements.* — Compared with the trend to reduce residence requirements that had been apparent a few years earlier, little interest in this subject was shown in the 1955 legislative sessions. Tennessee, which had had no requirement for durational residence, established 1 year as the period a person must have lived in the State to be eligible for public assistance. Minnesota and Delaware reduced the residence requirement for old-age assistance to 1 year.

Nevada amended its law for aid to the blind to cover persons otherwise eligible who do not meet the State's durational residence requirement but who had become blind while a resident of the State. Florida clarified the residence requirements for children in both aid to the blind and aid

to dependent children; a child under 1 year of age may now be eligible if the parent or relative with whom the child is living resided in the State 1 year immediately preceding the child's birth.

The Welfare Commissioner of Connecticut was authorized by law to negotiate with other States concerning situations in which an applicant is ineligible because he cannot meet residence requirements. Delaware provided for agreements with agencies in other States to extend public assistance on a reciprocal basis to Delaware residents living in other States and to residents of other States living in Delaware.

*Transfer of property.*—Maine law had formerly declared that after January 1, 1950, an individual who transfers property without receiving a reasonable consideration would be ineligible for public assistance; an amendment extended the date to January 1, 1952. South Dakota enacted a provision under which, when a transfer of property has been made without full consideration, the person becomes eligible for assistance after other resources are expended and after the equivalent of the property's value, considered against needs at the rate of \$100 a month, has been exhausted.

*Other provisions.*—Aged persons in Connecticut who have made a lump-sum payment and signed "life care contracts" with certain institutional homes, and whose payments under these contracts would have been exhausted at the rate of \$75 a month, may now be eligible for old-age assistance.

Several States amended the laws concerning needy children who are deprived of parental support and care because of a parent's incapacity. Minnesota's new law specifies that assistance may be given to or on behalf of any dependent child whose parent or parents are blind and receive aid to the blind. Iowa authorized county boards of social welfare to appoint boards of doctors to deter-

\* Division of Program Standards and Development, Bureau of Public Assistance.

mine the incapacity of the parent or parents of a dependent child. A new Missouri provision states that refusal by the parent of a dependent child to accept employment or vocational rehabilitation services, training, or medical or other healing treatment renders the child ineligible; the Department of Welfare has discretionary power, after consideration of all factors, to determine eligibility.

When proceedings for the support of a dependent child have begun under the reciprocal enforcement-of-support law, Wisconsin no longer requires an abandonment warrant as a condition of eligibility.

Illinois amended the procedural requirements in aid to dependent children and also extended coverage. When a county department finds that a child receiving assistance is living in a home that does not appear suitable, the county superintendent of welfare is required to file a petition in the family court. If the court determines that the home is not suitable and places the child in the home of a relative or in any licensed foster-care facility, the child continues to be eligible for assistance under the State program. The Illinois act also provides for an extension of coverage to include children aged 16-18 not attending school because of physical or mental disability, as well as to children living with nonrelatives standing in loco parentis if the Federal law is amended to include Federal sharing in assistance to such children.

Nevada deleted from various provisions in aid to the blind the 16-year age limitation. Illinois extended the definition of a permanently and totally disabled person to include some persons who have small earnings as an incident to occupational therapy or who are able to work occasionally but not predictably.

Minnesota changed the definition of a person permanently and totally disabled by deleting the clause "so disabled as to require constant care" and substituting "unable to maintain himself without assistance from others." Missouri added an upper age limit of 65 years for aid to the permanently and totally disabled. This law also includes a definition of permanent and total disability and a statement on method of deter-

mination, and it requires denial of aid for refusal of vocational rehabilitation, training, or medical treatment. The State agency is authorized to waive the requirement of medical treatment.

California modified its citizenship requirements for old-age assistance to include aliens who have been residents of the United States for 25 years and who were ineligible for United States citizenship before December 24, 1952. In general the provision would meet this problem of eligibility for certain Asiatic nationality groups. Delaware deleted citizenship as an eligibility requirement for old-age assistance.

### *Relatives' Responsibility*

Current State legislation reflects an increasing recognition of some of the complexities involved in obtaining support for needy individuals from relatives. Some legislation adopted in 1955 made more precise than earlier provisions the extent of the relatives' obligation, as well as the procedural steps in determining relatives' responsibility for support. Two States repealed laws requiring support from relatives of public assistance recipients, and other States amended provisions causing hardship.

In South Dakota the law now provides that a stepparent with whom a child is living has the same liability for support, to the extent of financial ability, as a natural parent would have. A Nevada provision declares that the parents of a minor child applying for or receiving aid to the blind are liable for the child's support. Before 1955 the Texas Department of Welfare had, by regulation, exempted cases of hardship in holding children or the spouse responsible for the support of a needy aged, blind, or disabled person. In 1955 legal authorization sanctioned this administrative decision. Indiana added the State Welfare Department to the list of persons or agencies who may institute action against children for the support of parents.

Oregon changed the contribution scale to put less liability on persons in the lowest income brackets. Relatives were made jointly and severally liable, and it is now possible for any

contributing relative to bring action to compel contributions by other liable relatives. Specific provisions require payment of support orders to county clerks who are required to set up a system for billing those persons who make payments to help support assistance recipients. The Oregon law further provided for cooperation among all State agencies in locating parents who desert their families. The office of the attorney general is authorized to have up to five assistants, whose function it will be to prosecute fraud and nonsupport cases referred by the State Public Welfare Commission.

Arkansas repealed 1951 legislation that had established relatives' responsibility for public assistance recipients and that had included enforcement provisions as well as provisions for recovery of assistance granted. Alabama also repealed its law requiring relatives' support for aged assistance recipients. Connecticut removed the legal liability of grandparents and grandchildren. Nebraska provided that eligibility of the needy aged and blind to receive assistance will not be affected when relatives living outside the State or estranged more than 10 years may be able to support.

Pennsylvania amended its law to relieve children of liability for the support of parents who abandoned them for a period of 10 years during their minority. California provided that a child who was abandoned by a parent for at least 3 years before his sixteenth year may petition the court to be relieved of responsibility for the support of that parent. Another provision allows the deduction of traveling expenses incurred while away from home in pursuit of trade or business in determining the extent of the liability for support by the responsible relative.

Delaware abolished the liability for support of grandparents and grandchildren and added a provision imposing on spouses liability for support. The law now imposes liability for support only on parents, spouses, and children—in the order named.

In the area of legislation on reciprocal enforcement of support, few laws were passed in 1955. Nevada was the forty-eighth State, if the Territories are excluded, to enact a law of

this type. Illinois extended reciprocal enforcement of support to intrastate as well as interstate cases, and Tennessee passed a law for intercounty enforcement of support. Both measures recognize the difficulty of enforcing support, even within State boundaries.

Iowa amended the reciprocal enforcement-of-support law to permit a political subdivision furnishing aid to bring action against a responsible relative. Tennessee now allows the welfare department to file a petition for enforcement of support of minor children who are receiving aid to dependent children.

### *Determination of Need and Amount of Assistance*

*Consideration of income.*—The Social Security Act requires that any income and resources be considered in determining the need for and the amount of the assistance payment, except that in aid to the blind the first \$50 a month of earned income must be disregarded. A few States have expressed the opinion that the requirement discourages recipients from working and meeting part of their need. In 1955, Illinois provided for the exemption of certain earned income in old-age assistance in the event that it is permitted by Federal law or regulation. Oregon will also exempt part of the amount earned by the needy aged if the Federal law is so amended. In addition, the Oregon Legislature memorialized Congress to amend the Social Security Act to permit exemption of earnings in old-age assistance and aid to dependent children.

Oregon placed statutory responsibility on the State Public Welfare Commission to take into consideration the income of stepparents in arriving at a decision concerning any grant of public assistance.

*Property limitations.*—A few States considered some specific problems in the ownership of real and personal property that affect eligibility for assistance. Under Missouri law, for example, old-age assistance recipients are allowed the value of real property involuntarily converted to cash by reason of eminent domain. In 1955, this law was extended to apply to all assistance programs and was broad-

ened to include involuntary conversion caused by fire, flood, or act of God. The return from such conversion is considered real property for 1 year or until it is reinvested in real estate.

Minnesota passed a law giving the State agency discretionary powers in determining eligibility for aid to the blind if liquidation of land contracts would cause hardship and loss. For families receiving aid to dependent children, Minnesota law now exempts from property limitation the sale value of clothing and household goods that may be held, and it includes a burial lot as real property that may be retained. Wisconsin amended its laws for old-age assistance and aid to the blind by increasing to \$1,000 the maximum on the cash value of life insurance that may be held and limiting to \$500 the value of other liquid assets not subject to agency control.

*Maximum payments.*—Most of the legislative activity relating to maximum assistance payments affected the programs of aid to the aged and to the blind. Minnesota increased its maximum payment for old-age assistance from \$60 to \$65, excluding costs of medical, dental, surgical, hospital, and nursing-home care, but retained the maximum of \$75 for recipients living in a licensed boarding home. Delaware and Vermont, which had paid maximums of \$50 in old-age assistance, raised the maximum payments to \$75 and \$60, respectively. Ohio eliminated, effective July 1, 1956, the \$200-a-year limit on medical care in old-age assistance and provided that payments above the \$65 maximum may be made to meet the medical needs of recipients.

California voted increases of \$5 in the maximum payments under both old-age assistance and aid to the blind. Effective October 1, 1955, the maximums are \$85 for the aged and \$95 for the blind. Missouri liberalized the maximum income limit for a blind person and sighted spouse, raising it from \$1,800 to \$2,100, and also increased from \$55 to \$60 the monthly payment under aid to the blind. Minnesota increased from \$60 a month to \$65 the maximum payment in aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

Iowa had had no maximums on payments made under the aid to dependent children program. The 1955 appropriation bill in that State set \$175 a month as the maximum family payment. Payments were affected beginning August 1955.

*Other provisions.*—The appropriation act of North Dakota provided for a minimum payment of \$60 a month, less resources, to a needy aged person. When two or more recipients are living together, \$45 less resources is the minimum base for each person.

In determining the amount to be paid under old-age assistance, Minnesota had required the deduction of income from the statutory maximum. Under the 1955 legislation, income and resources are to be deducted from total requirements, and payment is to be made within the statutory maximum. Nebraska voted higher allowances for food and sundries in old-age assistance. By administrative directive, these standards will be applied to the other assistance programs.

A legislative directive to the Illinois Public Aid Commission specified that the Commission, in making its rules and regulations, should recognize the special needs and problems of the blind applicant and recipient. Legal provision was also made for payment in excess of the maximum to meet needs occasioned by the special handicaps of blindness.

Utah formerly allowed \$1 a day to the family of a person imprisoned because of desertion. This provision was repealed, and the State Welfare Department given the responsibility for full support of such families who are in need. The Utah program of aid to dependent children will be affected.

### *Liens, Recoveries, and Penalties*

A few States passed laws that attempted to clarify the effect of lien laws upon property. Minnesota amended its law to require that the old-age assistance lien certificate include a proper, legal description of all real estate, to define the priority of the lien as to unregistered and registered land and any interest in joint tenancy, and to increase filing fees.

The 2-year option to clear the lien on the property of a deceased old-age assistance recipient in Iowa was replaced by a 6-month option, and the interest charge was eliminated. North Carolina amended the old-age assistance law concerning liens by extending the time for recovery from the estate, providing for the deduction of collection costs from amounts recovered, and making it possible to subordinate the lien to a mortgage for necessary repairs.

A New York amendment relates to the redemption of property taken over by a public agency in connection with the furnishing of assistance and care; it permits the sale of the property 6 months after the death of the person deeding the property. A new Delaware law requires a written agreement for reimbursement of assistance granted and provides that, after the recipient's death, such an agreement constitutes a lien on any real property. The agency is authorized to compromise or waive its claim.

California revised and clarified its law relating to the recovery of aid paid to a recipient in excess of the amount permitted by law. Every applicant must be given an explanation of his rights and responsibilities. When overpayments are the result of errors of administration, collections from the individual are prohibited. Arizona repealed a law that provided for a claim against the estate of a recipient of old-age assistance for the recovery of assistance payments.

Laws relating to penalties for fraud were passed in a few States. Utah declared it a misdemeanor to aid or abet a person in obtaining public assistance to which he is not entitled or in obtaining an amount larger than that to which he is entitled. In Missouri a new provision relates to the withholding of payments or their reduction for a period determined by the welfare department when a recipient had received assistance to which he was not entitled.

Tennessee amended its law so that, instead of being considered a misdemeanor, an act to defraud shall now be considered as a felony with criminal intent. A sanction is provided against any person who aids or abets anyone in obtaining assistance to

which he is not entitled, as well as against any person who charges or receives anything of value in return for help in preparing an application for assistance.

### *Medical Care*

Financing of medical care for public assistance recipients was the subject of legislation in several States. On July 1, 1955, the medical care program in Washington was transferred from the Department of Health to the Department of Public Assistance. A medical care division within that department will be headed by a physician or a person skilled in medical administration. The division has authorization to set up a medical prepayment revolving fund, and it has administrative responsibility for providing medical, dental, and allied services to recipients of public assistance and the medically indigent.

North Carolina established a State fund to pay hospitalization costs for needy aged, blind, or disabled persons. A similar fund was provided for in Maine to meet the hospital expenses of public assistance recipients. Ohio included, among the amendments to the old-age assistance law, authorization to develop a pooled-fund plan for medical care.

The Virgin Islands established a pooled fund to pay for the medical care of assistance recipients; the fund is to be used, however, only for certain medical supplies and appliances. Connecticut extended payment from its pooled fund to cover the cost of treatment by prayer or other spiritual means. When recipients of old-age assistance and aid to the blind are medical patients in public medical institutions in California, the State agency may pay for such care. New Mexico placed the payment for hospitalization of public assistance recipients on a reimbursable cost basis.

A hospital services program for the medically indigent was created by Florida law. The State Board of Health, with an advisory committee, will administer the service and is authorized to cooperate with other departments—State and Federal.

In Minnesota the State welfare commissioner is required to establish, on a county, regional, or statewide basis, a schedule of maximum fees

that may be paid for all types of medical care. There must be authorization by the county before payment may be made for any nonemergency medical care. Illinois amended the provisions governing its pooled fund for medical care by deleting the requirement for liquidation of the fund each biennium.

An amendment in Indiana removes a limitation on the amount that can be charged for medical care of the aged in county homes and provides for a charge related to the actual costs of care. New Hampshire reduced its appropriation for medical care, making necessary major changes in policy. The appropriation for nursing and convalescent-home care was increased 17 percent.

Arkansas created by law an additional position of medical consultant to assist in administering aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

### *Organization and Administration*

Many State laws reflect legislative concern with the structure, organizational pattern, and effective administration of public welfare. In 1955, two States changed the names of the departments that have welfare responsibility. In Alabama the Department of Pensions and Security takes over the duties and responsibilities, as well as the effects and personnel, of the Department of Public Welfare. The program of old-age assistance is now termed "old-age pensions," and the caseworkers serving aged clients are to be known as "pension counselors."

Minnesota changed the name of the Department of Public Welfare to the Department of Welfare and the executive's title to Commissioner of Welfare. The term of the commissioner will be 2 years, instead of 6 as before. The State Board of Parole becomes the State Parole Commission in the Department of Welfare. Aid to the blind, formerly administered by the State agency, will be administered by county welfare boards under State supervision.

Delaware, which had an administrative reorganization in 1951, codified its public assistance laws and repealed inconsistent provisions.

Some jurisdictions are studying

and analysing their welfare agencies and programs and reporting to the legislative bodies. In Wyoming an interim committee of the legislature is to study and report on government responsibilities, including those of the welfare department. Oregon provided for the continuation of an interim committee to study the functioning and financing of State and county public welfare commissions and to study the requirements and costs of medical, hospital, and nursing care. The Legislative Research Council of North Dakota will study the programs of old-age assistance and aid to dependent children with the assistance of the personnel and records of State and local welfare boards. In South Dakota the welfare department is one of the State departments to be studied by the Legislative Research Council in a program to effect savings and efficiency.

Other organizational and administrative provisions include an Ohio law that will make it possible, at the option of the county commissioners, for the State-administered old-age assistance program to be administered by county departments of public welfare. The State of Washington created an advisory committee for the blind, to be composed of three blind members who will advise the director on programs of vocational rehabilitation and self-supporting aid to the blind. Advisory councils are now required in the larger counties in Kansas to work with the county boards and departments of social welfare. Such advisory councils are discretionary in the other counties.

A New York law permits the employment of attorneys by local welfare districts to perform services specifically related to matters of welfare administration. In Wyoming the attorney general is authorized to appoint special assistants and assign them to State agencies that request them.

Tennessee deleted a provision that had limited to 14 the number of regions administering public assistance. An Arkansas appropriation provides for the position of assistant commissioner. The Department of Welfare in Arizona was exempted from the provisions of the State law relating to judicial review of decisions of cer-

tain State agencies. Arizona also repealed the legal requirement that every recipient be required to file a written quarterly report with the department as a basis for showing a continuation of need. Minnesota deleted the requirement that the county agency shall at once report to the State department its decision on each application.

Wisconsin and Nevada amended the law for aid to the blind. Wisconsin now permits the blind applicant, his parent, or his legal guardian to file the application for assistance. Nevada deleted the requirement for a sworn affidavit at time of application and specified that agency failure to act promptly on an application would be reason for a request for a fair hearing.

*Fiscal provisions.*—A resolution of the Maryland General Assembly requested the department of public welfare to make recommendations to the Legislative Council and the General Assembly for standardizing the various formulas for State and local contributions to public welfare funds. A Florida law makes possible the transfer of funds between categories of public assistance. In Ohio an amendment to the law for aid to dependent children provides a method of distribution of State funds to local agencies on an equalization basis.

In South Dakota every agency receiving Federal funds is required to send a copy of the agency's request to the secretary of finance before submitting it to the proper Federal authority. Montana reenacted for a 2-year period an earlier authorization for county commissioners to levy an additional 4 mills when the regular poor-fund levy of 6 mills is inadequate to finance the county's share of the cost of public assistance and related programs. Counties in North Dakota are to pay 10 percent, instead of 15 percent, of the amount of old-age assistance expenditures in excess of the amount paid from Federal funds. In the same State the non-Federal share of the amounts spent for aid to dependent children in cases involving unmarried mothers will be paid by the State without reimbursement by the county.

Minnesota passed amendments pro-

viding that, in aid to the blind and aid to the disabled, the State and county will share equally the assistance costs above Federal matching; previously the State had met 10 percent and the counties 90 percent.

*Personnel.*—A new merit system plan was established in Florida, with members of the merit system council appointed by the State cabinet. A significant measure in Illinois, effective July 1, 1957, abolishes the present State merit system and establishes a State personnel department under a director to be appointed by the Governor. When the new personnel code becomes effective, it will require the anti-Communist oath from State employees and prohibit political activity. There were also changes in the retirement law for State employees.

In California the board of supervisors may grant educational leave with pay to employees of a county welfare department; the employee must guarantee by bond that he will return to the employ of the county for a period of time equivalent to twice the length of leave. An appropriation act of Florida provides that 12 public assistance employees may be granted educational leave.

### *Miscellaneous Provisions*

*Standard setting for institutions.*—Since July 1953 the Federal law has specified that, when a State plan provides for making payments to aged, blind, or permanently and totally disabled persons living in private or public institutions, there must be a State authority or authorities establishing and maintaining standards in those institutions. This is a factor that encourages the States to continually evaluate and strengthen their licensing laws.

In the State of Washington the plan had not included a provision for assistance to recipients who are patients in hospitals. In 1955 a law was passed that empowers the State Health Department to license all hospitals and thus enables the State to bring needy hospital patients under public assistance.

Convalescent homes in North Carolina are now subject to licensing by the State Medical Care Commission.

*(Continued on page 33)*

**Table 8.—Average payments including vendor payments for medical care, average amount of money payments, and average amount of vendor payments for assistance cases, by program and State, October 1955<sup>1</sup>**

State	Old-age assistance			Aid to dependent children (per family)			Aid to the blind			Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		
	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>
Total, 53 States <sup>4</sup> .....	\$53.28	\$49.57	\$3.97	\$87.74	\$84.87	\$2.98	\$57.82	\$55.35	\$2.65	\$55.51	\$48.32	\$7.74
Alabama.....	32.39	32.38	.01	40.51	40.48	.03	32.56	32.56	( <sup>5</sup> )	33.28	33.20	.08
California.....	88.35	87.93	.52	88.35	87.93	.52	88.35	87.93	.52	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )
Colorado.....	67.84	66.67	1.17	67.84	66.67	1.17	67.84	66.67	1.17	67.84	66.67	1.17
Connecticut.....	87.26	71.26	16.00	137.65	119.65	18.00	91.96	80.96	11.00	115.01	84.01	31.00
District of Columbia.....	53.57	53.43	.14	109.03	108.87	.16	59.32	59.25	.07	60.93	60.68	.25
Hawaii.....	49.33	38.46	10.86	93.45	91.52	1.93	58.84	49.59	9.25	63.10	51.23	11.86
Illinois.....	60.36	41.97	19.93	133.87	122.78	11.12	67.13	51.18	16.66	79.79	42.11	39.22
Indiana.....	49.12	38.03	11.80	89.65	82.20	7.59	59.89	50.97	9.55	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )
Kansas.....	65.48	59.89	5.93	112.19	103.69	9.31	70.69	66.41	4.50	70.14	62.42	8.08
Louisiana.....	51.15	51.14	( <sup>5</sup> )	65.37	65.12	.25	50.10	49.96	.14	42.86	42.74	.12
Maine.....	49.41	46.41	3.00	84.74	81.74	3.00	53.61	50.61	3.00	58.44	52.29	6.16
Massachusetts.....	77.57	56.11	21.95	126.42	117.22	9.58	95.32	94.55	.87	101.14	57.01	47.18
Michigan.....	56.21	55.49	2.03	63.53	63.14	1.35	63.53	63.14	1.35	72.69	71.53	10.74
Minnesota.....	08.17	45.02	23.22	120.98	109.12	12.32	82.31	53.75	29.42	57.32	50.57	8.45
Nevada.....	57.53	56.02	2.32	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )	( <sup>6</sup> )
New Hampshire.....	63.66	51.69	12.00	131.73	118.46	13.50	68.00	59.00	9.00	77.08	57.08	20.00
New Jersey.....	70.46	70.59	.02	118.20	115.99	2.21	70.46	70.59	.02	70.46	70.59	.02
New Mexico.....	32.40	29.32	3.09	68.36	62.65	5.71	35.01	30.10	4.91	33.11	29.24	3.88
New York.....	80.20	63.14	20.23	139.71	129.47	11.39	89.71	74.22	18.75	84.96	68.67	18.88
North Carolina.....	31.74	31.34	.40	62.43	61.82	.61	37.61	36.97	.64	37.61	36.97	.64
North Dakota.....	67.95	53.15	15.62	119.14	109.56	10.55	68.00	52.37	16.23	72.59	55.22	18.98
Ohio.....	57.89	55.86	2.03	90.96	90.14	.82	57.03	55.17	1.86	57.03	55.17	1.86
Pennsylvania.....	46.17	43.65	2.52	105.24	101.42	3.82	51.05	49.40	1.65	54.27	50.77	3.50
Rhode Island.....	60.58	55.84	6.39	111.42	104.42	7.00	72.27	66.36	7.86	75.88	67.72	11.45
Utah.....	59.83	59.77	.06	113.11	112.79	.31	68.16	67.79	.37	63.18	64.82	.36
Virgin Islands.....	18.72	18.22	.50	34.78	34.28	.50	( <sup>7</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )	19.27	18.78	.50
Washington.....	76.83	62.37	14.65	119.23	105.04	15.12	93.28	80.28	13.00	91.15	73.79	17.66
Wisconsin.....	64.33	52.43	12.03	143.29	128.56	14.88	69.32	59.62	9.75	96.29	66.50	29.91

<sup>1</sup> Averages for general assistance not computed because of difference among States in policy or practice regarding use of general assistance funds to pay medical bills for recipients of the special types of public assistance. Figures in italics represent payments made without Federal participation. States not shown made no vendor payments during the month or did not report such payments.

<sup>2</sup> Averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both.

<sup>3</sup> Averages based on number of cases receiving payments. See tables 9-12 for average money payments for States not making vendor payments.

<sup>4</sup> For aid to the permanently and totally disabled represents data for the 45 States with programs in operation.

<sup>5</sup> Less than 1 cent.

<sup>6</sup> No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

<sup>7</sup> Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 recipients.

## ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

(Continued from page 13)

In California, failure to comply with a rule or regulation of the State Social Welfare Department with respect to the operation of a boarding home or institution is cause for revocation or suspension of a license. The law also declares that a license issued for such a facility shall not be deemed to have a value for sale or exchange of property. Oregon expanded the legal definition of homes for the aged to include certain homes previously excluded; to strengthen and professionalize the services given in nursing homes, the operators are now licensed.

**Disclosure of information.**—Indiana was the first State to enact legislation prescribing the conditions under which there could be public access to the names of assistance recipients, as permitted by the 1951 Federal law. In 1955 Indiana amended its law to

simplify procedure. Copies of a schedule of monthly payments are now filed with designated officials.

Wyoming now permits public access to the names of recipients. The names of recipients and the amounts of their payments are available to public officials and representatives of charitable organizations, as designated; the use of the information for political and commercial purposes is prohibited. Tennessee made the same provision for public access to the names of recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled and the amounts of their assistance payments that had already been established for the other programs.

New Mexico provided that a monthly listing of recipients and amounts paid shall be available in each county office but prohibited publication by radio, television, or newspapers or for commercial or political purposes. A bill providing for a simi-

lar listing was passed by the West Virginia Legislature but vetoed by the Governor.

**Problems of the aging.**—In several States the problems of the aging received attention. The Governor of Colorado was authorized to appoint a commission on the aged to study problems of the aging and make periodic reports and proposals to the Governor and the legislature. California provided for a citizens' advisory committee on the aging, and Illinois and Indiana established commissions on the aging.

A new legislative council in Michigan, with members appointed by the legislature and a paid staff, will make legislative recommendations on the problems of the aging and on the correlation of work being done in this field by the various State departments. Pertinent laws, the problems of the aged, and the problems of cata-

(Continued on page 35)

Table 11.—Aid to dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, October 1955<sup>1</sup>

[Includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			Percentage change from—			
		Total <sup>2</sup>	Children	Total amount	Average per—		September 1955 in—		October 1954 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of families	Amount	Number of families	Amount
Total.....	598,488	2,171,261	1,642,932	\$52,512,776	\$87.74	\$24.19	-1.0	-0.6	+1.3	+3.4
Alabama.....	18,805	72,927	56,126	761,813	40.51	10.45	+6	-8.9	+14.0	+8.5
Alaska.....	1,264	4,405	3,246	114,834	90.86	26.07	+2.3	+2.8	+14.9	+35.3
Arizona.....	4,601	17,762	13,438	418,920	91.05	23.59	-2.1	-5.9	+9.8	+10.0
Arkansas.....	7,158	26,618	20,564	392,704	54.86	14.75	-4.5	-5.1	-1.1	+1.5
California.....	52,325	178,248	136,537	6,710,836	128.25	37.65	-1.0	(3)	-2.0	+7
Colorado.....	5,706	21,523	16,560	618,028	108.31	28.71	-1	-1	-1.1	+5
Connecticut.....	5,326	17,221	12,771	733,115	137.65	42.57	+2	-1.1	+16.6	+19.5
Delaware.....	1,066	4,143	3,172	91,625	85.95	22.12	+9	+6	+9.9	+11.0
District of Columbia.....	2,003	8,453	6,617	218,394	109.03	25.74	-2.9	-2.4	-15.9	-12.9
Florida.....	21,307	75,286	57,332	1,171,632	54.99	15.56	+4	+5	+4.1	+5.2
Georgia.....	14,081	51,141	39,058	1,058,427	75.17	20.70	+4	+6	+3.9	+5.5
Hawaii.....	3,237	12,354	9,793	302,499	93.45	24.49	+2	-4.4	+5.5	+7.5
Idaho.....	1,754	6,364	4,697	226,773	129.29	35.63	+2	+2	-2.9	+1.5
Illinois.....	21,694	84,020	63,615	2,904,195	133.87	34.57	+1.0	+1.4	+5.8	+10.4
Indiana.....	8,603	30,254	22,424	771,295	89.65	25.49	-7	-1.0	+4.2	+5.4
Iowa.....	6,479	23,510	17,578	711,024	109.74	30.23	-1	+1	-5	-1.7
Kansas.....	4,452	16,218	12,485	499,453	112.19	30.80	-1	+8	+5.3	+7.6
Kentucky.....	18,634	67,285	50,369	1,185,140	63.60	17.61	-8	-1.0	+1.3	+4.3
Louisiana.....	18,440	71,658	54,536	1,205,344	65.37	16.82	-2	(3)	+7.7	+9.9
Maine.....	4,340	14,992	10,823	367,755	84.74	24.53	(3)	+1	+3.6	+6.1
Maryland.....	6,127	24,985	19,406	588,511	96.05	23.55	-7	-5	+2.1	+3.6
Massachusetts.....	12,825	42,758	31,620	1,621,383	126.42	37.92	-5	-8	+2.5	+3.9
Michigan.....	19,209	65,868	47,934	2,190,477	114.03	33.26	-1.3	-4	-1.0	+3.3
Minnesota.....	7,874	26,665	20,465	952,593	120.98	35.72	+2	+1.9	+5.7	+9.3
Mississippi.....	11,073	41,307	32,039	305,848	27.71	7.43	-6.2	-6.4	-29.6	-25.2
Missouri.....	20,136	70,642	52,473	1,361,868	67.63	19.28	-6.6	-7.2	-4.6	-3.8
Montana.....	2,022	7,131	5,377	213,412	105.55	29.93	-3	-4	-8.5	-8.6
Nebraska.....	2,534	9,193	6,895	247,989	97.86	26.98	-2	+3.0	+3.7	+8.7
Nevada.....	259	933	711	22,196	85.70	23.79	+17.2	+18.2	(3)	(3)
New Hampshire.....	1,004	3,733	2,811	132,254	131.73	35.43	+1.1	+1.4	-4.3	+1.0
New Jersey.....	6,087	20,297	15,357	719,483	118.20	35.45	+2	(3)	+13.9	+16.7
New Mexico.....	5,996	22,173	16,906	409,860	68.36	18.48	-1.9	-2.1	-10.6	-16.8
New York.....	53,618	193,990	142,294	7,491,042	139.71	38.62	+1.0	+1.0	+5.6	+8.2
North Carolina.....	18,771	71,375	54,534	1,171,876	62.43	16.42	+1.2	+1.2	+4.8	+6.9
North Dakota.....	1,467	5,365	4,109	174,776	119.14	32.58	-1.7	-6	+3.1	+5.8
Ohio.....	15,962	60,572	45,929	1,451,584	90.96	23.97	+1	-4.9	+12.6	+6.9
Oklahoma.....	15,483	51,290	39,369	1,203,366	77.72	23.46	-1.0	-9	+2.5	+8.1
Oregon.....	3,346	11,951	9,035	407,586	121.81	34.10	+3	+7	-7.5	-9.4
Pennsylvania.....	28,325	108,728	82,282	3,001,852	105.24	27.61	-1.2	-1.2	+2.4	+3.8
Puerto Rico.....	41,270	142,609	109,925	434,997	10.54	3.05	-6	-4	+7	+4.8
Rhode Island.....	3,453	11,919	8,788	384,728	111.42	32.28	-1.1	-5	+4.6	+4.9
South Carolina.....	8,107	31,425	24,507	384,597	47.48	12.25	-1.8	-8	+3.5	+5.5
South Dakota.....	2,705	8,988	6,844	220,956	81.68	24.58	-2.1	-2.2	-3.2	-3.8
Tennessee.....	20,116	72,370	54,067	1,210,539	60.18	16.73	-2.1	-2.1	-9.2	-19.7
Texas.....	21,458	85,294	64,117	1,226,316	57.15	14.38	-3.9	-2.9	+3.3	-9
Utah.....	2,845	10,070	7,492	321,786	113.11	31.95	-2.8	-2.1	-8.5	-7.9
Vermont.....	1,690	3,785	2,841	87,245	80.04	28.05	+1	+4	+7.6	+11.4
Virgin Islands.....	211	784	646	7,339	34.78	9.36	+1.4	+1.1	+26.3	+87.7
Virginia.....	8,684	33,759	26,110	570,767	65.73	16.91	-4	-3	+2.3	+2.2
Washington.....	8,494	29,151	21,407	1,012,770	119.23	34.74	-2.7	-1.7	(3)	+13.7
West Virginia.....	17,921	67,885	52,823	1,312,565	73.24	19.34	-6	-5	-2.9	-11.5
Wisconsin.....	7,977	27,793	20,510	1,143,044	143.29	41.13	+2	+3.8	+1.5	+8.2
Wyoming.....	564	2,052	1,565	61,765	109.51	30.10	+1.4	+1.8	+8.7	+10.3

<sup>1</sup> For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1953, p. 16. All data subject to revision.

<sup>2</sup> Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

<sup>3</sup> Decrease of less than 0.05 percent.

<sup>4</sup> Increase of less than 0.05 percent.

<sup>5</sup> Not computed; July 1955 first month of operation under approved plan.

<sup>6</sup> In addition to these payments from aid to dependent children funds, supplemental payments of \$104,360 from general assistance funds were made to 3,001 families.

<sup>7</sup> Based on data excluding vendor payments for medical care for October 1954

(Continued from page 33)

strophic illness are included among the subjects to be studied by the Legislative Council in Connecticut, which will report in 1957.

Kansas passed enabling legislation to permit the construction of homes

for the aged by county welfare departments and to permit the leasing of such homes for private operation. A Michigan law provides that each of the public employment offices will have one or more counselors for work with persons aged 65 or over.

A law of a different nature that will affect some aged persons in Tennessee provides for the appointment of a conservator for persons incapable of managing their estate by reason of advanced age, physical infirmities, or mental weakness.