

receiving services increased from 1946 to 1950, when it approached 1957's all-time high; it dropped from 1951 through 1954 and in 1955 began the increase that has continued until, on March 31, 1957, the record high was reached.

The consistent and large increases in rural States in the number of children receiving child welfare case-work services from public welfare departments have resulted in a larger proportion of rural children among all children receiving such services in the United States. In 1946, of all children served, 19 percent lived in rural States, 38 percent in semirural States, and 43 percent in urban States. In 1957 the percentage who resided in urban States had dropped to 39, and the percentage residing in rural States had increased to 28. There was an 85-percent increase from 1946 to 1957 in the number of children served in the rural States and only a 12-percent increase in the number served in urban States.

The rates for children served in rural States have also shown an almost consistently rising trend; for the group the rate increased from 40 per 10,000 children in 1946 to 63 per 10,000 children in 1957 (table 4). In urban States there has been a generally declining trend, from 62 per 10,000 in 1946 to 49 per 10,000 in 1957.

State Variations

Although there has been a steady rise in the country as a whole in the

number of children served, and an even more marked upward trend in the rural States, individual States in each of the groups—urban, semirural, and rural—show considerable variations from the trend. Four States—Massachusetts, Indiana, Nebraska, and Idaho—had downward trends. The first is an urban State, and the last is a rural State; the other two are semirural. Twenty States showed rising trends; eight were semirural States, eight were rural, and four were urban. In the other 16 States no well-defined trend could be observed.

Nearly the same number of States in the urban and rural groups had declining trends in the rates of children served. Marked State variations in these rates tend to persist from year to year. In 1946 the rates in the reporting States ranged from 9 per 10,000 children to 201 per 10,000 children; in 1957 in the same group of States the rates ranged from 5 to 161. Among the eight States ranking lowest in 1946, five were still among the lowest eight in 1957.

A few States, however, have made remarkable progress. Mississippi is outstanding, with more than a five-fold increase from 1946 to 1957 in the number of children served and a rise in the rate of service from 13 per 10,000 children under age 21 to 79 per 10,000. Maryland increased the number served by 284 percent and the rate from 24 to 61. Arkansas and Oklahoma also moved out of the

group of States that had the lowest rates in 1946.

Conclusions

The major conclusion that can be drawn from the data on children receiving services provided by 40 States reporting continuously since 1946 is that there has been a significant expansion of child welfare services in rural States. Since these States are largely States with low per capita income, this expansion has occurred primarily in low-income States. During the same period, child welfare services in urban States have been reaching a declining proportion of the child population—from 62 of every 10,000 children in 1946 to 49 per 10,000 in 1957.

These factors, together with higher birthrates and increasing child population, have brought about a slight drop in the rates for children receiving services in the 40 reporting States.

That the lower rate is not the result of declining need for child welfare services was shown by the answers of 51 States to an inquiry about needs for foster care in 1956. The principal finding was that practically all States had children who needed foster care but for whom facilities were inadequate. Growth in the number of dependency and neglect cases in juvenile courts also points to the need for providing more child welfare casework services to children in their own homes.

Notes and Brief Reports

Canadian Programs for the Aged*

Twice during the calendar year 1957 important changes were made in the Canadian income-maintenance programs for the aged. The most significant of the modifications were the two successive increases in the benefit amounts. The programs¹ became effective in what is, in general, their present form at the beginning

* Prepared by Robert J. Myers, Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration.

¹ For more details, see "New Canadian Programs for the Aged," *Social Security Bulletin*, April 1952.

of 1952, when a dual basis for payments was established. The provision in effect immediately before this change provided for old-age assistance for persons aged 70 or over, which was financed jointly by the Dominion Government (75 percent) and the Provinces (25 percent); the maximum payment in which the Dominion Government shared was \$40 a month, with need being measured and the pension being reduced by income over a specified amount.

From 1952 on, old-age assistance has been provided on a national basis for persons aged 65-69, and flat-rate pensions under the "old-age security"

program have been available without a means test to persons aged 70 and over. Under both programs there are certain residence requirements but no citizenship requirements. The amount of the flat-rate pension is the same as the maximum available under old-age assistance—at least to the extent that the Dominion Government participates financially in the assistance payment. (Certain Provinces pay supplementary assistance out of their own funds to persons aged 70 and over, as well as to those aged 65-69.) Old-age assistance payments are not made to persons receiving either an allowance because of blindness or disability or a war veteran's allowance, which is as large as or larger than the assistance pay-

ment and is payable under more liberal conditions.

The old-age assistance payments are financed jointly by the Dominion Government and the Provinces on a 50-50 basis. The pensions provided at age 70 and thereafter regardless of need under the old-age security program are financed solely by the Dominion Government, with the payments coming from the special "old-age security fund," which is simply an account in the general accounts of the Dominion Government. This fund receives the income from three earmarked taxes: individual taxes of 2 percent of taxable income up to \$3,000 a year; corporation taxes of 2 percent of total taxable income; and general sales taxes of 2 percent on most items (except food, heating fuel, most building materials, and the like) levied on the manufacturer's sale price of goods produced or manufactured in Canada or on the duty-paid value of goods imported into Canada. When the receipts from these sources fall short of what is required to pay the pensions, temporary loans are made to the fund by the Minister of Finance from the General Treasury. The practice has been to reduce the amount of the loans by special grants voted by Parliament from time to time when subsequent receipts from these earmarked taxes have not been large enough to pay off the full amount of

the temporary loans. These special grants are, of course, financed from the general revenues of the Government, which also come, to a considerable extent, from the sales tax and the corporation and personal income taxes.

Legislative Developments

The amount of the old-age pension payable without a means test to persons aged 70 and over was initially established at \$40 a month, beginning in 1952, and remained at this figure until July 1957, when it was increased to \$46 or by 15 percent. In November 1957 the pension was further increased to \$55—a rise of almost 40 percent from the rate that had been in effect through June 1957. At the same time, the individual maximum amount under the old-age assistance program was increased correspondingly, and similar changes were made in the public assistance programs for blind persons and for persons totally and permanently disabled.²

Until the legislation that became effective in November 1957, a person to be eligible either for old-age assistance or for the pension payable as a right at age 70 generally had to have lived in Canada for 20 years immediately preceding the applica-

tion for benefits. An individual who could not meet this condition but who had 1 year of residence immediately preceding the application could, however, be eligible if he had lived in Canada before the 20-year period for at least twice the number of years that he was not a resident of Canada during the 20 years. The recent legislation changed the 20-year residence requirement to 10 years.

Another change made in the old-age assistance program by the two modifications effective in 1957 relates to the maximum total income³ that is allowed in determining need in those cases where there is to be financial participation by the Dominion Government. At present the maximum allowed for a single person is \$960 a year. If the individual has "nonexempt income" of \$300 or less, the full old-age assistance of \$55 a month is payable, with half the cost financed by the Dominion Government; if such income is \$600, for example, then the maximum payment in which the Dominion Government will share is \$30 a month. The maximum allowable annual income for single persons, married couples generally, and married couples where one spouse is blind is shown below.

² See "Canadian Act for Assistance to Disabled Persons," *Social Security Bulletin*, February 1955.

Table 1.—Canadian old-age security program: Actual program operations, 1952-57, and estimated operations, 1957-59

[In millions]

Fiscal year ¹	Pension payments	Income to meet pension payments, by source			
		Individual income tax	Corporation income tax	Sales tax	General Treasury ²
1952 ³	\$76.1	\$0.1	\$2.0	\$24.3	\$49.7
1953	323.1	45.2	36.9	141.5	99.5
1954	338.9	90.7	55.6	146.8	45.8
1955	353.2	100.9	46.0	143.0	63.3
1956	366.2	102.5	53.3	160.4	50.0
1957:					
Actual	379.1	125.0	67.3	179.3	7.5
If at \$46 pension rate ⁴	436.0	125.0	67.3	179.3	64.4
If at \$55 pension rate ⁴	521.3	125.0	67.3	179.3	149.7
1958 ⁵	473.2	135.0	61.0	177.0	100.2
1959 ⁶	555.0	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)

¹ April 1 of preceding year to March 31 of year shown.

² Balancing item between pension payments and income from the earmarked taxes.

³ For last 3 months of year only.

⁴ Estimated by the Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration; derived from actual data for fiscal year 1957.

⁵ Estimated by the Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration; derived from actual data for the first 11 months.

⁶ Estimated.

⁷ Data not available.

Source: *Canada Year Book, 1956*, and unpublished data from Research and Statistics Division, Canadian Department of National Health and Welfare.

Period	Single person	Married couple	Married couple, spouse blind
Jan. 1952-June 1957	\$720	\$1,200	\$1,320
July 1957-Oct. 1957	840	1,380	1,740
Nov. 1957 and after	960	1,620	1,980

On the whole, these amounts are about two-thirds higher for married couples generally than for single persons, although, when one member of the couple is blind, they are roughly twice as high as for a single person. The total amount of income allowed recipients of old-age assistance was increased at the same time the amount of the maximum payment

³ The total income includes the old-age assistance payment and the imputed value of assets (after certain exemptions); it excludes any supplementary assistance payment made entirely by the Province and certain other minor or unusual income, such as casual gifts, family contributions for other than ordinary maintenance, and family allowances for young children.

was raised; the increase was, however, relatively less. The maximum payment was raised a total of 37½ percent from the amount before July 1957, and the allowable income for single persons and for married persons generally 33–35 percent.

One relatively minor change made by the legislation that became effective in November 1957 affected only the old-age pensions payable at age 70 as a matter of right. Under the old law, if the individual was absent from Canada and returned within 6 months, the pension was paid retroactively for the time he was away, up to a maximum of 3 months' benefits in any calendar year. Under current legislation, such payments may be made for the entire 6 months. As before, however, no benefits will be paid for any period of absence from the country longer than 6 months. Moreover, such payments are limited to a total of 6 months in any calendar year in the event of more than one absence.

Program Operations

Old-age security.—Table 1 shows the financial operation of the old-age security program, for persons aged 70 or over, for the period from January 1952 to March 1958. The figures are on a fiscal-year basis, running from April 1 to March 31; thus, the fiscal year 1958 consists of the period from April 1, 1957, to March 31, 1958. The figures for the latest year are partially estimated (from the actual experience for the first 11 months of the year). In addition, estimated projections of pension payments are given for the fiscal year 1959, and derived estimates are shown for 1957, based on the hypothesis that the higher pension rates that went into effect shortly after the close of the year had been effective throughout that year.

The number of persons receiving pensions rose slowly but steadily during the 6 years of operation as the population aged 70 and over increased. There were 643,013 pensioners in March 1952 and 827,560 in March 1958.

Pension payments have risen slowly over the years in line with the normal increase in the size of the population aged 70 and over. Thus the annual rate in the first fiscal year

(based on the rate for January–March 1952) was about \$305 million, and by 1957 it had grown to almost \$380 million, an increase of 25 percent. For 1958, pension payments are estimated at \$473 million—25 percent more than in the preceding year; most of the increase is, of course, the result of the higher benefit rate rather than the growth in the number of pensioners, which was only 3 percent.

Estimated pension payments for the fiscal year 1959 are \$555 million, or 18 percent higher than the amount for 1958. This rise is primarily the result of assuming the \$55 pension rate to be in effect for the entire year. During 1958 it was in effect for only the last 5 months of the year. When the estimates for 1957 that are based on a constant pension rate of \$55 are considered, it will be seen that from that year to the fiscal year 1959 the increase amounts to only about 6½ percent. Although this increase results largely from population growth, it also—to a slight extent—reflects the change in residence requirements and the more liberal provisions governing payments to persons returning from visits outside the country.

Table 1 also shows from what sources the income to meet the pension payments was derived for each of the fiscal years from 1952 to 1958. The tax on individual incomes did not produce any income to all intents and purposes until July 1952, and then in the next few months there was the customary administrative lag in collecting the taxes. As a result, there was virtually no income from this source in the first fiscal year (ended March 1952) and the amount in the second fiscal year was relatively low because it did not represent a full year's experience. The revenue from the individual income tax amounted to about \$100 million annually for the 3 fiscal years 1954–56 and to \$125 million for 1957 and to an estimated \$135 million for 1958. The same general trends are apparent in the fund's income from the corporation income tax, except that at the beginning of the program this tax produced income somewhat more rapidly; in the 5 fiscal years 1954–58, income from this source was about half as large as that from the individual income tax. Income from

the sales tax came in much more rapidly than either individual or corporation income taxes. In the first full fiscal year of operation and in the succeeding 3 years, this source produced an average of about \$150 million a year and in the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, almost \$180 million. The total receipts from the three earmarked taxes were about the same in the fiscal year 1958 as in 1957—that is, approximately \$370 million. Thus, in general, during the period that the system has been in full operation, the income to the fund from the three earmarked taxes has been in roughly the following proportions: from the sales tax—one-half; from the individual income tax—one-third; and from the corporation income tax—one-sixth.

As indicated previously, if the income to the fund from the earmarked taxes and any existing balance in the fund are not sufficient to meet the pension payments, a loan may be obtained from the General Treasury. In each of the 7 fiscal years to date such action has been required, but from time to time the outstanding balances on these loans have been repaid—or in other words, cancelled—by special grants voted by Parliament, not necessarily in the same fiscal year that the deficit occurred. It is possible that such loans can be repaid or reduced by subsequent surpluses of the earmarked taxes over pension payments, but to date this situation has not occurred.

The grant from the General Treasury was about \$50 million in the first fiscal year of operations. Although pension payments were made only for the last 3 months, the earmarked taxes were low because the application of individual income tax receipts was not effective until July 1952, and revenue from the other two sources, though earmarked as from January 1952, were slow in being received and so could not be credited in the early months of the year. In the next fiscal year—the first year of full operation for pension payments—the General Treasury loaned almost \$100 million to the fund, but in each of the 3 following years these loans were only about \$50 million. The reason for the relatively large loan from the General Treasury in 1953 was

(Continued on page 24)

Table 10.—Amount of vendor payments for medical care for recipients of public assistance, by program and State, February 1958¹

State	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	General assistance
Total.....	\$13,538,584	\$3,796,176	\$459,678	\$2,419,131	² \$6,350,000
Alabama.....	1,906	782	5	³ 248	⁴ 5
Alaska.....					33,047
Arkansas.....	222,272	25,190	7,964	31,612	(⁵)
California.....	1,593,006	765,966	81,828		87,308
Colorado.....	100,558	39,008	2,961	12,600	(⁵)
Connecticut.....	243,584	88,665	5,304	64,046	(⁵)
Delaware.....			852		
District of Columbia.....	536	656	175	797	509
Hawaii.....	8,970	32,241	602	6,654	
Illinois.....	2,157,907	353,105	54,938	400,492	514,380
Indiana.....	464,570	93,906	22,579	(⁵)	264,192
Iowa.....				(⁵)	248,131
Kansas.....	291,748	61,326	6,099	48,852	35,748
Louisiana.....	197,151	6,404	3,741	38,958	4,850
Maine.....	73,182	15,078	2,856	10,998	83,784
Massachusetts.....	1,642,625	126,119	23,205	305,170	141,596
Michigan.....	398,612	31,305	10,506	19,518	159,506
Minnesota.....	600,577	124,422	15,754	8,677	192,429
Montana.....			1,540		174,102
Nebraska.....	173,558	5,683	13,605	20,899	61,689
Nevada.....	15,408		828	(⁵)	(⁵)
New Hampshire.....	84,241	14,619	2,702	10,045	(⁵)
New Jersey.....	216,218	32,434	2,246	46,439	145,307
New Mexico.....	65,196	64,270	2,029	12,822	15,532
New York.....	1,692,723	855,414	60,707	799,426	121,111
North Carolina.....	65,148	36,884	3,480	35,918	224,789
North Dakota.....	85,360	23,730	702	19,118	21,129
Ohio.....	535,356	11,512	26,393	94,260	1,043,014
Oklahoma.....	560,304	208,233	11,478	47,946	(⁵)
Oregon.....	403,534	49,185	3,937	92,435	86,307
Pennsylvania.....	289,863	222,203	63,782	106,508	171,218
Rhode Island.....	65,718	58,545	792	25,692	41,637
South Carolina.....					14,112
South Dakota.....					115,917
Tennessee.....	57,300	39,347	4,151	4,346	
Utah.....	52,260	39,957	1,242	10,920	43
Virgin Islands.....	314	144	5	50	148
Virginia.....					11,516
Washington.....	520,143	163,957	6,026	78,199	176,816
West Virginia.....	29,621	52,421	1,631	21,099	11,526
Wisconsin.....	595,514	147,493	12,758	39,755	235,556
Wyoming.....	33,597	5,972	286	5,632	20,239

¹ For the special types of public assistance figures in italics represent payments made without Federal participation. For State programs not shown, no vendor payments were made during the month or such payments were not reported.

² Includes an estimated amount for States making vendor payments for medical care from general assistance funds and from special medical funds and report-

ing these data semiannually but not on a monthly basis.

³ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁴ Includes payments made in behalf of recipients of the special types of public assistance.

⁵ Data not available.

CANADIAN PROGRAMS

(Continued from page 15)

that the earmarked individual income taxes were not yet fully effective. In the fiscal year 1957—the last full year that the pension was \$40—the loan from the General Treasury to the fund dropped sharply, to less than \$10 million. The reason was the sharp rise in receipts from the earmarked taxes. In the fiscal year 1958 the loan from the General Treasury is estimated to amount to about \$100 million, reflecting the increased pension rates in effect during the last 9 months of the year.

If the \$46 pension rate that was effective for July–October 1957 had been in force throughout the fiscal year 1957, the deficit of the fund—or, in other words, the loan from the

General Treasury—would have been almost \$65 million, only slightly more than the annual deficits occurring in each of the years 1954–56. If, however, the current pension rate of \$55 had been in effect throughout 1957, the deficit to be met from the General Treasury would have been almost \$150 million, about three times the annual deficit during the 3 preceding years.

If the income from the earmarked taxes remains at the level in the fiscal years 1957 and 1958, the deficit to be met from the General Treasury in 1959 will be about \$185 million. The subsidy would then amount to about one-third of the cost of the program in that year. In other words, if the earmarked taxes were to come close to financing the pen-

sion payments in 1959, and if they run at about the level they did in the 2 preceding years, a rate for each of the earmarked taxes amounting to 3 percent would be required rather than the 2-percent rate now in effect.

Old-age assistance.—The Canadian old-age assistance program for persons aged 65–69 has complemented the old-age security system since the latter began operations in January 1952. In the latter part of the calendar year 1951 the number of assistance recipients—all aged 70 or over, as required at that time—was about 309,000, and the average monthly payment was about \$37.50. The annual rate of assistance expenditures was thus about \$139 million, of which \$104 million, or 75 percent,

Table 11.—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, February 1958¹

State	Old-age assistance			Aid to dependent children (per recipient)			Aid to the blind			Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		
	All assistance ²	Money payments to recipients ³	Vendor payments for medical care ²	All assistance ²	Money payments to recipients ³	Vendor payments for medical care ²	All assistance ²	Money payments to recipients ³	Vendor payments for medical care ²	All assistance ²	Money payments to recipients ³	Vendor payments for medical care ²
Total, 53 States ⁴	\$61.08	\$55.77	\$5.47	\$27.05	\$25.60	\$1.47	\$66.54	\$62.37	\$4.27	\$60.57	\$52.66	\$8.18
Alabama	38.49	38.47	.02	8.37	8.36	.01	35.76	35.76	(5)	32.80	32.78	.02
Arkansas	45.38	41.45	3.96	15.60	14.81	.79	51.06	47.15	3.93	35.55	30.94	4.64
California	83.32	77.32	6.00	44.40	40.73	3.68	104.93	98.93	6.00			
Colorado	83.27	81.34	1.92	31.61	30.06	1.55	75.87	66.73	9.14	60.39	58.04	2.35
Connecticut	⁶ 118.05	⁶ 102.05	16.00	44.67	40.07	4.60	⁶ 112.62	⁶ 95.62	17.00	⁶ 136.81	⁶ 105.81	31.00
Delaware							69.52	66.91	3.12			
District of Columbia	56.12	55.95	.17	28.58	28.53	.05	65.05	64.33	.72	66.62	66.30	.32
Hawaii	81.60	45.75	5.85	29.91	26.93	2.98	62.51	55.35	7.17	64.22	58.27	5.95
Illinois	68.79	44.79	26.07	36.65	33.43	3.23	73.38	57.51	16.90	83.04	54.01	30.53
Indiana	56.95	42.25	14.92	27.63	25.03	2.65	69.58	57.28	12.43	(7)	(7)	(7)
Kansas	72.60	63.42	9.35	33.97	30.86	3.21	78.49	69.31	9.62	76.48	65.20	11.48
Louisiana	63.23	61.65	1.59	20.91	20.85	.07	73.54	72.03	1.55	50.08	47.46	2.64
Maine	65.85	49.85	6.00	26.63	25.77	.86	60.33	54.33	6.00	62.19	53.19	9.00
Massachusetts	96.82	78.15	19.22	46.08	43.31	2.87	117.66	106.70	11.54	115.76	85.66	32.18
Michigan	66.47	60.58	5.91	37.17	36.78	.39	74.66	68.73	5.93	82.42	76.53	5.97
Minnesota	80.09	67.82	12.28	40.47	36.22	4.27	85.73	71.97	13.76	60.41	55.98	4.80
Montana							72.77	68.88	3.89			
Nebraska	63.43	53.19	10.45	27.16	26.64	.52	77.01	63.72	13.94	69.63	54.61	15.18
Nevada	68.15	62.13	6.02				96.96	90.92	6.04	(7)	(7)	(7)
New Hampshire	68.50	52.95	15.66	37.88	34.07	3.90	72.47	61.30	11.17	86.70	56.54	30.17
New Jersey	81.34	70.07	11.27	42.34	41.16	1.18	77.63	75.13	2.50	90.01	81.67	8.35
New Mexico	53.80	47.37	6.43	26.27	23.68	2.58	56.21	51.04	5.18	56.33	49.79	6.55
New York	93.77	76.36	18.83	39.72	36.26	3.58	97.89	84.57	14.49	93.92	74.68	20.88
North Carolina	36.66	35.38	1.28	18.12	17.72	.40	45.81	45.10	.71	41.95	39.63	2.32
North Dakota	85.14	74.04	11.18	37.99	34.31	3.78	67.31	61.64	6.21	98.27	80.10	18.63
Ohio	64.53	58.70	5.83	24.65	24.50	.15	64.30	57.16	7.14	62.54	52.22	10.31
Oklahoma	70.58	64.61	5.97	29.13	25.42	3.71	86.05	80.03	6.01	77.28	71.23	6.05
Oregon	81.60	59.15	22.46	39.00	36.20	2.83	85.21	72.00	13.21	91.26	68.94	22.45
Pennsylvania	52.02	46.13	5.89	29.99	28.42	1.57	63.15	59.51	3.64	60.19	52.74	7.45
Rhode Island	70.37	61.43	9.00	34.37	30.60	3.76	70.97	64.97	6.00	76.46	64.52	12.00
Tennessee	38.28	37.28	1.00	18.67	18.12	.55	43.18	41.76	1.43	41.46	40.57	.89
Utah	64.96	59.01	5.95	36.59	32.87	3.72	70.18	64.46	5.72	69.55	63.79	5.76
Virgin Islands	18.67	18.17	.50	9.16	9.03	.17	(8)	(8)	(8)	20.02	19.52	.50
Washington	85.19	76.01	9.35	42.74	38.48	4.29	98.10	90.48	7.86	98.58	85.21	13.72
West Virginia	33.96	32.60	1.36	23.53	22.79	.75	38.43	36.96	1.48	38.37	35.61	2.76
Wisconsin	75.60	60.44	15.50	43.98	38.87	5.15	78.22	65.95	12.46	115.07	83.78	31.63
Wyoming	70.34	61.21	9.13	36.13	33.70	2.44	68.74	64.34	4.40	72.34	61.43	10.91

¹ 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. For State programs not shown, no vendor payments were made during the month or such payments were not reported.

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

³ May also include small amounts for assistance in kind and vendor payments

for other than medical care. Averages based on number of cases receiving payments. See tables 12-15 for average payments for State programs under which no vendor payments for medical care were made.

⁴ For aid to the permanently and totally disabled represents data for the 48 States with programs in operation.

⁵ Less than 1 cent.

⁶ Includes retroactive payments covering increase in rate for convalescent care.

⁷ No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

⁸ Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 recipients.

came from the Dominion Government.

When the new program became effective at the beginning of 1952, all those formerly on the assistance rolls were transferred to the old-age security program—since they were all aged 70 or over—to receive benefits without a means test. At the same time, needy persons aged 65-69 became eligible for old-age assistance. The number on the rolls rose each month until, by March 1953, there were 87,675 receiving an average monthly payment of about \$36.50. As of March 1954, the number had increased to 93,273, and it remained

at about this level through March 1956; the number then declined to 89,907 in March 1957 but rose to 92,484 in March of 1958. During the entire period through March 1956, the average monthly payment remained relatively constant, but it then increased to about \$37.00 in March 1957. The average has since increased as a result of the provisions liberalizing the individual maximum payment, and in March 1958 it was \$52.19. Thus, during this period the average payment was somewhat more than 90 percent of the maximum possible individual payment.

In each of the 5 fiscal years 1953-57, the cost to the Dominion Government was about \$20 million—increasing from \$19.1 million for 1953 to \$20.9 million for the fiscal years 1955 and 1956, although dropping to \$20.3 million for 1957. As a result of the higher rates of payment, the program cost the Government about \$25.1 million in the fiscal year 1958. The corresponding cost in the future will apparently be somewhat higher, since on the basis of experience in March 1958 the Dominion Government share is running at about \$29.0 million a year.

(Continued on page 27)

Table 14.—Aid to dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, February 1958¹

[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 ²	Children	Total amount	Average per—		January 1957 in—		February 1957 in—	
					Family	Recipient	Number of recipients	Amount	Number of recipients	Amount
Total	690,027	2,587,827	1,981,959	\$70,011,021	\$101.46	\$27.05	+1.8	+2.0	+11.3	+16.1
Alabama.....	22,233	88,091	68,302	736,966	33.15	8.37	+1.4	+1.8	+10.8	+3
Alaska.....	1,251	4,335	3,203	125,377	100.22	28.92	+5	+4	-11.7	-12.6
Arizona.....	5,687	22,023	16,890	569,838	100.20	25.87	+2.1	+1.9	+12.4	+14.2
Arkansas.....	8,276	31,875	24,996	497,182	60.08	15.60	+1.6	+1.7	+1.1	+6.4
California.....	58,569	208,373	161,424	9,252,169	157.97	44.40	+2.4	+2.7	+15.0	+31.6
Colorado.....	6,504	25,123	19,497	794,256	122.12	31.61	+1.8	+1.9	+7.9	+15.1
Connecticut.....	5,911	19,263	14,325	860,543	145.58	44.67	+1.9	-2	+11.5	+14.6
Delaware.....	1,600	5,962	4,553	139,766	87.35	23.44	+6	+3.0	+15.1	+16.8
District of Columbia.....	2,915	12,572	9,824	359,281	123.25	28.58	+9	+9	+30.0	+38.4
Florida.....	23,738	86,157	66,529	1,400,758	59.01	16.26	+9	+8	+8.9	+7.8
Georgia.....	15,111	56,476	43,380	1,254,007	82.99	22.20	+1.5	+1.6	+2.7	+1.8
Hawaii.....	2,775	10,811	8,629	323,401	116.54	29.91	+8	+7	-2.0	-1.8
Idaho.....	1,891	6,938	5,112	267,685	141.56	38.58	+2.4	+2.4	+8.3	+10.6
Illinois.....	26,762	109,212	83,899	4,002,390	149.55	36.65	+2.4	+3.0	+7.3	+9.0
Indiana.....	9,771	35,445	26,545	979,398	100.24	27.63	+1.4	-1.2	+9.8	+11.7
Iowa.....	7,615	27,812	20,751	906,189	119.00	32.58	+1.7	+2.8	+4.6	+2.8
Kansas.....	5,239	19,086	14,788	648,382	123.76	33.97	-1	+2.9	+6.6	+9.5
Kentucky.....	19,762	71,973	54,341	1,413,931	71.55	19.65	+5	+7	+4.4	+4.1
Louisiana.....	23,728	95,154	73,341	1,989,975	83.87	20.91	+7	+8	+15.0	+22.7
Maine.....	5,026	17,520	12,860	466,610	92.84	26.63	+2.3	+2.2	+12.2	+14.2
Maryland.....	7,162	29,464	23,027	727,711	101.61	24.70	+2.0	+2.3	+7.4	+7.6
Massachusetts.....	13,138	44,012	32,970	2,027,892	154.35	46.08	+2	+1.8	+4.8	+15.3
Michigan.....	22,268	80,019	59,022	2,974,214	133.56	37.17	+1.6	+5	+13.2	+15.2
Minnesota.....	8,546	29,151	22,523	1,179,834	138.06	40.47	+7	-5	+4.1	+8.0
Mississippi.....	15,470	58,429	46,155	737,323	47.66	12.62	+3.2	+3.1	+20.5	+103.0
Missouri.....	23,290	87,092	65,854	2,064,437	88.64	23.70	+2.0	+2.1	+18.2	+23.4
Montana.....	2,106	7,524	5,816	247,580	117.56	32.91	+1.5	+3.2	-5.7	-2.9
Nebraska.....	2,927	10,893	8,239	295,900	101.09	27.16	+1.6	+1.7	+5.3	+6.8
Nevada.....	788	2,674	2,051	72,518	92.03	27.12	+3.6	+3.3	+31.9	+30.3
New Hampshire.....	984	3,748	2,829	141,990	144.30	37.88	+3.6	+3.6	+6.4	+10.5
New Jersey.....	8,227	27,603	20,963	1,168,664	142.05	42.34	+9	+1.1	+18.0	+21.1
New Mexico.....	6,675	24,871	18,921	653,252	97.87	26.27	+4	+4	+5.6	+9.7
New York.....	62,945	239,234	178,471	9,501,342	150.95	39.72	+1.6	+1.4	+12.8	+16.5
North Carolina.....	23,343	92,209	71,148	1,670,879	71.58	18.12	+3.0	+3.8	+14.9	+19.2
North Dakota.....	1,668	6,270	4,843	238,200	142.81	37.99	+1.2	+4.3	+2.0	+2.9
Ohio.....	19,837	77,425	59,355	3,190,689	96.22	24.65	+1.2	+1.1	+10.4	+9.7
Oklahoma.....	16,387	56,169	42,765	1,636,175	99.85	29.13	+7	+1.0	+4.7	+21.8
Oregon.....	4,736	17,357	13,143	676,941	142.94	39.00	+4.0	+5.5	+29.0	+31.8
Pennsylvania.....	35,904	141,342	107,772	4,238,949	118.06	29.99	+3.9	+4.6	+20.6	+20.5
Puerto Rico.....	46,923	170,626	136,930	632,291	13.48	3.71	+1.2	+1.2	+19.4	+19.2
Rhode Island.....	4,339	15,553	11,591	534,483	123.18	34.37	+2.2	+3.0	+23.6	+25.1
South Carolina.....	9,044	35,769	28,067	503,775	55.70	14.08	+2.2	+2.2	+11.7	+10.7
South Dakota.....	3,011	10,308	7,802	267,858	88.96	25.99	+1.6	+1.7	+8.1	+11.7
Tennessee.....	19,404	71,396	53,716	1,332,799	68.69	18.67	+2.1	+2.1	+2.2	+8.8
Texas.....	25,286	103,900	78,921	1,797,983	71.11	17.30	+2.9	+3.0	+10.9	+10.4
Utah.....	3,071	10,744	7,977	393,142	128.02	36.59	+2.7	+8	+7.9	+20.7
Vermont.....	1,062	3,725	2,808	97,976	92.26	26.30	+1.9	+1.8	+2.2	+3.7
Virgin Islands.....	234	869	731	7,962	34.03	9.16	-3.9	-4.5	-9.4	-9.5
Virginia.....	8,964	35,817	28,041	660,305	73.66	18.44	+1.8	+2.7	+1.4	+3.5
Washington.....	10,985	38,189	28,418	1,632,326	148.60	42.74	+2.4	+2.3	+15.9	+31.8
West Virginia.....	18,322	70,130	54,559	1,650,422	90.08	23.53	+1.8	+1.8	+2.1	-4
Wisconsin.....	7,931	28,662	21,481	1,260,506	158.93	43.98	+2.2	+2.4	+2.6	+4.3
Wyoming.....	686	2,452	1,861	88,599	129.15	36.13	+4.3	+6.5	+6.7	+14.5

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, October 1957, p. 18. All data subject to revision.
² 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.
³ In addition, supplemental payments were made from general assistance funds to an unknown number of families.

CANADIAN PROGRAMS

(Continued from page 25)

The Dominion Government's annual cost for old-age assistance in each of the 5 fiscal years 1953-57 was about \$80 million less than it had

been before the new system went into effect in 1952. On the whole, this "savings" is somewhat more than the annual payment from the General Treasury to meet the residual costs of the old-age security program, which averaged \$53 million in the 6

fiscal years 1952-57. It is only about half the payment that would have been required from the General Treasury to finance the old-age security pension payments in 1957 if the current monthly pension rate had then been in effect.