

The Shape of Poverty in 1966

by MOLLIE ORSHANSKY*

Despite much progress, the anomaly of privation in plenty continues, and a large share of that privation—indeed more than in earlier years—is borne by aged persons, women who must themselves serve as family heads, Negroes, and others who in our society have a hard time earning enough to support themselves and their dependents. This is not to say that such groups fare worse in the absolute sense than their counterparts of yesteryear but rather that today they have fewer around to keep them company. Public programs do exist to provide income when earnings are interrupted or lacking altogether, but they are limited in both how much they may pay and to whom they will pay it. Thus, some get no help at all from any public program though their other sources of income are well below what they need; others who do get such help are still poor after the payments.

AT THE END of 1959, a total of 38.9 million Americans in 13.4 million households were classified as poor. Four years later the number with inadequate income had declined by about 3½ million. By the end of 1966, the same income standard—considered by some almost too niggardly to be American—counted 9¼ million fewer persons as living in poverty than were so designated in 1959.

The number not sharing fully in the Nation's prosperity thus was growing smaller, but the fact that it is mainly certain groups who are bypassed is more obvious and hence more disturbing. It becomes then even more challenging to ensure for all Americans the good living long taken for granted by the majority.

The fact that there now exists, if only until a better measure is developed, an official working definition of poverty, makes it possible to evaluate progress and pinpoint specific areas of concern in a way not feasible before.

*Office of Research and Statistics.

¹ For a description and discussion of both the Social Security Administration indexes, see the *Social Security Bulletin* for January and July 1965 and April, May, and December 1966.

In 1965 the Social Security Administration developed two criteria to assay the relative economic well-being of different types of households in this country, and the lower of these two dollar measures is being used as the current delineator of poverty for program planning.¹ The implied level of living is that afforded by an income in 1966 of about \$65 weekly for an average family of four not living on a farm (and correspondingly more for larger households and less for smaller). The slightly less stringent measure, labeled "near poor," requires about a third more in income, or about \$20 more for a four-person family, than the amount of income at the poverty threshold (table 1).

The poverty and low-income criteria, adjusted for price changes, have been carried back as far as 1959, so that it is possible to see the changes in both the number and the kinds of households identified as poor or near poor during the seven successive years of plenty.

THE POVERTY ROSTER, 1966

By 1966, the income of the United States population had climbed to a new high. Even after allowance for higher prices, families averaged \$5 in real income for every \$4 available to them in 1959. But though a majority in the country were enjoying record-high incomes, a total of 29.7 million persons, or 1 out of every 7 noninstitutionalized Americans, were in households with money incomes for the year below the poverty line. The poor were distributed throughout 11 million households, which contained one-sixth of all the Nation's children under age 18. Indeed, in 1966 as in 1959, such youngsters made up half of all the persons in poor families (table 2).

The total for the poverty roster in 1966 denoted a drop of 9.2 million from the number counted poor in 1959, a year when nearly every fourth person was living in a household with income insufficient to cover even the barest necessities. The number called near poor—those with incomes barely above the poverty threshold yet

TABLE 1.—Weighted average of poverty and low-income criteria¹ for families of different composition by household size, sex of head, and farm or nonfarm residence, March 1967

Number of family members	Weighted average of incomes at poverty level						Weighted average of incomes at low-income level					
	Nonfarm			Farm			Nonfarm			Farm		
	Total	Male head	Female head	Total	Male head	Female head	Total	Male head	Female head	Total	Male head	Female head
1 member.....	\$1,635	\$1,710	\$1,595	\$1,145	\$1,180	\$1,110	\$1,985	\$2,080	\$1,930	\$1,390	\$1,440	\$1,340
Head under age 65.....	1,685	1,760	1,625	1,195	1,230	1,140	2,045	2,140	1,975	1,450	1,495	1,380
Head aged 65 or over.....	1,565	1,580	1,560	1,095	1,105	1,090	1,890	1,925	1,880	1,330	1,350	1,315
2 members.....	2,115	2,130	2,055	1,475	1,480	1,400	2,855	2,875	2,735	1,990	2,000	1,870
Head under age 65.....	2,185	2,200	2,105	1,535	1,540	1,465	2,945	2,970	2,790	2,075	2,080	1,945
Head aged 65 or over.....	1,970	1,975	1,955	1,380	1,380	1,370	2,665	2,675	2,615	1,870	1,875	1,835
3 members.....	2,600	2,610	2,515	1,815	1,820	1,725	3,425	3,440	3,330	2,400	2,400	2,325
4 members.....	3,335	3,335	3,320	2,345	2,345	2,320	4,345	4,355	4,255	3,060	3,060	3,000
5 members.....	3,930	3,930	3,895	2,755	2,755	2,775	5,080	5,085	4,970	3,565	3,565	3,560
6 members.....	4,410	4,410	4,395	3,090	3,090	3,075	5,700	5,710	5,600	3,995	4,000	3,920
7 or more members.....	5,430	5,440	5,310	3,790	3,795	3,790	6,945	6,960	6,780	4,850	4,850	4,815

¹ Required income in 1966 according to Social Security Administration poverty or low-income index for a family of a given size and composition. Family income criteria weighted together in accordance with percentage distribution of total units by number of related children and sex of head, as

of Current Population Survey, March 1967.

For detailed description of the Social Security Administration measures of poverty and low income and their rationale, see the *Social Security Bulletin* for January 1965 (pages 5-11) and July 1965 (pages 3-10).

still in what might be termed the low-income range—is now, however, 15.2 million, very little different from the 15.8 million so characterized 7 years before. Another 5 million would be added to the ranks of the economically deprived were we to include the 2 million persons in institutions—not now in the count but ranking among the poorest of the poor—as well as the many aged persons and parent-child groups not now on the poverty roll but who would be there if they had to rely on their own resources instead of on those of the more fortunate relatives whose homes they share.

Included among the 45 million Americans designated poor or near poor in 1966 were 18-28 percent of the Nation's children and from 30 to 43 percent of the aged—groups whose members could do little on their own to improve their income. Minorities, however defined, were less favored than the rest. Counted poor were nearly 1 in 4 of those living on farms, compared with 1 in 7 of the nonfarm population, but most of the poor were not on a farm. The total with low incomes included from 12 to 19 percent of the white population and from 41 to 54 percent of the non-white. Of the total in poverty, however, 2 out of 3 were white, and among the near poor 4 out of 5 were white (table 3).

As might be expected, the family with the head currently employed was only one-fourth as likely to be poor as one with the head unemployed or out of the labor force altogether. Yet every sixth poor family of two or more persons was that of

a white man under age 65 who had worked every week in the year—the kind of family that has the best chance to escape poverty in our society.

Because income of families generally rose more than enough to offset rising prices between 1959 and 1966 while the poverty line was adjusted only by the amount of such price rise, those counted poor at the end of the period were even less well off, compared with the nonpoor population, than those counted poor at the beginning. But beyond this, the profile of poverty had changed, leaving more difficult problems to solve. The decline in the number considered poor was largely a result of increased job opportunities and higher earnings. Those equipped to make the most of such possibilities fared best. By 1966, families of a woman with children, the aged, and the households of the disabled accounted for about 3 million of the 6 million families counted poor (table 4).

For the aged as for the disabled, changes in social security benefits and other existing public programs to provide income when earnings are lacking could serve to improve economic status and thus alleviate poverty.² But for families with young children, in straitened circumstances because there is no father in the home or because his earnings are too low to support the number dependent on him, other remedies have yet to be devised. One type of proposal currently under

² See Ida C. Merriam, "Social Security Benefits and Poverty" (Social Security Administration, Research and Statistics Note No. 6), 1967.

TABLE 2.—The poor and near poor, 1966: Number and percent of persons in households below SSA poverty level and above that level but below low-income level, by family status and sex and color of head

[Numbers in thousands]

Family status	All households					With male head					With female head				
	Total	Poor		Near poor		Total	Poor		Near poor		Total	Poor		Near poor	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All households															
All persons.....	193,415	29,657	15.3	15,150	7.8	168,536	18,952	11.2	13,031	7.7	24,878	10,704	43.0	2,119	8.5
In families.....	181,048	24,836	13.7	14,369	7.9	163,972	17,675	10.8	12,750	7.8	17,075	7,160	41.9	1,619	9.5
Head.....	49,922	6,086	12.4	3,554	7.3	43,750	4,276	9.8	3,061	7.0	5,171	1,810	35.0	492	9.5
Children under age 18.....	69,771	12,539	18.0	6,637	9.5	62,521	8,117	13.0	5,932	9.5	7,251	4,423	61.0	705	9.7
Other family members.....	62,355	6,211	10.0	4,178	6.7	57,701	5,282	9.2	3,757	6.5	4,653	927	19.9	422	9.1
Unrelated individuals.....	12,367	4,821	39.0	781	6.3	4,564	1,277	28.0	281	6.2	7,803	3,544	45.4	500	6.4
Under age 65.....	7,489	2,124	28.4	312	4.2	3,279	712	21.7	146	4.5	4,210	1,412	33.5	166	3.9
Aged 65 and over.....	4,878	2,697	55.3	469	9.6	1,285	565	44.0	135	10.5	3,593	2,132	59.3	334	9.3
White households															
All persons.....	170,384	20,313	11.9	12,278	7.2	151,265	13,417	8.9	10,651	7.0	19,120	6,896	36.1	1,627	8.5
In families.....	159,598	16,287	10.2	11,601	7.3	147,445	12,410	8.4	10,427	7.1	12,154	3,877	31.9	1,174	9.7
Head.....	44,016	4,375	9.9	2,968	6.7	40,006	3,264	8.2	2,586	6.5	4,010	1,111	27.7	382	9.5
Children under age 18.....	59,578	7,526	12.6	5,222	8.8	55,103	5,280	9.6	4,732	8.6	4,475	2,246	50.2	492	11.0
Other family members.....	56,004	4,386	7.8	3,411	6.1	52,336	3,866	7.4	3,109	5.9	3,669	521	14.2	300	8.2
Unrelated individuals.....	10,786	4,026	37.3	677	6.3	3,820	1,007	26.4	224	5.9	6,966	3,019	43.3	453	6.5
Under age 65.....	6,296	1,626	25.8	241	3.8	2,688	540	20.1	110	4.1	3,608	1,086	30.1	131	3.6
Aged 65 and over.....	4,490	2,400	53.5	436	9.7	1,132	467	41.3	114	10.1	3,358	1,933	57.6	322	9.6
Nonwhite households															
All persons.....	23,034	9,345	40.6	2,873	12.5	17,271	5,535	32.0	2,381	13.8	5,761	3,809	66.1	492	8.5
In families.....	21,450	8,549	39.9	2,768	12.9	16,527	5,265	31.9	2,323	14.1	4,921	3,283	66.7	445	9.0
Head.....	4,905	1,711	34.9	586	11.9	3,744	1,012	27.0	476	12.7	1,161	699	60.2	111	9.6
Children under age 18.....	10,193	5,014	49.2	1,413	13.9	7,419	2,837	38.2	1,201	16.2	2,776	2,177	78.4	213	7.7
Other family members.....	6,352	1,824	28.7	769	12.1	5,364	1,416	26.4	646	12.0	984	407	41.4	121	12.3
Unrelated individuals.....	1,584	796	50.3	105	6.6	744	270	36.3	58	7.8	840	526	62.6	47	5.6
Under age 65.....	1,196	499	41.7	72	6.0	592	172	29.1	37	6.3	604	327	54.1	35	5.8
Aged 65 and over.....	388	297	76.5	33	8.5	152	98	64.5	21	13.8	236	199	84.3	12	5.1

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population

Survey for March 1967.

discussion is to make money grants for children in families during their minority. A later section of this article includes illustrative estimates of the cost and antipoverty effect in 1965 of six versions of a children's allowance payment schedule. These estimates were originally made for use at a conference on children's allowances held in October 1967.³

The final section of this article reports on the number of households who received payments from existing public income-support programs in 1965 and suggests how many households not poor as we now count them were removed from poverty only by such payments, and how many payees who were poor before the payments remained poor even after they got them.

³ Citizens' Committee of New York, Inc., "19,000,000 Children Counted Out by the Affluent Society—Latest Figures on Child Poverty," November 21, 1967.

THE POVERTY INDEX

The index of poverty used as a reference criterion is a far from generous measure. It is the minimum income per household of a given size, composition, and farm-nonfarm status, as set by the Social Security Administration. In 1966 the Agriculture Department economy food plan, which is the core of the poverty index, provided for total food expenditures of only 75 cents a day per person (in an average four-person family). The index adds only twice this amount to cover all family living items other than food. It has not been adjusted for changes since 1959, except to allow for rising prices.⁴

Between 1959 and 1966 both the income received by consumers and the prices of what they bought continued to climb but income went up faster.

⁴ The measure of near poverty—about one-third higher in cost—centers about the low-cost food plan.

TABLE 3.—The poor and near poor, 1966: Number and percent of persons in households below SSA poverty level and above that level but below low-income level, by family status and sex of head

[Numbers in thousands]

Age and family status	All households					With male head					With female head				
	Total	Poor		Near poor		Total	Poor		Near poor		Total	Poor		Near poor	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All persons.....	193,415	29,657	15.3	15,150	7.8	168,536	18,952	11.2	13,031	7.7	24,878	10,704	43.0	2,119	8.5
Living alone ¹	12,367	4,821	39.0	781	6.3	4,564	1,277	28.0	281	6.2	7,803	3,544	45.4	500	6.4
Aged 14-21.....	690	378	54.8	43	6.2	280	141	50.4	27	9.6	409	237	57.9	16	3.9
Aged 22-64.....	6,799	1,746	25.7	269	3.9	2,999	571	19.0	119	4.0	3,801	1,175	30.9	150	3.9
Aged 65 and over.....	4,878	2,697	55.3	469	9.6	1,285	565	44.0	135	10.5	3,593	2,132	59.3	334	9.3
In families.....	181,048	24,836	13.7	14,369	7.9	163,972	17,675	10.8	12,750	7.8	17,075	7,160	41.9	1,619	9.5
Children under age 18.....	69,771	12,539	18.0	6,637	9.5	62,522	8,117	13.0	5,931	9.5	7,251	4,423	61.0	706	9.7
Own children of head or spouse.....	66,319	11,307	17.0	6,258	9.4	60,183	7,472	12.4	5,652	9.4	6,137	3,835	62.5	605	9.9
Other related children.....	3,452	1,232	35.7	379	11.0	2,339	645	27.6	279	11.9	1,114	588	52.8	101	9.1
Under age 6.....	23,550	4,386	18.6	2,360	10.0	21,534	2,964	13.8	2,196	10.2	2,018	1,423	70.5	164	8.1
Aged 6-13.....	32,303	5,904	18.3	3,167	9.8	28,816	3,767	13.1	2,829	9.8	3,487	2,140	61.4	338	9.7
Aged 14-17.....	13,918	2,249	16.2	1,110	8.0	12,172	1,389	11.4	906	7.4	1,746	860	49.3	204	11.7
Aged 18-54 ²	83,502	7,968	9.5	5,081	6.1	76,749	5,855	7.6	4,484	5.8	6,751	2,112	31.3	594	8.8
Head.....	34,304	3,748	10.9	2,177	6.3	31,043	2,337	7.5	1,877	6.0	3,260	1,411	43.3	299	9.2
Wife.....	33,202	2,549	7.7	1,990	6.0	33,202	2,549	7.7	1,990	6.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Never-married children aged 18-21.....	8,238	818	9.9	454	5.5	7,052	503	7.1	334	4.7	1,185	314	26.5	120	10.1
Other relatives.....	7,758	853	11.0	460	5.9	5,452	466	8.5	283	5.2	2,306	387	16.8	175	7.6
Aged 55-64.....	14,716	1,653	11.2	854	5.8	13,487	1,403	10.4	762	5.6	1,230	251	20.4	92	7.5
Head.....	7,689	800	10.4	381	5.0	6,900	635	9.2	329	4.8	790	166	21.0	52	6.6
Wife.....	5,803	685	11.8	386	6.7	5,803	685	11.8	386	6.7	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Other relatives.....	1,224	168	13.8	87	7.1	784	83	10.6	47	6.0	440	85	19.3	40	9.1
Aged 65 and over.....	13,059	2,675	20.5	1,798	13.8	11,215	2,300	20.5	1,572	14.0	1,844	375	20.3	227	12.3
Head.....	6,929	1,538	22.2	996	14.4	5,806	1,304	22.5	855	14.7	1,122	234	20.9	141	12.6
Wife.....	3,548	835	23.5	594	16.7	3,548	835	23.5	594	16.7	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Other relatives.....	2,582	302	11.7	208	8.1	1,861	161	8.7	123	6.6	722	141	19.5	86	11.9
Poor by own income.....	2,007	292	14.5	-----	-----	1,448	157	10.8	-----	-----	559	135	24.2	-----	-----
Not poor by own income ³	573	10	1.7	-----	-----	412	4	1.0	-----	-----	163	6	3.7	-----	-----

¹ Excludes children under age 14 who live with a family to no member of which they are related. Income normally not reported for persons under 14.

² Includes heads, wives, and other ever-married relatives under age 18.

³ An additional 100,000 of those not poor nevertheless had income below the near poor level. Thus the total number of aged other relatives with own

Inevitably then, the poverty thresholds, adjusted only for price changes, were farther below general levels of income at the end of the period than at the outset. Median income of four-person families in 1966 was \$8,340, according to the Bureau of the Census—just two and one-half times the non-farm poverty threshold of \$3,335. In 1959, by contrast, median income for four-person families was \$6,070, about twice the poverty index cut-off line. In other words, the average income of four-person families had increased by 37 percent but the poverty line by only 9 percent, or one-fourth as much.⁵

CHANGES IN POVERTY, 1959-66

In 1959, 24 percent of the Nation's households—counting as households both one-person units

⁵ Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-60, No. 53, "Income in 1966 of Families and Persons in the United States," and No. 35, "Income of Families and Persons in the United States in 1959." See also the *Social Security Bulletin*, April 1966.

income below the near poor level was 2.1 million; only 0.5 million lived in a poor or near poor family.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1967.

and families of two or more persons—had so little income as to be counted poor. Seven years later only 17.7 percent had too little money income to support the number dependent on them. What is perhaps of greater significance than the general improvement is that, as already indicated, more of the poor in 1966 were persons of limited earning capacity or those whom age, home responsibilities, race discrimination, or other factors kept out of the labor force altogether.

Children—particularly if they live in a home without a father—and old people are at a disadvantage, compared with persons aged 18-64, when it comes to earning. The number of children under age 18 being reared in poverty went down from 16.6 million in 1959 to 12.5 million in 1966, but the number near poor dipped by only 0.4 million to reach 6.6 million. All told, even in 1966, after a continued run of prosperity and steadily rising family income, one-fourth of the Nation's children were in families living in poverty or hovering just above the poverty line.

TABLE 4.—Incidence of poverty and low-income status, 1966: Number and percent of households below SSA poverty level and above that level but below low-income level, by number of children under age 18 and sex and color of head

[Numbers in thousands]

Type of household	All households					With male head					With female head				
	Total	Poor		Near poor		Total	Poor		Near poor		Total	Poor		Near poor	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All households															
Total.....	61,291	10,906	17.7	4,334	7.1	48,314	5,552	11.5	3,341	6.9	12,977	5,354	41.3	993	7.7
Unrelated individuals.....	12,367	4,821	39.0	781	6.3	4,564	1,277	28.0	281	6.2	7,803	3,544	45.4	500	6.4
Under age 65.....	7,489	2,124	28.4	312	4.2	3,279	712	21.7	146	4.5	4,210	1,412	33.5	166	3.9
Aged 65 and over.....	4,878	2,697	55.3	469	9.6	1,285	565	44.0	135	10.5	3,593	2,132	59.3	334	9.3
Families.....	48,924	6,085	12.4	3,553	7.3	43,750	4,275	9.8	3,060	7.0	5,174	1,810	35.0	493	9.5
With no children.....	20,332	2,204	10.8	1,436	7.1	18,118	1,874	10.3	1,247	6.9	2,214	330	14.9	189	8.5
With children.....	28,593	3,877	13.6	2,118	7.4	25,634	2,399	9.4	1,814	7.1	2,959	1,478	49.9	304	10.3
1 child.....	9,081	843	9.3	433	4.8	8,034	491	6.1	331	4.1	1,047	352	33.6	102	9.7
2 children.....	8,491	869	10.2	454	5.3	7,665	503	6.6	359	4.7	826	366	44.3	95	11.5
3 children.....	5,416	694	12.8	458	8.5	4,949	406	8.2	411	8.3	467	288	61.7	47	10.1
4 children.....	2,923	543	18.6	361	12.4	2,629	342	13.0	323	12.3	294	201	68.4	38	12.9
5 children.....	1,396	387	27.7	206	14.8	1,262	281	22.3	195	15.5	134	106	79.1	11	8.2
6 or more.....	1,286	541	42.1	206	16.0	1,095	376	34.3	195	17.8	191	165	86.4	11	5.7
White households															
Total.....	54,801	8,402	15.3	3,644	6.6	43,826	4,272	9.7	2,808	6.4	10,975	4,130	37.6	836	7.6
Unrelated individuals.....	10,786	4,026	37.3	677	6.3	3,820	1,007	26.4	224	5.9	6,966	3,019	43.3	453	6.5
Under age 65.....	6,296	1,626	25.8	241	3.8	2,688	540	20.1	110	4.1	3,608	1,086	30.1	131	3.6
Aged 65 and over.....	4,490	2,400	53.5	436	9.7	1,132	467	41.3	114	10.1	3,358	1,933	57.6	322	9.6
Families.....	44,026	4,373	9.9	2,967	6.7	40,006	3,265	8.2	2,584	6.5	4,013	1,111	27.7	383	9.5
With no children.....	18,759	1,863	9.9	1,268	6.8	16,823	1,607	9.6	1,111	6.6	1,936	256	13.2	157	8.1
With children.....	25,257	2,509	9.9	1,701	6.7	23,182	1,656	7.1	1,476	6.4	2,075	853	41.1	225	10.8
1 child.....	8,164	616	7.5	340	4.2	7,337	372	5.1	258	3.5	827	244	29.5	82	9.9
2 children.....	7,721	599	7.8	373	4.8	7,114	373	5.2	303	4.3	607	226	37.2	70	11.5
3 children.....	4,865	461	9.5	394	8.1	4,533	278	6.1	358	7.9	332	183	55.1	36	10.8
4 children.....	2,498	336	13.5	280	11.2	2,321	235	10.1	252	10.9	177	101	57.1	28	15.8
5 children.....	1,125	217	19.3	165	14.7	1,063	175	16.5	159	15.0	62	42	67.7	6	9.7
6 or more.....	884	280	31.7	149	16.9	814	223	27.4	146	17.9	70	57	81.4	3	4.3
Nonwhite households															
Total.....	6,488	2,506	38.6	690	10.6	4,487	1,281	28.5	533	11.9	2,001	1,225	61.2	157	7.8
Unrelated individuals.....	1,584	796	50.3	105	6.6	744	270	36.3	58	7.8	840	526	62.6	47	5.6
Under age 65.....	1,196	499	41.7	72	6.0	592	172	29.1	37	6.3	604	327	54.1	35	5.8
Aged 65 and over.....	388	297	76.5	33	8.5	152	98	64.5	21	13.8	236	199	84.3	12	5.1
Families.....	4,898	1,712	34.9	585	11.9	3,743	1,011	27.0	475	12.7	1,161	699	60.2	110	9.5
With no children.....	1,568	341	21.7	166	10.6	1,293	267	20.6	134	10.4	275	74	26.9	32	11.6
With children.....	3,333	1,371	41.1	421	12.6	2,449	746	30.5	341	13.9	884	625	70.7	80	9.0
1 child.....	916	228	24.8	94	10.3	696	119	17.1	73	10.5	220	109	49.5	21	9.5
2 children.....	770	270	35.1	82	10.6	551	130	23.6	57	10.3	219	140	63.9	25	11.4
3 children.....	550	231	42.0	64	11.6	416	128	30.8	53	12.7	134	103	76.9	11	8.2
4 children.....	424	209	49.3	82	19.3	308	108	35.1	72	23.4	116	101	87.1	10	8.6
5 children.....	271	170	62.7	43	15.9	198	107	54.0	38	19.2	73	63	86.3	5	6.8
6 or more.....	402	263	65.4	56	13.9	280	154	55.0	48	17.1	122	109	89.3	8	6.6

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey

for March 1967.

Though the poverty rate among all persons aged 18-64 or older declined by more than one-third in the 7-year period, for the aged as a group it dropped only 20 percent. Children in a family with a woman at the head were only 17 percent less likely to be poor in 1966 than in 1959; for children in a home headed by a man the risk of poverty was 40 percent lower in 1966 than it had been earlier.

As a group, persons aged 65 or older were even

worse off than the youngsters. Those counted poor in 1966 numbered 5.4 million, the same number as the count of aged poor 2 years earlier, and only half a million less than the count in 1959. In that year, one-third of all aged couples were poor, and in 1966 only one-fourth were so situated. But in 1966 the 1.2 million aged couples in poverty represented 1 in 5 of all families counted poor; in 1959 these couples had accounted for only 1 in 6 of the total. In similar fashion, the fi-

nancial fate of the aged living alone was better than it once had been, but it still spelled poverty for the majority (55 percent). Moreover, compared with the situation in 1959 when aged unrelated individuals accounted for fewer than one-fifth of all households tagged poor, in 1966 every fourth household in poverty was that of an aged person living alone. Indeed, despite the overall drop in the number of poor of all ages, the number of elderly women living in solitary poverty was now 2.1 million, though it was only 1.8 million in the earlier year (table 5).

Such findings did not signify that these elderly persons as a group had less income than they used to have. It was rather that, thanks to social security and related programs, more of them had enough income to try going it alone—choosing privacy, albeit the privacy of poverty, rather

than being an “other relative” in the home of their children. But despite spectacular improvement aided in large measure by increases in the number drawing OASDI benefits, and in the size of the checks, persons aged 65 or older remained the most poverty-stricken age group in the Nation.

Though the odds that households headed by women would have insufficient income were less than they used to be, the improvement was less marked than for units headed by men. In 1959, of all households counted poor, 5.4 million had a woman at the head and 8 million were headed by a man. By 1966 the number poor with a man at the head dropped 2.4 million, but the number poor and headed by a woman remained unchanged. (There was, to be sure, no telling how many were families who had been in poverty

TABLE 5.—Incidence of poverty in 1966: Number and percent of unrelated individuals with income below the SSA poverty level, by sex, race, and other specified characteristics

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	All unrelated individuals				Male unrelated individuals				Female unrelated individuals			
	Total	Poor			Total	Poor			Total	Poor		
		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution
	Total individuals											
Total.....	12,368	4,820	39.0	100.0	4,563	1,276	28.0	100.0	7,804	3,544	45.4	100.0
Residence:												
Nonfarm.....	12,068	4,683	38.8	97.2	4,414	1,212	27.5	95.0	7,654	3,471	45.3	97.9
Farm.....	300	138	46.0	2.9	150	65	43.3	5.1	150	73	48.7	2.1
Region:												
Northeast.....	3,210	1,172	36.5	24.3	1,136	302	26.6	23.7	2,074	870	41.9	24.5
North Central.....	3,402	1,362	40.0	28.3	1,173	322	27.5	25.2	2,230	1,039	46.6	29.3
South.....	3,368	1,573	46.7	32.6	1,257	434	34.5	34.0	2,111	1,139	54.0	32.1
West.....	2,385	713	29.9	14.8	996	217	21.8	17.0	1,390	496	35.7	14.0
Race:												
White.....	10,784	4,026	37.3	83.5	3,819	1,007	26.4	78.9	6,965	3,019	43.3	85.2
Nonwhite.....	1,583	794	50.2	16.5	744	269	36.2	21.1	839	525	62.6	14.8
Age:												
14-24.....	1,294	509	39.3	10.6	586	194	33.1	15.2	707	314	44.4	8.9
25-34.....	1,134	159	14.0	3.3	690	69	10.0	5.4	444	89	20.0	2.5
35-44.....	1,077	220	20.4	4.6	613	81	13.2	6.3	464	139	30.0	3.9
45-54.....	1,482	364	24.6	7.6	639	127	19.9	10.0	843	237	28.1	6.7
55-64.....	2,502	872	34.9	18.1	751	238	31.7	18.7	1,752	634	36.2	17.9
65 and over.....	4,878	2,697	55.3	56.0	1,284	564	43.9	44.2	3,594	2,132	59.3	60.2
Sex:												
Male.....	4,563	1,276	28.0	26.5	4,563	1,276	28.0	100.0				
Female.....	7,804	3,544	45.4	73.5					7,804	3,544	45.4	100.0
Earners status:												
Earner.....	7,370	1,459	19.8	30.3	3,335	545	16.3	42.7	4,035	914	22.7	25.8
Nonearner.....	4,998	3,361	67.2	69.7	1,228	731	59.5	57.3	3,769	2,630	69.8	74.2
Employment status and occupation:												
Employed, March 1967.....	6,479	1,225	18.9	25.4	2,899	442	14.6	33.1	3,580	804	22.5	22.7
Professional and technical workers.....	1,294	192	14.8	4.0	559	60	10.7	4.7	735	133	18.1	3.8
Farmers and farm managers.....	102	31	30.4	.6	82	25	(¹)	2.0	21	6	(¹)	.2
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm).....	507	50	9.9	1.0	306	20	6.5	1.6	201	31	15.4	.9
Clerical and sales workers.....	1,567	155	9.9	3.2	385	43	11.2	3.4	1,180	111	9.4	3.1
Craftsmen and foremen.....	431	38	8.8	.8	382	29	7.6	2.3	49	9	(¹)	.3
Operatives.....	889	97	10.9	2.0	505	41	8.1	3.2	384	55	14.3	1.6
Service workers.....	1,361	545	40.0	11.3	360	86	23.9	6.7	1,002	459	45.8	13.0
Private household workers.....	425	288	67.8	6.0	7	7	(¹)	.5	419	281	67.1	7.9
Laborers (except mine).....	328	117	35.7	2.4	320	118	36.9	9.2	8			
Unemployed.....	287	103	35.9	2.1	176	60	34.1	4.7	112	42	37.5	1.2
Not in labor force.....	5,603	3,492	62.3	72.4	1,491	794	53.3	62.2	4,113	2,697	65.8	76.1

See footnotes at end of table.

throughout the period and how many were replacing units elevated to better status or disbanded as families.) Accordingly, in 1966 households headed by a woman accounted for nearly one-half of all units tagged poor rather than the two-fifths they represented in 1959. And if there were children in the home making it difficult for the mother to work, the disadvantage was especially striking (table 6).

The number of poor families with a man at the head and children under age 18 went from 3.8 million to 2.4 million in 1966. But the 1½ million poor families headed by a woman with children numbered almost as many as those poor in 1959. Thus, though the total count of children in poverty was one-fourth less than it had been 7 years earlier, the number poor in families with a woman at the head was actually one-tenth higher.

The peril of poverty for the child with several brothers and sisters remained high: The family with five or more children was still three and one-half times as likely to be poor as the family raising only one or two, and, just as in earlier years, almost one-half the poor children were in families with five or more children. The number of poor families with five or more children remained almost unchanged—0.9 million in 1966, compared with 1.1 million in 1959—with the added disadvantage that 29 percent of them now were headed by a woman, instead of 18 percent as in 1959. What is more, the economic deprivation associated with a father's absence was more common than it used to be: from 1959 to 1966 the proportion of all children under age 18 who were in a family headed by a woman rose from 9 to 11 percent; and in parallel fashion it was 1 in 3 of all poor children in 1966 who were minus

TABLE 5.—Incidence of poverty in 1966: Number and percent of unrelated individuals with income below the SSA poverty level, by sex, race, and other specified characteristics—*Continued*

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	All unrelated individuals				Male unrelated individuals				Female unrelated individuals			
	Total	Poor			Total	Poor			Total	Poor		
		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution
White individuals												
Total.....	10,784	4,026	37.3	100.0	3,819	1,007	26.4	100.0	6,965	3,019	43.3	100.0
Residence:												
Nonfarm.....	10,511	3,911	37.2	97.1	3,680	949	25.8	94.2	6,831	2,962	43.4	98.1
Farm.....	273	115	42.1	2.9	139	58	41.7	5.8	134	57	42.5	1.9
Region:												
Northeast.....	2,864	1,053	36.8	26.2	978	269	27.5	26.7	1,886	784	41.6	26.0
North Central.....	3,100	1,214	39.2	30.2	1,054	290	27.5	28.8	2,046	923	45.1	30.6
South.....	2,657	1,120	42.2	27.8	921	271	29.4	26.9	1,736	849	48.9	28.1
West.....	2,162	639	29.6	15.9	866	176	20.3	17.5	1,297	463	35.7	15.3
Age:												
14-24.....	1,145	449	39.2	11.2	527	179	34.0	17.8	618	270	43.7	8.9
25-34.....	936	108	11.5	2.7	566	49	8.7	4.9	370	59	15.9	2.0
35-44.....	823	128	15.6	3.2	469	51	10.9	5.1	354	77	21.8	2.6
45-54.....	1,197	253	21.1	6.3	497	80	16.1	7.9	700	173	24.7	5.7
55-64.....	2,193	688	31.4	17.1	628	180	28.6	17.9	1,565	508	32.5	16.8
65 and over.....	4,490	2,400	53.5	59.6	1,132	467	41.3	46.4	3,358	1,933	57.6	64.0
Sex:												
Male.....	3,819	1,007	26.4	25.0	3,819	1,007	26.4	100.0				
Female.....	6,965	3,019	43.3	75.0					6,965	3,019	43.3	100.0
Earned status:												
Earner.....	6,305	1,100	17.4	27.3	2,778	420	15.1	41.7	3,527	680	19.3	22.5
Nonearner.....	4,480	2,926	65.3	72.7	1,041	587	56.4	58.3	3,438	2,339	68.0	77.5
Employment status and occupation:												
Employed, March 1967.....	5,545	932	16.8	23.1	2,417	325	13.4	32.3	3,130	608	19.4	20.1
Professional and technical workers.....	1,209	181	15.0	4.5	511	57	11.2	5.7	699	126	18.0	4.2
Farmers and farm managers.....	95	27	(1)	.7	75	21	(1)	2.1	21	6	(1)	.2
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm).....	478	43	9.0	1.1	284	17	6.0	1.7	194	27	13.9	.9
Clerical and sales workers.....	1,502	147	9.8	3.7	363	39	10.7	3.9	1,138	107	9.4	3.5
Craftsmen and foremen.....	378	32	8.5	.8	334	25	7.5	2.5	45	7	(1)	.2
Operatives.....	672	64	9.5	1.6	354	25	7.1	2.5	318	39	12.3	1.3
Service workers.....	989	366	37.0	9.1	279	70	25.1	7.0	711	296	41.6	9.8
Private household workers.....	246	164	66.7	4.1	7	(1)	.7	.7	240	157	65.4	5.2
Laborers (except mine).....	221	71	32.1	1.8	217	71	32.7	7.1	4			
Unemployed.....	220	66	30.0	1.6	131	36	27.4	3.6	90	30	(1)	1.0
Not in labor force.....	5,019	3,027	60.3	75.2	1,274	646	50.7	64.2	3,746	2,381	63.6	78.9

See footnotes at end of table.

a father, not 1 in 4 as in 1959. To make matters worse, the poverty rate among children in families headed by a woman was now four and one-half times as high as in families headed by a man; in 1959 it was only three and one-third times as high.

There was other evidence that economic growth had not helped all population groups in equal measure. The nonwhite population generally had not fared as well as the white during the 1959-66 upswing, though by the end of the period it was making greater strides than at the beginning. To be sure, in 1966 it was 1 in 3 nonwhite families who were poor compared with 1 in 10 white families, and back in 1959 it was 1 in 2 nonwhite families and 1 in 7 white families who were poor. It is also a fact that the nonwhite made up about one-third of the Nation's poor in 1966, compared with just over one-fourth in 1959—a widening

disadvantage explained only in small part by the greater population growth among the nonwhite.

The farm population, though still poorer than the nonfarm, had reduced the incidence of poverty by nearly one-half, a rate of improvement twice that registered by the nonfarm population. But with the nonfarm population growing while the farm population steadily declined, it was likely that many families had merely exchanged a farm address for a city one at which they might be even worse off than before.

Though in comparison with the situation in 1959 the poverty roster now included fewer poor families headed by a regularly employed man and more headed by men who encountered trouble finding and holding a job or by those out of the labor force altogether, the difficulty of the low-paid worker with a large family to support was growing more striking. In 1959, among families

TABLE 5.—Incidence of poverty in 1966: Number and percent of unrelated individuals with income below the SSA poverty level, by sex, race, and other specified characteristics—Continued

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	All unrelated individuals				Male unrelated individuals				Female unrelated individuals			
	Total	Poor			Total	Poor			Total	Poor		
		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution
Nonwhite individuals												
Total.....	1,583	794	50.2	100.0	744	269	36.2	100.0	839	525	62.6	100.0
Residence:												
Nonfarm.....	1,556	772	49.6	97.2	734	263	35.8	97.8	823	509	61.8	96.9
Farm.....	26	23	(¹)	2.9	11	7	(¹)	2.6	16	16	(¹)	3.0
Region:												
Northeast.....	346	119	34.4	15.0	159	33	20.8	12.3	188	86	45.7	16.4
North Central.....	302	148	49.0	18.6	119	32	26.9	11.9	184	116	63.0	22.1
South.....	711	453	63.7	57.1	336	163	48.5	60.6	375	290	77.3	55.2
West.....	223	74	33.2	9.3	130	41	31.5	15.2	93	33	(¹)	6.3
Age:												
14-24.....	148	60	40.5	7.6	59	16	(¹)	5.9	89	44	(¹)	8.4
25-34.....	198	50	25.3	6.3	124	20	16.1	7.4	74	30	(¹)	5.7
35-44.....	255	92	36.1	11.6	144	30	20.8	11.2	110	62	56.4	11.8
45-54.....	285	111	38.9	14.0	142	47	33.1	17.5	143	64	44.8	12.2
55-64.....	309	184	59.5	23.2	123	58	47.2	21.6	187	126	67.4	24.0
65 and over.....	388	297	76.5	37.4	152	97	63.8	36.1	236	199	84.3	37.9
Sex:												
Male.....	744	269	36.2	33.9	744	269	36.2	100.0				
Female.....	839	525	62.6	66.1					839	525	62.6	100.0
Earners status:												
Earner.....	1,065	359	33.7	45.2	557	125	22.4	46.5	508	234	46.1	44.6
Nonearner.....	518	435	84.0	54.8	187	144	77.0	53.5	331	291	87.9	55.4
Employment status and occupation:												
Employed, March 1967.....	933	294	31.6	37.0	482	97	20.1	36.1	450	196	43.6	37.3
Professional and technical workers.....	84	10	(¹)	1.3	48	3	(¹)	1.1	36	7	(¹)	1.3
Farmers and farm managers.....	7	4	(¹)	.5	7	4	(¹)	1.5				
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm).....	30	7	(¹)	.9	22	3	(¹)	1.1	7	4	(¹)	.8
Clerical and sales workers.....	64	8	(¹)	1.0	22	4	(¹)	1.5	42	4	(¹)	.8
Craftsmen and foremen.....	52	6	(¹)	.8	48	4	(¹)	1.5	4	2	(¹)	.4
Operatives.....	216	33	15.3	4.2	151	16	10.6	5.9	66	16	(¹)	3.0
Service workers.....	372	179	48.1	22.5	81	16	(¹)	5.9	291	163	56.0	31.0
Private household workers.....	179	124	69.3	15.6					179	124	69.3	23.6
Laborers (except mine).....	108	47	43.5	5.9	103	47	45.6	17.5	4	4		
Unemployed.....	66	36	(¹)	4.5	45	24	(¹)	8.9	22	12	(¹)	2.3
Not in labor force.....	584	465	79.6	58.6	217	148	68.2	55.0	367	316	86.1	60.2

¹ Not shown for base less than 100,000.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special

tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1967.

of a fully employed worker in poverty, one-half included one to three children under age 18 and 30 percent had more than three; 19 percent had none. Among the corresponding group in poverty in 1965, 37 percent had at least four children, 46 percent had from one to three, and only 16 percent had none.

It is clear that in the period since 1959, poverty, which never was a random affliction, has become even more selective, and some groups initially vulnerable are now even more so. There is still

no all-embracing characterization that can encompass all the poor. Some are poor because they cannot work; others are poor even though they do. Most of the poor receive no assistance from public programs; others remain poor because they have no resources but the limited payments provided under such programs. And public programs to help the poor are in the main geared to serve those who cannot work at all or are temporarily out of a job. The man who works for a living but is not making it will normally find no avenue of aid.

TABLE 6.—Incidence of poverty in 1966: Number and percent of families with income below the SSA poverty level, by sex and race of head and other specified characteristics

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	All families				With male head				With female head			
	Total	Poor			Total	Poor			Total	Poor		
		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution
	All families											
Total	48,922	6,086	12.4	100.0	43,751	4,276	9.8	100.0	5,172	1,810	35.0	100.0
Residence:												
Nonfarm	46,225	5,598	12.1	92.0	41,199	3,835	9.3	89.7	5,026	1,764	35.1	97.5
Farm	2,697	488	18.1	8.0	2,552	441	17.3	10.3	145	47	32.4	2.6
Race:												
White	44,017	4,375	9.9	71.9	40,007	3,264	8.2	76.3	4,010	1,111	27.7	61.4
Nonwhite	4,905	1,711	34.9	28.1	3,744	1,012	27.0	23.7	1,162	699	60.2	38.6
Age of head:												
14-24	3,011	510	16.9	8.4	2,761	347	12.6	8.1	250	163	65.2	9.0
25-34	9,560	1,139	11.9	18.7	8,753	668	7.6	15.6	806	472	58.6	26.1
35-44	11,113	1,180	10.6	19.4	10,026	737	7.4	17.2	1,087	444	40.8	24.5
45-54	10,620	919	8.7	15.1	9,503	587	6.2	13.7	1,116	333	29.8	18.4
55-64	7,689	800	10.4	13.1	6,900	635	9.2	14.9	789	166	21.0	9.2
65 and over	6,929	1,538	22.2	25.3	5,807	1,304	22.5	30.5	1,122	234	20.9	12.9
Number of persons in family:												
2	16,354	2,271	13.9	37.3	13,978	1,693	12.1	39.6	2,376	578	24.3	31.9
3	10,098	889	8.8	14.6	8,901	532	6.0	12.4	1,197	357	29.8	19.7
4	9,400	793	8.4	13.0	8,687	488	5.6	11.4	712	305	42.8	16.9
5	6,189	649	10.5	10.7	5,808	440	7.6	10.3	382	209	54.7	11.5
6	3,438	501	14.6	8.2	3,230	362	11.2	8.5	209	138	66.0	7.6
7 or more	3,443	984	28.6	16.2	3,146	762	24.2	17.8	296	222	75.0	12.3
Region:												
Northeast	12,039	1,037	8.6	17.0	10,650	675	6.3	15.8	1,389	362	26.1	20.0
North Central	13,617	1,259	9.2	20.7	12,400	874	7.0	20.4	1,216	385	31.7	21.3
South	14,978	2,950	19.7	48.5	13,251	2,186	16.5	51.1	1,727	763	44.2	42.2
West	8,288	840	10.1	13.8	7,448	540	7.2	12.6	839	300	35.8	16.6
Type of family:												
Male head	43,751	4,276	9.8	70.3	43,751	4,276	9.8	100.0				
Married, wife present	42,553	4,069	9.6	66.9	42,553	4,069	9.6	95.2				
Wife in paid labor force	15,005	743	5.0	12.2	15,005	743	5.0	17.4				
Wife not in paid labor force	27,548	3,326	12.1	54.7	27,548	3,326	12.1	77.8				
Other marital status	1,197	207	17.3	3.4	1,197	207	17.3	4.8				
Female head	5,172	1,810	35.0	29.7					5,172	1,810	35.0	100.0
Employment status and occupation of head:												
Employed, March 1967	38,885	3,020	7.8	49.6	36,293	2,376	6.5	55.6	2,593	641	24.7	35.4
Professional and technical workers	5,338	129	2.4	2.1	5,050	107	2.1	2.5	286	22	7.7	1.2
Farmers and farm managers	1,588	315	19.8	5.2	1,572	309	19.7	7.2	16	6	(¹)	.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm)	5,759	233	4.0	3.8	5,643	216	3.8	5.1	118	17	14.4	.9
Clerical and sales workers	5,146	225	4.4	3.7	4,323	124	2.9	2.9	823	100	12.2	5.5
Craftsmen and foremen	8,050	353	4.4	5.8	8,013	349	4.4	8.2	36	3	(¹)	.2
Operatives	7,696	746	8.4	10.6	7,230	544	7.5	12.7	466	102	21.9	5.6
Service workers	3,011	585	19.4	9.6	2,192	212	9.7	5.0	820	373	45.5	20.6
Private household workers	282	154	54.6	2.5	13	2	(¹)	(²)	270	152	56.3	8.4
Laborers (except mine)	2,297	533	23.2	8.9	2,270	515	22.7	12.0	28	18	(¹)	1.0
Unemployed	904	248	27.4	4.1	780	180	23.1	4.2	124	68	54.8	3.8
Not in labor force	9,132	2,817	30.8	46.3	6,678	1,718	25.7	40.2	2,454	1,100	44.8	60.8
Number of earners in 1966:												
None	4,073	1,978	48.6	32.5	3,017	1,216	40.3	28.4	1,056	762	72.2	42.1
1	20,451	2,620	12.8	43.0	18,163	1,892	10.4	44.2	2,288	729	31.9	40.3
2	17,992	1,112	6.2	18.3	16,608	891	5.4	20.8	1,384	221	16.0	12.2
3 or more	6,405	376	5.9	6.2	5,961	278	4.7	6.5	443	100	22.8	5.5

See footnotes at end of table.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF POVERTY

About half of all the Nation's poor families— one-seventh of the white poor and two-thirds of the nonwhite poor—lived in the South in 1966. Incomes in that area continue to be lower than elsewhere, by more than could possibly be compensated for by any price differential. Despite the exodus of many nonwhite persons from the South in recent years, the South still spells home for about half of all nonwhite families in the country (table 6). It is thus the nonwhite population that is most immediately affected by the region's

economic disadvantage. In 1966, white families in the South on an average had only \$5 in income for every \$6 enjoyed by white families elsewhere; Southern nonwhite families averaged less than \$3 for every \$5 of income of nonwhite families outside the South. A fifth of all nonwhite families not in the South and a third of the white families had at least \$10,000 in income in 1966. Within the South, almost none of the nonwhite families and only a fourth of the white families had this much income, as indicated by the figures in the tabulation that follows.

TABLE 6.—Incidence of poverty in 1966: Number and percent of families with income below the SSA poverty level, by sex and race of head and other specified characteristics—*Continued*

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	All families				With male head				With female head			
	Total	Poor			Total	Poor			Total	Poor		
		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution		Number	Percent	Percentage distribution
White families												
Total.....	44,017	4,375	9.9	100.0	40,007	3,264	8.2	100.0	4,010	1,111	27.7	100.0
Residence:												
Nonfarm.....	41,525	4,025	9.7	92.0	37,629	2,940	7.8	90.1	3,896	1,085	27.8	97.7
Farm.....	2,492	350	14.0	8.0	2,378	324	13.6	9.9	114	26	22.8	2.3
Age of head:												
14-24.....	2,676	374	14.0	8.5	2,508	275	11.0	8.4	168	99	58.9	8.9
25-34.....	8,448	733	8.7	16.8	7,924	455	5.7	13.9	523	279	53.3	25.1
35-44.....	9,967	810	8.1	18.5	9,167	536	5.8	16.4	800	274	34.2	24.7
45-54.....	9,606	623	6.5	14.2	8,736	441	5.0	13.5	869	183	21.1	16.5
55-64.....	6,950	558	8.0	12.8	6,290	458	7.3	14.0	660	100	15.2	9.0
65 and over.....	6,371	1,277	20.0	29.2	5,382	1,100	20.4	33.7	989	177	17.9	15.9
Number of persons in family:												
2.....	14,942	1,892	12.7	43.2	12,915	1,463	11.3	44.8	2,027	429	21.2	38.6
3.....	9,213	654	7.1	14.9	8,252	412	5.0	12.6	961	242	25.2	21.8
4.....	8,628	566	6.6	12.9	8,090	369	4.6	11.3	538	197	36.6	17.7
5.....	5,615	432	7.7	9.9	5,362	321	6.0	9.8	253	111	43.9	10.0
6.....	2,989	297	9.9	6.8	2,880	241	8.4	7.4	110	55	50.0	5.0
7 or more.....	2,630	534	20.3	12.2	2,507	458	18.3	14.0	122	76	62.3	6.8
Region:												
Northeast.....	11,213	831	7.4	19.0	10,065	580	5.8	17.8	1,148	251	21.9	22.6
North Central.....	12,587	1,007	8.0	23.0	11,596	760	6.6	23.3	991	247	24.9	22.2
South.....	12,619	1,843	14.6	42.1	11,468	1,466	12.8	44.9	1,151	377	32.8	33.9
West.....	7,597	694	9.1	15.9	6,878	458	6.7	14.0	719	236	32.8	21.2
Type of family:												
Male head.....	40,007	3,264	8.2	74.6	40,007	3,264	8.2	100.0				
Married, wife present.....	39,007	3,119	8.0	71.3	39,007	3,119	8.0	95.6				
Wife in paid labor force.....	13,319	428	3.2	9.8	13,319	428	3.2	13.1				
Wife not in paid labor force.....	25,688	2,691	10.5	61.5	25,688	2,691	10.5	82.4				
Other marital status.....	1,000	146	14.6	3.3	1,000	146	14.6	4.5				
Female head.....	4,010	1,111	27.7	25.4					4,010	1,111	27.7	100.0
Employment status and occupation of head:												
Employed, March 1967.....	35,261	2,070	5.9	47.3	33,254	1,710	5.1	52.4	2,006	358	17.8	32.2
Professional and technical workers.....	5,082	112	2.2	2.6	4,832	95	2.0	2.9	248	17	6.9	1.5
Farmers and farm managers.....	1,498	262	17.5	6.0	1,485	258	17.4	7.9	13	4	(1)	.4
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm).....	5,622	216	3.8	4.9	5,513	202	3.7	6.2	109	15	13.8	1.4
Clerical and sales workers.....	4,819	188	3.9	4.3	4,063	102	2.5	3.1	756	86	11.4	7.7
Craftsmen and foremen.....	7,583	273	3.6	6.2	7,551	270	3.6	8.3	32	2	(1)	.2
Operatives.....	6,739	427	6.3	9.8	6,369	363	5.7	11.1	370	63	17.0	5.7
Service workers.....	2,244	302	13.5	6.9	1,782	140	7.9	4.3	463	161	34.8	14.5
Private household workers.....	93	37	(1)	.8	9	1	(1)	(2)	85	36	(1)	3.2
Laborers (except mine).....	1,674	290	17.3	6.6	1,659	280	16.9	8.6	15	10	(1)	.9
Unemployed.....	733	150	20.5	3.4	654	117	17.9	3.6	79	33	(1)	3.0
Not in labor force.....	8,022	2,154	26.9	49.2	6,098	1,436	23.5	44.0	1,925	718	37.3	64.6
Number of earners in 1966:												
None.....	3,593	1,589	44.2	36.3	2,808	1,071	38.1	32.8	785	519	66.1	46.7
1.....	18,721	1,927	10.3	44.0	16,933	1,481	8.7	45.4	1,789	446	24.9	40.1
2.....	16,039	691	4.3	15.8	14,911	577	3.9	17.7	1,128	114	10.1	10.3
3 or more.....	5,663	168	3.0	3.8	5,354	136	2.5	4.2	308	33	10.7	3.0

See footnotes at end of table.

Race of family	South	Rest of country
	Median income	
All families.....	\$6,235	\$7,930
White.....	6,775	8,090
Nonwhite.....	3,445	5,970
	Percent with income of \$10,000 or more	
All families.....	21.7	33.1
White.....	24.8	34.3
Nonwhite.....	5.0	18.8

The Southern States today support a larger proportion of their population on public assistance than is true of the rest of the country. Indeed, of the 10 States with the highest OAA recipient rate per 1,000 aged persons in December 1966, eight were Southern States, although eligibility requirements are at least as restrictive in the South as anywhere else.

Much of the burden of poverty among the fully employed—that is, in terms of weeks worked—rested on nonwhite men, and particularly so in

TABLE 6.—Incidence of poverty in 1966: Number and percent of families with income below the SSA poverty level, by sex and race of head and other specified characteristics—Continued

[Numbers in thousands]

Characteristic	All families				With male head				With female head			
	Total	Poor		Percentage distribution	Total	Poor		Percentage distribution	Total	Poor		Percentage distribution
		Number	Percent			Number	Percent			Number	Percent	
	Nonwhite families											
Total.....	4,905	1,711	34.9	100.0	3,744	1,012	27.0	100.0	1,162	699	60.2	100.0
Residence:												
Nonfarm.....	4,700	1,573	33.5	91.9	3,570	895	25.1	88.4	1,130	679	60.1	97.1
Farm.....	205	138	67.3	8.1	174	117	67.2	11.6	31	21	(1)	3.0
Age of head:												
14-24.....	335	136	40.6	7.9	253	72	28.5	7.1	82	64	(1)	9.2
25-34.....	1,113	406	36.5	23.7	829	213	25.7	21.0	283	193	68.2	27.6
35-44.....	1,146	371	32.4	21.7	859	201	23.4	19.9	287	170	59.2	24.3
45-54.....	1,015	295	29.1	17.2	767	146	19.0	14.4	247	150	60.7	21.5
55-64.....	739	243	32.9	14.2	610	177	29.0	17.5	129	66	51.2	9.4
65 and over.....	558	261	46.8	15.3	425	204	48.0	20.2	133	57	42.9	8.2
Number of persons in family:												
2.....	1,412	379	26.8	22.2	1,063	230	21.6	22.7	349	149	42.7	21.3
3.....	885	234	26.4	13.7	649	120	18.5	11.9	236	115	48.7	16.5
4.....	772	227	29.4	13.3	597	119	19.9	11.8	174	108	62.1	15.5
5.....	575	217	37.7	12.7	446	119	26.7	11.8	129	98	76.0	14.0
6.....	448	204	45.5	11.9	350	121	34.6	12.0	99	85	(1)	11.9
7 or more.....	813	450	55.4	26.3	639	304	47.6	30.0	174	146	83.9	20.9
Region:												
Northeast.....	826	206	24.9	12.0	585	95	16.2	9.4	241	111	46.1	15.9
North Central.....	1,030	252	24.5	14.7	804	114	14.2	11.3	225	138	61.3	19.7
South.....	2,359	1,107	46.9	64.7	1,783	720	40.4	71.1	576	386	67.0	55.2
West.....	691	146	21.1	8.5	571	82	14.4	8.1	120	64	53.3	9.2
Type of family:												
Male head.....	3,744	1,012	27.0	59.1	3,744	1,012	27.0	100.0				
Married, wife present.....	3,547	951	26.8	55.6	3,547	951	26.8	94.0				
Wife in paid labor force.....	1,686	315	18.7	18.4	1,686	315	18.7	31.1				
Wife not in paid labor force.....	1,861	636	34.2	37.2	1,861	636	34.2	62.8				
Other marital status.....	198	61	30.8	3.6	198	61	30.8	6.0				
Female head.....	1,162	699	60.2	40.9					1,162	699	60.2	100.0
Employment status and occupation of head:												
Employed, March 1967.....	3,625	950	26.2	55.5	3,039	666	21.9	65.8	587	283	48.2	40.5
Professional and technical workers.....	256	17	6.6	1.0	218	12	5.5	1.2	38	5	(1)	.7
Farmers and farm managers.....	90	53	(1)	3.1	87	51	(1)	5.0	3	2	(1)	.3
Managers, officials, and proprietors (except farm).....	137	16	11.7	.9	130	14	10.8	1.4	9	2	(1)	.3
Clerical and sales workers.....	327	36	11.0	2.1	260	22	8.5	2.2	67	14	(1)	2.0
Craftsmen and foremen.....	467	81	17.3	4.7	462	79	17.1	7.8	4	1	(1)	1.1
Operatives.....	957	220	23.0	12.9	861	181	21.0	17.9	96	39	(1)	5.6
Service workers.....	767	284	37.0	16.6	410	72	17.6	7.1	357	212	59.4	30.3
Private household workers.....	189	117	61.9	6.8	4	1	(1)	.1	185	116	62.7	16.6
Laborers (except mine).....	624	243	38.9	14.2	611	235	38.5	23.2	13	8	(1)	1.1
Unemployed.....	171	98	57.3	5.7	126	63	50.0	6.2	45	35	(1)	5.0
Not in labor force.....	1,109	663	59.8	38.7	580	282	48.6	27.9	529	382	72.2	54.6
Number of earners in 1966:												
None.....	480	389	81.0	22.7	209	145	69.4	14.3	271	243	89.7	34.8
1.....	1,730	693	40.1	40.5	1,230	411	33.4	40.6	499	283	56.7	40.5
2.....	1,953	421	21.6	24.6	1,697	314	18.5	31.0	256	107	41.8	15.3
3 or more.....	742	208	28.0	12.2	607	142	23.4	14.0	135	67	49.6	9.6

¹ Not shown for base less than 100,000.

² Less than 0.05 percent.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special

tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1967.

TABLE 7.—Incidence of poverty among families in 1966 by work experience and sex of head

Work experience of head in 1966	All families				With male head				With female head			
	Total	Head under age 55	Head aged 55-64	Head 65 or over	Total	Under age 55	Aged 55-64	65 or over	Total	Under age 55	Aged 55-64	65 or over
All families (in thousands)												
Total ¹	48,922	34,304	7,689	6,929	43,750	31,043	6,900	5,806	5,171	3,260	790	1,122
Didn't work.....	6,893	1,468	966	4,459	4,743	535	691	3,516	2,149	931	275	942
Ill, disabled.....	1,757	357	493	906	1,433	276	434	721	324	80	58	185
Other.....	5,136	1,111	473	3,553	3,310	259	257	2,795	1,825	851	217	757
Worked part year.....	7,905	5,418	1,353	1,033	6,615	4,499	1,168	948	1,189	919	185	85
Unemployed.....	2,858	2,313	430	116	2,626	2,117	400	108	232	195	30	6
Other.....	4,947	3,105	923	917	3,989	2,382	768	840	957	724	155	79
Worked all year.....	33,389	26,582	5,370	1,437	31,555	25,173	5,040	1,342	1,834	1,410	330	95
Poor families (in thousands)												
Total ¹	6,086	3,748	800	1,538	4,276	2,337	635	1,304	1,810	1,411	166	234
Didn't work.....	2,418	855	353	1,209	1,465	212	256	997	953	643	98	212
Ill, disabled.....	719	171	207	340	575	120	172	282	144	50	35	59
Other.....	1,699	684	146	869	890	92	84	715	809	593	63	153
Worked part year.....	1,653	1,243	221	189	1,132	777	180	175	521	466	41	14
Unemployed.....	673	467	76	31	471	372	69	29	102	93	7	1
Other.....	1,080	776	145	158	661	405	111	146	419	373	34	13
Worked all year.....	1,943	1,577	226	140	1,606	1,275	199	132	337	302	27	8
Percent of families in poverty												
Total ¹	12.4	10.9	10.4	22.2	9.8	7.5	9.2	22.5	35.0	43.3	21.0	20.9
Didn't work.....	35.1	58.2	36.5	27.1	30.9	39.6	37.0	28.4	44.3	69.1	35.6	22.5
Ill, disabled.....	40.9	47.9	42.0	37.5	40.1	43.5	39.6	39.1	44.4	82.5	60.3	31.9
Other.....	33.1	61.6	30.9	24.5	26.9	35.5	32.7	25.6	44.3	69.7	29.0	20.2
Worked part year.....	21.2	22.9	16.3	18.3	17.1	17.3	15.4	18.5	43.8	50.7	22.2	16.5
Unemployed.....	20.0	20.2	17.7	26.7	17.9	17.6	17.3	26.9	44.0	47.7	23.3	16.7
Other.....	21.8	25.0	15.7	17.2	16.6	17.0	14.5	17.4	43.8	51.5	21.9	16.5
Worked all year.....	5.8	5.9	4.2	9.7	5.1	5.1	3.9	9.8	18.4	21.4	8.2	8.4

¹ Includes heads in Armed Forces in March 1967, not shown separately; work experience in 1966 not asked for such heads.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1967.

the South. There, more than one-third of the non-white men who worked full time throughout 1965 had been poor, as were 7 percent of the white men. Elsewhere in the country the corresponding rates were 10 percent and 4 percent.⁶

About one-fourth of the white poor and two-fifths of the nonwhite poor resided in central cities of metropolitan areas. Yet, for the Nation as a whole, the white poor outnumbered the non-white even in the central cities: There were about 5½ million white persons counted poor in central cities and 4 million nonwhite. Because of the well-established difficulties of Negroes—whatever their income—in finding housing, a larger proportion of them, both poor and nonpoor, are clustered in what may be termed poverty areas of

large cities than is true for the white population.⁷

THE WORKING POOR

In our society it is a truism that work is the key to economic security. Yet though a job is usually necessary if one is to keep out of poverty, having one does not guarantee it.

With all the interest in more jobs for the poor, the statistics reveal that for many it is not more jobs that are needed but better ones. In 1966, 1 in 4 of all poor families was headed by a man who had worked throughout the year. The families of these working men included 8 million persons, or one-third of all the poor who were not

⁶ *Economic Report of the President (with The Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers)*, January 1967, page 139.

⁷ Arno I. Winard, "Characteristics of Families Residing in Poverty Areas Within Large Metropolitan Areas," paper presented at annual meeting of the Population Association of America, April 1967.

keeping house by themselves. To put it more directly, of the 3 million families headed by a man under age 65—leaving out families headed by an aged person or by a woman, persons who might have difficulty getting any work at all—half were “fully employed” in terms of time spent on the job. Seven out of 10 of these men were white and so presumably not subjected to discrimination in the hiring hall. Though a number of these men had large families, many had earnings so low they would have been poor with only two or three children to support. Overall, there was an average of 2.8 children under age 18 per family. Indeed, in 1965—the latest year for which such details are available—of the men under age 65 heading a family in poverty despite their “full employment,” three-fifths had no more than three children to support.

For many of the poor, particularly in households headed by women, it was the inability of the family breadwinner to find a job or keep one that accounted for their plight. When the family head did not work at all in 1966, 1 out of 3 families was counted poor, compared with only 1 in 17 when the family head was on a job every week in the year. But 9½ million persons were poor though they were in the family of a breadwinner who did have a job throughout 1966. To be sure, many families were poor because the head was unemployed part of the year. Families in poverty included 1 out of 4 of all those with the head looking for a job in March 1967, and 1 out of 5 of those whose family head had lost some weeks’ pay in 1966 because of unemployment. Among men who were family heads and in the labor force in 1966, one-sixth of the poor had been out of work and actively seeking a job sometime during the year—an unemployment rate nearly three times that for the heads of nonpoor families. In families headed by women, the unemployment rate reported by the poor was about 12 percent, or twice that in nonpoor families (table 7).

All told, among poor families headed by men under age 65, 5 out of 6 of the heads worked some time in 1966, and the majority of those who didn’t were disabled.

As one would expect, the kind of job held was intimately related to the risk of poverty. The most poverty-prone calling for men was farming or unskilled labor; for women workers it was

domestic service. Indeed, among women family heads employed as household workers in March 1967, nearly 3 in 5 reported family income for 1966 below the poverty line. Most of these women were nonwhite. Some women who go out to work achieve a better standard of living for their own family, but the families of some of the women who keep house for them are likely to remain on a substandard one.

AGE AND POVERTY

A majority of the aged live alone or with just one other person. In 1966, 2 out of 5 households consisting of one aged person or an elderly couple fell below the poverty line, compared with but 1 in 7 of all other households. Families headed by aged persons generally have lower incomes than younger households of the same size because they are less likely to include a steady earner, and because the public programs that help many of the aged almost always pay less than the earnings they are intended to replace.

On the average, aged couples or persons living alone must get along on less than half the money income available to a young couple or single person—a difference greater than any possible differential in living requirements. The fact that for a variety of reasons, more and more aged persons are spending their last years living by themselves or just with a spouse rather than as part of a larger family group emphasizes the significance of the income disadvantage of such elderly households. Between 1959 and 1966 the number of non-aged one-person households rose by only 6 percent, but the number of elderly men and women living alone—or with nonrelatives only—was a third greater in 1966 than in 1959. In parallel fashion, with youngsters marrying and starting their families at an earlier age than they formerly did, the number of childless couples under age 65 rose only 2 percent in this 7-year period. At the same time, the number of aged couples increased by a fifth. There are thus relatively more elderly persons who must manage by themselves on their own meager resources.

The fact that aged men and women are less likely to work regularly than younger persons and that they earn less when they do work is the main reason why poverty is so much more preval-

ent among the aged. When families are matched by work experience and by sex of the head, aged families are not so much worse off than others. For example, the poverty rate for families of all aged men is nearly triple that of younger ones, but when the family head works the year round the rate of poverty among the aged is only twice that of the others. And, indeed, when the family head does not work at all, the average aged family will do better than a corresponding younger family because social security and other public support programs are more readily available to older people. Among the families headed by men who did not work at all in 1966, 28 percent of the aged were in poverty, compared with 37 percent when the head was aged 55-64 and 40 percent if he was under age 55.

WOMEN IN POVERTY

Among the poor, women outnumbered the men, 8 to 5. In the age group 65 or older, there were nearly 2 women living in poverty for every man. Aged women living alone were particularly ill-favored, with more than 3 out of 5 purchasing their privacy only at the price of poverty, but whatever their age or family status the woman was poorer than the man. Those who had to double as family head and homemaker were three and one-half times as likely to be poor as men heading a family, and they were even more disadvantaged if they had children under age 6 to look after.

Of the 5.2 million women heading a family, 35 percent were counted poor and 2 out of 3 of those heading a family with children under age 6 were raising their youngsters on incomes too low to provide for them properly. Because their home responsibilities were greater than in nonpoor families, women in poor families would find it more difficult to hold down a full-time job and some could take no job at all. The woman in a poor family—whether wife or family head—had more children and younger children to care for. It is not surprising then to find that among poor families with a husband present, only 1 in 6 of the wives was in the paid labor force, but that in nonpoor families, 2 in 5 were either working or looking for work.

Poor families generally were larger than those

better off, mainly because they included more children, not because they had more adults. And every disadvantage of the poor family was greater if the head was a woman. As one instance, in the women's families just about one-fifth of all family members were preschoolers under age 6, and 6 out of 10 members were not yet aged 18. In families of men in poverty, one-half the members were not yet aged 18, and about one-sixth were not yet 6 years of age (table 8).

The role of social security and other public programs in ameliorating poverty is quite evident in the situation of families headed by a woman. Because a woman responsible for a family cannot work as readily as a man and will earn less when she does, the families of women are generally much poorer than men's families. But by age 65 when most men heading a family are not working regularly either, the economic gap between the man's and woman's family lessens. With a head under age 55, a woman's family is nearly six times as likely to be poor as a man's; between ages 55 and 64, the woman's family is two and one-third times as likely to be poor as the man's; at age 65 or older, the risk of poverty for a woman's family is about the same as for a man's and, if both are not working at all, the risk for the woman's family is about one-fourth less than the man's.

CHILDREN OF THE POOR

Children generally do not contribute income of their own to a family but must rely instead on the support of others. As a result, after the aged—whose earning capacity is also likely to be limited if not lacking altogether—children are the poorest age group, particularly if the father is absent. Three out of 5 youngsters in families headed by women were being raised in poverty—a total of 4½ million poor children—but there were also 8 million other children who were poor in unbroken families. The mother of young children, whether she herself is the family head or shares the responsibility with a husband, finds it hard to take a job, but many families can escape poverty only if both parents work and some not even then. Twelve percent of the husband-wife families were poor when the wife did not work and 5 percent even when she did. Perhaps more

to the point in assessing remedial action against poverty is the fact that 4½ million children were counted poor though they were in the home of a man who had worked throughout 1966 and nearly 1 million more were in the family of a woman who held a job all year. Children with a working mother but minus a father receive little help from existing public programs unless they are the orphans of veterans or workers who were covered under OASDHI, but the children with a father present and working receive almost no help at all. Youngsters in large families were particularly

bad off, and if the large family had a woman at its head, the odds were better than 4 out of 5 that it was poor.

All told, close to half the Nation's poor children were in families with at least five youngsters present, but the size and current living arrangements of families, as the Census normally counts them, are sometimes the result of poverty; they are not always the cause. Family groups with insufficient income, particularly if there is no man at the head, may share living quarters with relatives to help meet living expenses. Thus

TABLE 8.—Distribution of members of families with 1966 income below SSA poverty level by work experience of family head, by color and sex of head

Age and race	Total	In household with male head						In household with female head					
		Total ¹	Work experience, 1966				Total	Work experience, 1966				Worked all year	
			Didn't work		Worked part year			Didn't work		Worked part year			
			Ill	Other	Unem- ployed	Other		Ill	Other	Unem- ployed	Other		
Numbers (in thousands)													
Families.....	6,086	4,276	575	890	471	661	1,606	1,810	144	809	102	419	337
White.....	4,375	3,264	433	794	305	519	1,151	1,111	72	565	57	247	170
Nonwhite.....	1,711	1,012	142	96	166	142	455	699	72	243	45	173	167
Persons in families.....	24,836	17,675	1,979	2,283	2,396	2,548	8,139	7,160	474	3,145	427	1,727	1,388
White.....	16,287	12,410	1,381	1,946	1,485	1,843	5,486	3,877	193	1,975	213	887	609
Nonwhite.....	8,549	5,265	598	337	911	704	2,653	3,283	282	1,169	215	839	778
Children under age 18 ²	12,539	8,117	639	372	1,321	1,073	4,526	4,423	213	1,933	281	1,135	861
White.....	7,527	5,281	408	261	826	702	2,940	2,245	58	1,104	139	571	373
Nonwhite.....	5,014	2,837	232	112	496	370	1,586	2,177	156	827	140	566	487
Children under age 6.....	4,386	2,964	137	118	496	418	1,697	1,423	43	680	88	385	228
White.....	2,564	1,893	83	73	312	274	1,071	871	11	356	36	183	85
Nonwhite.....	1,823	1,071	54	46	184	145	627	752	33	322	51	202	143
Persons aged 18-54.....	3,748	2,337	120	92	372	405	1,275	1,411	50	593	93	373	302
White.....	2,540	1,706	87	79	248	322	910	834	20	387	54	221	152
Nonwhite.....	1,208	631	34	12	124	83	366	577	31	206	41	151	148
Persons aged 55-64.....	800	635	172	84	69	111	199	166	35	63	7	34	27
White.....	558	458	129	68	39	83	139	100	18	50	3	16	13
Nonwhite.....	243	177	43	16	30	28	59	66	17	13	4	17	15
Persons 65 and over.....	1,538	1,304	282	715	29	146	132	234	59	153	1	13	8
White.....	1,277	1,100	217	648	17	116	102	177	34	129	1	8	5
Nonwhite.....	261	204	65	67	12	30	30	57	24	25	0	5	3
Percentage distribution													
Families.....	100.0	70.3	9.4	14.6	7.7	10.9	26.4	29.7	2.4	13.3	1.7	6.9	5.5
White.....	100.0	74.6	9.9	18.1	7.0	11.9	26.3	25.4	1.6	12.9	1.3	5.6	3.9
Nonwhite.....	100.0	59.1	8.3	5.6	9.7	8.3	26.6	40.9	4.2	14.2	2.6	10.1	9.8
Persons in families.....	100.0	71.2	8.0	9.2	9.6	10.3	32.8	28.8	1.9	12.7	1.7	7.0	5.6
White.....	100.0	76.2	8.5	11.9	9.1	11.3	33.7	23.8	1.1	12.1	1.3	5.4	3.7
Nonwhite.....	100.0	61.6	7.0	3.9	10.7	8.2	31.0	38.4	3.3	13.7	2.5	9.8	9.1
Children under age 18 ²	100.0	64.7	5.1	3.0	10.5	8.6	36.1	35.3	1.7	15.4	2.2	9.1	6.9
White.....	100.0	70.2	5.4	3.5	11.0	9.3	39.1	29.8	.8	14.7	1.8	7.6	5.0
Nonwhite.....	100.0	56.6	4.6	2.2	9.9	7.4	31.6	43.4	3.1	16.5	2.8	11.3	9.7
Children under age 6.....	100.0	67.6	3.1	2.7	11.3	9.5	38.7	32.4	1.0	15.5	2.0	8.8	5.2
White.....	100.0	73.8	3.2	2.8	12.2	10.7	41.8	26.2	.4	13.9	1.4	7.1	3.3
Nonwhite.....	100.0	58.7	3.0	2.5	10.1	8.0	34.4	41.3	1.8	17.7	2.8	11.1	7.8
Persons aged 18-54.....	100.0	62.4	3.2	2.5	9.9	10.8	34.0	37.6	1.3	15.8	2.5	10.0	8.0
White.....	100.0	67.2	3.4	3.1	9.8	12.7	35.8	32.8	.8	15.2	2.1	8.7	6.0
Nonwhite.....	100.0	52.2	2.8	1.0	10.3	6.9	30.3	47.8	2.6	17.1	3.4	12.5	12.3
Persons aged 55-64.....	100.0	79.4	21.6	10.5	8.6	13.9	24.9	20.7	4.4	7.9	.9	4.2	3.4
White.....	100.0	82.1	23.1	12.2	7.0	14.9	24.9	17.9	3.2	9.0	.5	2.9	2.3
Nonwhite.....	100.0	72.8	17.7	6.6	12.3	11.5	24.3	27.2	7.0	5.3	1.6	7.0	6.2
Persons 65 and over.....	100.0	84.8	18.3	46.5	1.9	9.5	8.6	15.2	3.8	9.9	.1	.8	.5
White.....	100.0	86.1	17.0	50.7	1.3	9.1	8.0	13.9	2.7	10.1	.1	.6	.4
Nonwhite.....	100.0	78.2	24.9	25.7	4.6	11.5	11.5	21.8	9.2	9.6	1.9	1.1

¹ Includes heads in Armed Forces in March 1967, not shown separately; work experience in 1966 not asked for such heads.

² Never-married children.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1967.

TABLE 9.—1966 income of families: Number and median income of families by number of children under age 18 and sex and race of head

Type of family	Total families	With no children	With children						
			Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
Number (in thousands)									
All families.....	48,923	20,327	28,598	9,082	8,492	5,416	2,922	1,397	1,287
With male head.....	43,751	18,116	25,638	8,034	7,666	4,949	2,629	1,261	1,095
White.....	40,007	16,824	23,183	7,338	7,114	4,533	2,321	1,062	815
Nonwhite.....	3,744	1,292	2,455	696	552	416	308	199	280
With female head.....	5,172	2,211	2,960	1,048	826	467	293	136	192
White.....	4,010	1,936	2,075	827	607	332	177	61	70
Nonwhite.....	1,162	275	885	221	219	135	116	75	122
Poor families ¹	6,086	2,206	3,880	844	869	695	544	390	541
With male head.....	4,276	1,874	2,403	492	503	405	343	283	376
White.....	3,264	1,607	1,657	373	373	277	236	176	223
Nonwhite.....	1,012	267	746	199	130	128	107	107	153
With female head.....	1,809	332	1,477	353	365	288	202	107	166
White.....	1,110	258	852	244	226	184	101	42	58
Nonwhite.....	699	74	625	109	139	104	101	65	108
Nonpoor families.....	42,835	18,121	24,710	8,239	7,620	4,723	2,379	1,008	744
With male head.....	39,474	16,242	23,230	7,542	7,161	4,542	2,289	979	719
White.....	36,742	15,217	21,522	6,965	6,740	4,254	2,088	887	592
Nonwhite.....	2,732	1,025	1,708	577	421	288	201	92	127
With female head.....	3,361	1,879	1,480	695	459	180	92	29	25
White.....	2,899	1,678	1,221	583	380	148	77	19	12
Nonwhite.....	462	201	259	112	79	32	15	10	13
Median income									
All families.....	\$7,436	\$6,740	\$7,803	\$7,776	\$7,945	\$8,108	\$7,750	\$7,467	\$6,014
With male head.....	7,816	6,975	8,238	8,234	8,350	7,842	8,208	7,926	6,605
White.....	8,012	7,156	8,484	8,426	8,525	8,693	8,561	8,500	7,144
Nonwhite.....	5,370	4,724	5,693	5,881	6,200	5,977	5,563	4,922	4,781
With female head.....	4,012	5,275	3,320	3,640	3,355	2,980	3,065	3,250	3,174
White.....	4,466	5,510	3,710	3,995	3,818	3,140	3,538	(?)	(?)
Nonwhite.....	2,825	3,488	2,635	2,417	2,324	2,736	2,633	(?)	3,100
Poor families ¹	1,784	1,461	2,257	1,533	1,976	2,445	3,005	3,338	3,283
With male head.....	1,826	1,491	2,578	1,663	2,307	2,727	3,308	3,590	3,440
White.....	1,764	1,506	2,554	1,623	2,348	2,723	3,400	3,868	3,733
Nonwhite.....	2,160	1,401	2,629	1,777	2,174	2,694	3,190	3,234	3,164
With female head.....	1,673	1,310	1,823	1,360	1,595	2,123	2,306	2,614	2,867
White.....	1,587	1,264	1,747	1,413	1,635	2,041	2,161	(?)	(?)
Nonwhite.....	1,835	(?)	1,954	1,284	1,493	2,306	2,397	(?)	2,750
Nonpoor families.....	8,122	7,441	8,524	8,269	8,486	8,782	8,760	9,017	8,214
With male head.....	8,342	7,645	8,719	8,567	8,689	8,906	8,864	9,068	8,271
White.....	8,471	7,774	8,837	8,687	8,778	8,986	8,958	9,268	8,558
Nonwhite.....	6,832	5,838	7,221	7,038	7,053	7,706	7,204	(?)	7,339
With female head.....	5,680	6,043	5,317	5,010	5,156	5,611	(?)	(?)	(?)
White.....	5,813	6,171	5,393	5,062	5,302	5,778	(?)	(?)	(?)
Nonwhite.....	5,041	4,982	5,051	4,867	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)	(?)

¹ Families with 1966 income below SSA poverty level.

² Not shown for base less than 100,000.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special

tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1967.

in nonpoor families in 1966, only 1 in 25 of the children under age 18 were not the children of the head or wife but children of other relatives. In poor families as a group, 1 in 10 children were related rather than own children, and in poor families headed by a woman, the proportion was 1 in 8.

Many families with four or five youngsters had insufficient income to support even two or three, though all would be less poor if they spread their limited resources among fewer members. For example, of the families poor in 1966 with a woman at the head and four children, one-half had less than \$2,300 income for the year. Even

on the assumption that there was no one else in the family, this median was 40 percent less than the minimum of \$3,900 required to enable a nonfarm family of this size to stay above the poverty line and was not even enough for a mother and two children (tables 9 and 10; see also table 1).

THE POVERTY GAP IN 1965

The latest statistics on the aggregate dollar amount by which poor households fell short of their estimated income need are for 1965 when the total poverty roster numbered 31.9 million

persons, of whom 14 million were under age 18. At that time the total dollar poverty gap—the aggregate difference between required and actual income—stood at \$11 billion. This figure represented an overall reduction of 20 percent since 1959, but now one-fifth of the gap represented unmet need of families with children and headed by a woman, compared with one-sixth then. In

contrast, the share of the total gap accounted for by families with children and a man at the head dropped from 37 percent in 1959 to 34 percent in 1965 (tables 11 and 12).

It must be remembered that aggregate deficits as computed represent a needs-resources gap, still remaining after payments of public assistance, OASDHI benefits, and any other public pro-

TABLE 10.—1966 income of families: Percentage distribution of poor and nonpoor families by amount of income, by sex of head and number of children under age 18

Income	Total families	With no children	With children						
			Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
All families									
Number (in thousands).....	48,923	20,327	28,598	9,082	8,492	5,416	2,922	1,397	1,287
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	2.3	2.4	2.3	.5	2.3	1.7	2.1	2.6	2.6
\$1,000-1,499.....	2.3	3.2	1.6	2.0	1.4	1.2	1.0	2.1	2.5
\$1,500-1,999.....	3.1	4.9	1.8	2.3	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.8	2.7
\$2,000-2,499.....	3.4	4.9	2.3	2.4	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.4	5.9
\$2,500-2,999.....	3.2	4.5	2.2	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.5	4.0
\$3,000-3,499.....	3.5	4.3	3.0	3.0	2.4	2.6	3.5	3.7	5.9
\$3,500-3,999.....	3.3	3.9	2.9	3.2	2.4	2.5	2.7	2.9	5.8
\$4,000-4,999.....	7.1	7.5	6.8	6.8	6.0	6.0	7.8	8.4	11.1
\$5,000-5,999.....	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.0	8.2	9.7	7.5	9.3
\$6,000-6,999.....	9.4	8.0	10.3	9.3	11.2	10.1	10.2	12.0	11.0
\$7,000-7,999.....	9.3	7.6	10.5	10.4	11.4	10.7	9.2	8.8	8.8
\$8,000-8,999.....	8.1	6.9	9.0	8.7	9.2	9.5	9.2	9.0	7.1
\$9,000-9,999.....	7.0	5.6	8.0	7.4	8.7	9.0	7.8	8.4	4.4
\$10,000-11,999.....	11.2	9.7	12.3	12.3	12.3	13.7	12.1	11.3	8.1
\$12,000-14,999.....	9.2	8.9	9.5	9.9	9.8	9.3	9.5	8.7	5.4
\$15,000-24,999.....	7.5	7.3	7.6	7.9	7.9	7.6	7.2	7.0	3.8
\$25,000 and over.....	1.7	1.9	1.6	1.4	1.4	2.0	1.9	1.0	1.7
Median income.....	\$7,436	\$6,740	\$7,803	\$7,776	\$7,945	\$8,108	\$7,750	\$7,467	\$6,014
All poor families ¹									
Number (in thousands).....	6,086	2,206	3,880	844	869	695	544	390	541
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	18.9	22.7	16.7	26.7	22.3	13.6	11.4	9.6	6.1
\$1,000-1,499.....	18.3	29.6	11.9	21.7	14.1	9.7	5.1	7.5	5.9
\$1,500-1,999.....	22.5	38.7	13.4	24.1	14.3	12.3	8.6	6.5	6.5
\$2,000-2,499.....	12.7	7.6	15.6	18.9	19.1	16.3	11.0	8.5	14.0
\$2,500-2,999.....	7.8	1.1	11.6	5.6	14.7	16.5	13.6	9.0	9.6
\$3,000-3,499.....	7.7	.4	11.9	2.1	12.2	16.7	17.6	13.2	14.0
\$3,500-3,999.....	4.5	0	7.1	.2	2.0	12.1	11.9	9.8	12.9
\$4,000-4,999.....	5.8	0	9.0	.2	1.1	2.0	17.1	25.1	24.4
\$5,000 and over.....	1.8	0	2.8	.4	.1	.9	3.7	10.9	6.5
Median income.....	\$1,784	\$1,461	\$2,257	\$1,533	\$1,976	\$2,445	\$3,005	\$3,338	\$3,283
All nonpoor families									
Number (in thousands).....	42,835	18,121	24,710	8,239	7,620	4,723	2,379	1,008	744
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,000-1,499.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,500-1,999.....	.3	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$2,000-2,499.....	2.0	4.5	.2	.7	0	0	0	0	0
\$2,500-2,999.....	2.5	4.9	.7	1.7	.5	.1	0	0	0
\$3,000-3,499.....	2.9	4.8	1.5	3.1	1.2	.6	.2	0	0
\$3,500-3,999.....	3.1	4.4	2.2	3.5	2.5	1.1	.5	.3	.5
\$4,000-4,999.....	7.3	8.5	6.4	7.5	6.6	6.5	5.7	2.0	1.5
\$5,000-5,999.....	9.3	9.4	9.3	9.3	8.9	9.3	11.1	6.3	11.3
\$6,000-6,999.....	10.7	9.0	11.9	10.3	12.5	11.6	12.5	16.6	18.9
\$7,000-7,999.....	10.6	8.5	12.1	11.4	12.7	12.3	11.3	12.2	15.2
\$8,000-8,999.....	9.3	7.8	10.4	9.6	10.2	10.9	11.3	12.5	12.2
\$9,000-9,999.....	8.0	6.3	9.3	8.1	9.7	10.3	9.6	11.6	7.5
\$10,000-11,999.....	12.8	10.9	14.2	13.6	13.7	15.7	14.9	15.6	14.0
\$12,000-14,999.....	10.5	10.0	10.9	11.0	10.9	10.6	11.7	12.0	9.4
\$15,000-24,999.....	8.5	8.2	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.7	8.8	9.6	6.6
\$25,000 and over.....	2.0	2.1	1.8	1.6	1.6	2.4	2.3	1.4	3.0
Median income.....	\$8,122	\$7,441	\$8,524	\$8,269	\$8,486	\$8,782	\$8,760	\$9,017	\$8,214

See footnotes at end of table.

grams aiming to help families with insufficient income of their own. Many receive no such help. It has been estimated that only about a fourth of all persons counted poor receive any public assistance, and the proportion of poor households who receive assistance is even less. In 1965, as shown later in this article, only a fourth of all households whose income for the year was below the

poverty line had received any public assistance payments.

Because, as a rule, women's families have fewer persons than men's families, the income needed for the women's families to stay above poverty is lower. But even allowing for this lesser need the families headed by women had incomes proportionately less in relation to estimated require-

TABLE 10.—1966 income of families: Percentage distribution of poor and nonpoor families by amount of income, by sex of head and number of children under age 18—Continued

Income	Total families	With no children	With children						
			Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
All families with male head									
Number (in thousands).....	43,751	18,116	25,638	8,034	7,666	4,949	2,629	1,261	1,095
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	1.5	2.2	1.1	1.3	1.0	.7	.7	1.8	1.7
\$1,000-1,499.....	1.8	3.0	1.0	1.3	.9	.6	.6	1.4	1.9
\$1,500-1,999.....	2.6	4.8	1.0	1.3	.7	1.0	.9	1.0	1.4
\$2,000-2,499.....	2.8	4.8	1.5	1.7	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.6	4.5
\$2,500-2,999.....	2.8	4.4	1.7	1.7	1.5	1.4	1.7	2.0	3.3
\$3,000-3,499.....	3.1	4.3	2.4	2.5	1.9	1.9	2.7	3.2	4.9
\$3,500-3,999.....	2.9	3.7	2.4	2.9	2.1	2.1	1.9	2.1	4.4
\$4,000-4,999.....	6.6	7.1	6.1	6.0	5.3	5.7	7.5	7.5	10.4
\$5,000-5,999.....	8.4	8.2	8.5	8.4	8.1	8.2	10.1	8.1	10.0
\$6,000-6,999.....	9.5	7.7	10.8	9.6	11.8	10.7	10.7	12.5	12.4
\$7,000-7,999.....	9.8	7.7	11.2	11.1	12.0	11.4	10.0	9.5	10.1
\$8,000-8,999.....	8.7	7.2	9.7	9.4	10.0	10.1	10.1	9.8	7.8
\$9,000-9,999.....	7.4	5.6	8.7	7.8	9.4	9.7	8.5	9.3	5.1
\$10,000-11,999.....	12.1	10.0	13.5	13.6	13.1	14.9	13.3	12.2	9.4
\$12,000-14,999.....	10.0	9.4	10.4	11.0	10.7	10.0	10.4	9.4	6.4
\$15,000-24,999.....	8.1	7.8	8.3	8.8	8.7	8.2	7.8	7.5	4.4
\$25,000 and over.....	1.9	2.1	1.7	1.6	1.6	2.2	2.0	1.1	1.9
Median income.....	\$7,816	\$6,975	\$8,238	\$8,234	\$8,350	\$7,842	\$8,208	\$7,926	\$6,605
Poor families with male head ¹									
Number (in thousands).....	4,276	1,874	2,403	492	503	405	343	283	376
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	16.1	21.5	11.9	21.4	16.5	8.8	5.3	7.8	5.1
\$1,000-1,499.....	18.7	29.1	10.7	21.8	13.1	7.8	4.4	6.4	5.6
\$1,500-1,999.....	23.3	39.6	10.5	21.0	9.9	12.0	6.7	4.2	4.0
\$2,000-2,499.....	12.0	8.3	14.9	23.0	17.2	14.2	8.8	7.1	13.1
\$2,500-2,999.....	7.9	1.3	13.1	8.8	20.4	15.7	13.2	8.8	9.6
\$3,000-3,499.....	8.3	.3	14.6	2.9	19.0	19.6	19.0	14.1	14.4
\$3,500-3,999.....	4.6	0	8.2	.2	2.2	17.9	12.8	8.8	11.7
\$4,000-4,999.....	6.8	0	12.1	.4	1.6	2.7	25.4	28.6	28.0
\$5,000 and over.....	2.3	0	4.1	.6	.2	1.2	4.7	14.1	8.5
Median income.....	\$1,826	\$1,491	\$2,578	\$1,663	\$2,307	\$2,727	\$3,308	\$3,590	\$3,440
Nonpoor families with male head									
Number (in thousands).....	39,474	16,242	23,230	7,542	7,161	4,542	2,289	979	719
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,000-1,499.....	(²)	(²)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,500-1,999.....	.3	.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$2,000-2,499.....	1.9	4.4	.1	.3	(²)	0	0	0	0
\$2,500-2,999.....	2.2	4.7	.5	1.2	.2	.1	0	0	0
\$3,000-3,499.....	2.6	4.7	1.1	2.5	.7	.4	.3	0	0
\$3,500-3,999.....	2.8	4.1	1.8	3.0	2.1	.7	.3	.2	.6
\$4,000-4,999.....	6.5	8.0	5.5	6.4	5.5	5.9	4.8	1.4	1.3
\$5,000-5,999.....	9.0	9.2	8.9	8.9	8.6	8.9	10.9	6.3	10.8
\$6,000-6,999.....	10.6	8.6	12.0	10.2	12.6	11.6	12.3	16.4	18.8
\$7,000-7,999.....	10.8	8.6	12.4	11.8	12.9	12.4	11.5	12.3	15.4
\$8,000-8,999.....	9.6	8.0	10.7	10.0	10.7	11.0	11.6	12.6	11.8
\$9,000-9,999.....	8.2	6.3	9.6	8.3	10.0	10.5	9.7	12.0	7.8
\$10,000-11,999.....	13.3	11.1	14.9	14.6	14.3	16.2	15.4	15.7	14.3
\$12,000-14,999.....	11.1	10.5	11.5	11.7	11.5	10.9	12.0	12.0	9.7
\$15,000-24,999.....	9.0	8.7	9.2	9.4	9.3	9.0	9.0	9.7	6.7
\$25,000 and over.....	2.1	2.4	1.9	1.7	1.7	2.4	2.3	1.4	2.9
Median income.....	\$8,342	\$7,645	\$8,719	\$8,567	\$8,689	\$8,906	\$8,864	\$9,068	\$8,271

See footnotes at end of table.

ments than was true of families headed by a man.

For example, the median income deficit for poor families with children—that is, the difference between the family's actual money income and the minimum amount appropriate for a household of that size and composition—was \$1,150 for the families headed by a man and

\$1,380 where the head was a woman. As a parallel to the fact that the larger the family the more likely it was to be poor, it was also true that irrespective of the sex of the head, the more children in the poor family the greater the dollar gap between the income it had to live on and what it should have had (tables A and B).

TABLE 10.—1966 income of families: Percentage distribution of poor and nonpoor families by amount of income, by sex of head and number of children under age 18—Continued

Income	Total families	With no children	With children						
			Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
All families with female head									
Number (in thousands).....	5,172	2,211	2,960	1,048	826	467	293	136	192
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	8.9	4.4	12.2	11.7	13.5	12.2	15.3	10.7	7.3
\$1,000-1,499.....	6.1	5.0	6.9	7.2	6.9	7.7	5.1	8.4	5.8
\$1,500-1,999.....	7.6	5.6	9.1	9.9	9.0	7.9	7.8	9.2	10.5
\$2,000-2,499.....	7.8	5.6	9.5	7.4	9.6	11.8	10.5	9.2	14.2
\$2,500-2,999.....	6.4	5.5	7.0	4.9	6.1	10.9	9.9	8.4	7.9
\$3,000-3,499.....	6.8	4.8	8.2	7.4	6.9	9.8	10.5	8.4	12.1
\$3,500-3,999.....	6.3	5.6	6.8	5.6	5.7	6.2	9.5	10.7	13.7
\$4,000-4,999.....	11.8	10.8	12.5	12.8	13.2	9.4	10.9	16.8	14.7
\$5,000-5,999.....	8.6	9.8	7.7	9.2	7.8	7.9	6.1	3.1	4.7
\$6,000-6,999.....	7.8	10.5	5.7	7.2	5.6	3.8	5.4	4.6	3.7
\$7,000-7,999.....	5.3	6.6	4.3	4.5	5.9	3.6	2.4	2.3	1.6
\$8,000-8,999.....	3.6	5.0	2.6	3.1	1.8	3.4	1.4	1.5	2.6
\$9,000-9,999.....	3.7	5.2	2.6	3.9	2.5	1.5	1.7	0	0
\$10,000-11,999.....	4.4	7.6	2.1	2.4	3.0	.9	.3	3.1	.5
\$12,000-14,999.....	2.8	4.5	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.9	1.4	3.1	0
\$15,000-24,999.....	2.0	3.3	1.1	1.2	1.1	.9	1.4	.8	.5
\$25,000 and over.....	.3	.3	.2	.2	.1	.2	.3	0	0
Median income.....	\$4,012	\$5,275	\$3,320	\$3,640	\$3,355	\$2,980	\$3,065	\$3,250	\$3,174
Poor families with female head ¹									
Number (in thousands).....	1,809	332	1,477	353	365	288	202	107	166
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	25.5	29.7	24.5	34.7	30.6	19.8	22.1	13.6	8.4
\$1,000-1,499.....	17.3	32.7	13.8	21.3	15.6	12.5	7.4	10.7	6.6
\$1,500-1,999.....	20.8	33.3	18.0	28.7	20.2	12.9	11.3	11.7	12.0
\$2,000-2,499.....	14.5	3.6	16.9	13.1	21.6	19.2	15.2	11.7	16.3
\$2,500-2,999.....	7.5	.3	9.1	.9	6.8	17.8	14.2	10.7	9.0
\$3,000-3,499.....	6.4	.3	7.7	1.1	2.5	12.5	15.2	10.7	13.9
\$3,500-3,999.....	4.3	0	5.3	.3	1.9	3.8	9.8	12.6	15.7
\$4,000-4,999.....	3.2	0	3.9	0	.8	1.0	2.9	16.5	16.3
\$5,000 and over.....	.6	0	.7	0	0	.3	2.0	1.9	1.8
Median income.....	\$1,673	\$1,310	\$1,823	\$1,360	\$1,595	\$2,123	\$2,306	\$2,614	\$2,867
Nonpoor families with female head									
Number (in thousands).....	3,361	1,879	1,480	695	459	180	92	29	25
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,000-1,499.....	(²)	.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,500-1,999.....	.5	.7	.2	.3	0	(²)	0	0	0
\$2,000-2,499.....	4.3	6.0	2.1	4.5	0	0	0	0	0
\$2,500-2,999.....	5.7	6.4	4.9	6.8	5.7	0	0	0	0
\$3,000-3,499.....	7.0	5.6	8.8	10.5	10.4	5.6	0	0	0
\$3,500-3,999.....	7.4	6.6	8.3	8.4	8.7	10.0	(³)	(³)	0
\$4,000-4,999.....	16.4	12.7	21.1	19.4	23.0	22.2	(³)	(³)	(³)
\$5,000-5,999.....	12.9	11.5	14.7	13.9	13.9	20.0	(³)	(³)	(³)
\$6,000-6,999.....	12.0	12.3	11.5	10.8	10.0	10.0	(³)	(³)	(³)
\$7,000-7,999.....	8.1	7.8	8.5	6.8	10.7	9.4	(³)	(³)	(³)
\$8,000-8,999.....	5.5	5.9	5.1	4.6	3.3	8.9	(³)	(³)	(³)
\$9,000-9,999.....	5.7	6.1	5.1	5.9	4.6	3.9	(³)	0	0
\$10,000-11,999.....	6.8	8.9	4.2	3.6	5.4	2.2	(³)	(³)	(³)
\$12,000-14,999.....	4.3	5.3	2.9	2.3	2.2	5.0	(³)	(³)	0
\$15,000-19,999.....	3.1	3.8	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.2	(³)	(³)	(³)
\$25,000 and over.....	.4	.4	.4	.3	.2	.6	(³)	0	0
Median income.....	\$5,680	\$6,043	\$5,317	\$5,010	\$5,156	\$5,611	(³)	(³)	(³)

¹ Families with 1966 income below SSA poverty level.

² Less than 0.05 percent.

³ Not shown for base less than 100,000.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1967.

TABLE 11.—Incidence of poverty or low-income status among families with children under age 18, 1965

[Numbers in millions]

Type of family	Total families	Poor families		Low-income families (poor and near poor)	
		Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
All families.....	28.1	4.2	15.1	6.2	22.2
With children under age 6.....	14.7	2.6	17.9	(1)	(1)
With no children under age 6.....	13.4	1.6	12.0	(1)	(1)
With male head.....	25.2	2.8	10.9	4.4	17.6
With children under age 6.....	13.5	1.8	13.5	(1)	(1)
With no children under age 6.....	11.7	.9	8.0	(1)	(1)
With female head.....	2.9	1.5	51.7	1.8	62.6
With children under age 6.....	1.2	.8	66.6	(1)	(1)
With no children under age 6.....	1.7	.7	41.0	(1)	(1)
Children under age 18.....	69.7	14.0	20.1	20.0	28.7
Under 6 years.....	23.9	5.1	21.3	(1)	(1)
6-17 years.....	45.8	8.9	19.4	(1)	(1)
In families with male head.....	62.5	9.5	15.1	14.7	23.6
Under 6 years.....	21.8	3.6	16.5	(1)	(1)
6-17 years.....	40.7	5.9	14.5	(1)	(1)
In families with female head.....	7.2	4.6	63.6	5.3	73.3
Under 6 years.....	2.1	1.5	72.3	(1)	(1)
6-17 years.....	5.1	3.0	60.0	(1)	(1)

¹ Not available.

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1966.

PROPOSALS FOR CHILDREN'S ALLOWANCES

Along with old age, disability, or death of the breadwinner, the years of child-raising can place special pressures on the economic situation of a family. Children themselves ordinarily do not contribute income to a family. In fact the presence of children can be a deterrent to augmenting family income because the homemaker with youngsters to look after, whether she herself is the family head or she shares responsibility with a husband, will find it more difficult to take a job.

Accordingly, the risk of poverty for a family of specified size is more intimately related to the number of young children in it than to the number of adults—as illustrated by poverty rates in 1966 among men's families of various types:

Total number of family members	With specified number of children under age 18						
	None	1	2	3	4	5	6 or more
2, head aged 65 or older.....	23	(1)					
2, head under age 65.....	7	23					
3.....	5	6	(1)				
4.....	5	5	6	(1)			
5.....	4	4	9	8	(1)		
6.....	(1)	0	10	11	12	(1)	
7 or more.....	(1)	(1)	2	9	18	22	34

¹ Percentages not shown for base less than 75,000.

Recognition of both the economic vulnerability of families raising their children and the importance to society of the well-being of our future citizens has led some to propose that allowances for families with children be paid in the United States, as they are in most Western countries. Many questions would need to be resolved: How much can be spent, all told, for such a purpose and what will be the level of payments per child? Should the allowance go to all families or only those in need or be restricted to families below a fixed dollar income? How should the benefit plan relate to existing income-tax exemptions for dependents, and should the child benefit payment itself be taxable? Will the child's benefit be the same at all ages, and if not will it rise or fall with age? Other questions requiring study involve the possible inhibiting effect on earnings effort if money can be obtained as a family allowance, and, indeed, the interrelationship of a children's allowance program to other public aid programs.

As background for a recent conference taking up the question of children's allowances, the costs and benefits of a number of proposals were roughly estimated. The figures relate to 1965 rather than 1966, because only 1965 data are presently available to permit the distribution of poor families with specified numbers of children by their dollar distance from the appropriate poverty threshold. Such distributions are necessary in order to determine the antipoverty effect of a specified payment scheme.

Tables 15 through 18 suggest the antipoverty effect on children (and their families) of several illustrative plans for payments to families in lieu of existing income-tax exemptions for dependent children. If a program could be devised to provide those now poor with enough additional income to eliminate the gap between what they already have and the poverty cut-off—but no more than this—it is estimated it would have taken an aggregate of \$6 billion just to bring all poor families with children up to the poverty line in 1965. All but one of the proposals costed here require considerably more than \$6 billion, even assuming the maximum tax offset.⁸ They are

⁸ Estimates of tax recovery or offset are first-step gross approximations made after consultation with staff of the Office of Tax Analysis of the Treasury Department. No adjustments were made in the count for families including more than one tax unit.

TABLE 12.—The poverty gap, 1959 and 1965: Total difference between actual and required income of all households below the poverty level

Type of household	Poor households				Dollar deficit			
	Number (in millions)		Percentage distribution		Amount (in billions)		Percentage distribution	
	1959	1965	1959	1965	1959	1965	1959	1965
Total.....	13.4	11.2	100.0	100.0	\$13.7	\$11.0	100.0	100.0
Unrelated individuals.....	5.1	4.8	38.0	42.5	4.0	3.4	29.2	30.5
Men.....	1.6	1.3	11.7	11.4	1.2	.9	8.8	8.3
Women.....	3.5	3.5	26.3	31.1	2.8	2.5	20.4	22.2
Families.....	8.3	6.4	62.0	57.5	9.7	7.7	70.8	69.5
No children under age 18.....	2.9	2.2	22.2	19.7	2.3	1.7	16.8	15.3
Some children under age 18.....	5.4	4.2	39.8	37.8	7.4	6.0	54.0	54.2
With male head.....	6.3	4.6	47.6	40.7	7.0	5.1	51.1	46.3
No children under age 18.....	2.5	1.8	19.1	16.1	2.0	1.4	14.6	12.5
Some children under age 18.....	3.8	2.8	28.5	24.6	5.0	3.8	36.5	33.8
With female head.....	2.0	1.9	14.4	16.8	2.7	2.6	19.7	23.2
No children under age 18.....	.4	.4	3.1	3.6	.3	.3	2.2	2.9
Some children under age 18.....	1.6	1.5	11.3	13.2	2.4	2.3	17.5	20.4
<i>Race</i>								
White.....	10.4	8.5	77.5	76.0	9.8	7.9	71.5	71.3
Unrelated individuals.....	4.2	3.9	31.2	35.1	3.2	2.8	23.3	24.9
Families.....	6.2	4.6	46.3	40.9	6.6	5.2	48.2	46.4
Nonwhite.....	3.0	2.7	22.6	24.0	3.9	3.2	28.5	28.7
Unrelated individuals.....	.9	.8	6.9	7.4	.8	.6	5.8	5.6
Families.....	2.1	1.9	15.7	16.6	3.1	2.6	22.7	23.1
<i>Age of head</i>								
Under 25.....	1.1	1.1	8.4	9.6	1.2	1.2	8.7	11.2
Unrelated individuals.....	.5	.5	3.9	4.4	.5	.5	3.6	4.9
Families.....	.6	.6	4.5	5.2	.7	.7	5.1	6.3
25-64.....	7.9	6.0	58.9	53.7	9.2	7.3	67.2	65.7
Unrelated individuals.....	2.1	1.7	15.6	14.7	1.8	1.4	13.1	12.3
Families.....	5.8	4.4	43.3	39.0	7.4	5.9	54.1	53.4
65 and over.....	4.4	4.1	32.7	36.7	3.3	2.6	24.1	23.2
Unrelated individuals.....	2.5	2.6	18.5	23.4	1.7	1.5	12.4	13.5
Families.....	1.9	1.5	14.2	13.3	1.6	1.1	11.7	9.7

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1960 and 1966.

TABLE 13.—The low-income gap, 1959 and 1965: Total difference between actual and required income of all households below the low-income level

Type of household	Low-income households				Dollar deficit			
	Number (in millions)		Percentage distribution		Amount (in billions)		Percentage distribution	
	1959	1965	1959	1965	1959	1965	1959	1965
Total.....	17.6	15.4	100.0	100.0	\$22.8	\$19.7	100.0	100.0
Unrelated individuals.....	5.6	5.6	31.8	36.2	5.4	5.0	23.7	25.3
Men.....	1.8	1.6	10.2	10.3	1.7	1.4	7.3	7.1
Women.....	3.8	4.0	21.6	25.8	3.8	3.6	16.4	18.2
Families.....	12.0	9.9	68.2	63.8	17.4	14.7	76.3	74.7
No children under age 18.....	4.3	3.6	24.4	23.4	4.4	3.6	19.3	18.6
Some children under age 18.....	7.8	6.3	43.9	40.4	12.9	11.1	57.0	56.1
With male head.....	9.7	7.5	55.1	48.3	13.2	10.5	57.9	53.2
No children under age 18.....	3.7	3.0	21.0	19.5	3.8	3.0	16.7	15.4
Some children under age 18.....	6.1	4.5	34.2	28.8	9.3	7.5	41.2	37.8
With female head.....	2.3	2.4	13.1	15.5	4.2	4.2	18.4	21.5
No children under age 18.....	.6	.6	3.4	3.9	.6	.6	2.6	3.2
Some children under age 18.....	1.7	1.8	9.7	11.6	3.6	3.6	15.8	18.3

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1960 and 1966.

more costly even if one eliminates present exemptions and minimum standard deductions for children getting allowances and also taxes all children's allowance payments at existing tax rates.

The efficacy of the proposals from the standpoint of eliminating poverty has been approximated for the near-poor reference level as well as for the official poverty line. Because the poverty

criterion itself is so Spartan, the near-poor level (requiring about one-third more in money income for a family of specified composition) may be a more realistic target. The total number of children is growing. It is clear then that if the number of children in poverty continues to decline, a larger and larger share of outlays under any universal system would go to families already above the poverty line to begin with. In any case, as time goes on, a continuing rise in economic activity will make it difficult to avoid raising the poverty line.

If one now substituted the near-poor standard for the poverty line as the reference point, it would have taken \$11.1 billion rather than \$6

billion to just fill the gap between actual and needed income, and no more, for families with children in 1965 (tables 13 and C).

If the children's allowance benefit is considered taxable, the number of families raised out of poverty would be somewhat less than the number calculated and shown in tables 15-18, because some families not now required to pay Federal income tax would have to do so after receiving the allowance. At the current poverty level of income, few families now must pay a tax, but at the near-poor level most families are already subject to Federal income tax even before receiving any allowance. No adjustment in the estimates was made to take account of this.

TABLE 14.—Income deficit of poor families: Percentage distribution of poor families with 1965 income below SSA poverty level index by amount of income deficit, by number of children under age 18 and sex of head

Income deficit	Total poor families	With no children	With children						
			Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
All families									
Number (in thousands).....	6,450	2,202	4,248	955	820	836	630	451	556
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
\$1-249.....	14.7	20.9	11.5	11.7	14.5	10.8	12.7	11.1	6.8
\$250-499.....	13.0	19.4	9.7	12.0	11.3	12.0	7.5	4.2	7.0
\$500-749.....	12.7	18.0	10.0	15.5	9.3	8.4	9.5	8.0	5.3
\$750-999.....	11.4	15.0	9.5	10.7	9.8	10.6	9.4	7.8	7.2
\$1,000-1,249.....	10.3	9.6	10.6	13.8	12.6	9.9	7.0	9.1	8.6
\$1,250-1,499.....	7.6	6.4	8.3	8.3	7.7	9.6	7.6	8.0	8.3
\$1,500-1,749.....	5.9	3.4	7.2	6.4	7.6	9.1	6.7	7.1	5.9
\$1,750-1,999.....	5.2	3.2	6.3	6.1	6.2	6.0	7.6	4.4	7.4
\$2,000-2,499.....	8.7	2.3	12.0	12.5	12.0	9.1	11.7	15.3	13.1
\$2,500-2,999.....	3.9	.4	5.7	.7	6.1	6.5	6.5	8.2	9.7
\$3,000 and over.....	6.5	1.5	9.2	2.3	3.1	8.1	13.6	16.6	20.2
Families with male head									
Number (in thousands).....	4,565	1,803	2,762	564	523	518	423	334	399
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
\$1-249.....	16.6	21.2	13.6	12.8	16.3	13.3	15.1	15.0	9.3
\$250-499.....	14.1	19.7	10.5	11.9	12.6	13.7	9.0	3.9	7.5
\$500-749.....	13.2	18.0	10.0	16.7	8.4	8.9	9.0	7.8	7.5
\$750-999.....	11.5	14.9	9.2	9.0	8.8	10.0	10.2	8.1	9.0
\$1,000-1,249.....	10.5	9.3	11.3	13.7	14.9	11.2	6.4	9.9	9.8
\$1,250-1,499.....	7.0	6.2	7.5	8.7	7.5	6.8	6.4	7.2	8.5
\$1,500-1,749.....	5.5	3.5	6.9	6.6	7.1	9.7	6.4	5.1	5.5
\$1,750-1,999.....	4.4	2.8	5.5	6.9	4.4	5.4	6.4	3.6	5.8
\$2,000-2,499.....	7.5	2.2	11.0	8.9	11.3	8.1	10.9	15.6	14.0
\$2,500-2,999.....	3.5	.5	5.5	1.2	3.6	6.0	7.6	8.4	9.0
\$3,000 and over.....	6.0	1.9	8.8	4.0	5.0	7.0	12.4	15.9	14.4
Families with female head									
Number (in thousands).....	1,885	399	1,486	391	297	318	206	117	158
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
\$1-249.....	10.0	19.3	7.5	10.2	11.1	6.6	8.3	0	.6
\$250-499.....	10.4	18.0	8.3	12.5	9.1	9.1	2.4	4.3	5.7
\$500-749.....	11.6	18.0	9.8	14.1	10.8	7.5	10.7	8.5	1.3
\$750-999.....	11.1	15.3	10.0	13.0	11.4	11.6	7.8	6.8	1.9
\$1,000-1,249.....	9.9	11.5	9.4	14.1	8.4	7.9	8.3	7.7	5.7
\$1,250-1,499.....	9.1	7.3	9.6	7.7	8.1	13.8	10.2	10.3	7.6
\$1,500-1,749.....	6.7	2.8	7.8	6.4	8.4	8.2	7.3	12.8	7.0
\$1,750-1,999.....	7.1	4.8	7.7	4.6	9.1	6.9	10.2	6.8	11.4
\$2,000-2,499.....	11.5	2.8	13.9	17.6	13.1	10.7	14.1	15.4	11.4
\$2,500-2,999.....	4.8	0	6.1	0	10.4	7.2	4.4	7.7	12.0
\$3,000 and over.....	7.7	.5	9.7	0	0	10.1	16.5	19.7	34.9

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population

Survey for March 1966.

TABLE 15.—Cost and antipoverty effect on families with children under age 18 of four specified monthly allowance payments for children in 1965

Payment program	\$25		\$50	
	Every child	Third and subsequent children	Every child	Third and subsequent children
<i>Program cost</i>				
Payment (in billions).....	\$20.9	\$6.7	\$41.2	\$13.3
Tax recovery potential (in billions)...	\$9.6	\$2.6	\$12.7	\$3.5
Eliminating exemption ¹	6.5	1.8	6.5	1.8
Tax on the allowance.....	3.1	.8	6.2	1.7
<i>Reduction in poverty status of families with children</i>				
Payments to the poor (in billions)...	\$4.2	\$1.9	\$8.4	\$3.9
Percent of families removed from poverty:				
Total.....	36.2	15.2	64.3	28.7
With male head.....	40.7	18.9	67.7	33.0
With female head.....	27.8	8.3	58.3	21.2
Percent of children in families removed from poverty:				
Total children.....	45.4	24.9	77.0	46.4
In families with male head.....	50.4	29.9	79.8	51.3
In families with female head.....	34.7	14.3	71.8	37.3
Percent of persons in families removed from poverty:				
Total persons ²	35.4	17.9	61.0	33.9
In families with male head.....	37.0	20.0	59.9	34.6
In families with female head.....	30.9	12.2	64.0	31.9
<i>Reduction in low-income status of families with children</i>				
Payments to the poor and near poor (in billions).....	\$6.0	\$2.7	\$12.0	\$5.4
Percent of families removed from low-income status:				
Total.....	27.2	9.6	53.6	20.3
With male head.....	32.4	12.3	59.2	24.8
With female head.....	14.1	3.1	40.0	9.5
Percent of children in families removed from low-income status:				
Total children.....	32.6	15.9	64.5	33.8
In families with male head.....	50.4	29.9	79.8	51.3
In families with female head.....	34.7	14.3	71.8	37.3
Percent of persons in families removed from low-income status:				
Total persons ²	36.8	16.9	66.7	33.9
In families with male head.....	14.7	4.6	47.8	14.4
In families with female head.....	31.3	13.8	62.0	29.0

¹ Eliminating \$600 exemption and minimum standard deduction for children receiving allowance.

² Based on total of 27.1 million persons in poor families including persons in families with no children.

Source: Prepared by the Social Security Administration as background material for Citizens' Committee for Children, Conference on Children's Allowances, October 1967.

As presently calculated, the crude estimates also ignore the fact that some families, especially large ones, would receive considerably more income than they require just to come up to the reference standard while others would receive too little. As table 18 suggests, all the illustrative plans more readily rescue large families from poverty than small ones. In setting the poverty criteria, the dollar requirements for additional children as the total number in the family increased were assumed to decrease with economy of scale, but five of the six programs reviewed

here offer uniform payments for each child in a family.

A scheme tapering benefits so that each successive child entitles his family to a lesser increment in the allowance than the child before was also costed. In terms of the total percentage of children rescued from poverty it is only slightly more effective than proposals requiring the same aggregate money outlay but paying out the same amount to each child (or to children in the same age group). The tapered allowance does, however, do relatively more for small families than a uniform payment. It thus can give more help to couples just starting their family—a time at which they are considered especially vulnerable by some experts—and would not in itself seem to “reward” the large family unduly. In somewhat similar fashion the illustrative proposal to pay much larger amounts to youngsters under age 6 than to older children is an attempt to acknowledge the special custodial needs of preschool children that will either keep their mother from working or cause her to pay for day care if she does. The poverty rate among families with children is 50 percent higher if any of them is under age 6 than when none of them is that young.

More definitive appraisal of the antipoverty efficacy of children's allowances requires more details than assumed here about specific proposals for conditions of payment, and the assumed income distributions among families and marginal tax rates as of the date any such proposals would go into effect. For this first-approximation exercise, it has been assumed that as in most countries any allowance program would be universal rather than selective and that the payments would depend solely on the number and perhaps on the age of the children, not on how much income the family had. The gross cost of the programs evaluated in this fashion ranged from \$41 billion for the most generous—paying \$50 a month for every single child—to about \$6¾ billion for the most stringent—nothing for the first 2 children in a family and only \$25 monthly for each of the later children. Corresponding net costs range from a high of \$28½ billion to a low of \$4 billion, with the in-between programs costing roughly \$10 or \$11 billion each.

On the other hand, the program with lowest net cost distributed 46 percent of this outlay to

TABLE 16.—Cost and antipoverty effect on families with children under age 18 of monthly allowance payments of \$50 to children under age 6 and \$10 to children aged 6–17 in 1965

Payment program	Amount	Families with children under age 18		
		Total	With male head	With female head
<i>Program cost</i>				
Payment (in billions).....	\$19.8			
Tax recovery potential (in billions).....	9.3			
Eliminating exemption ¹	6.5			
Tax on the allowance.....	2.8			
<i>Reduction in poverty status</i>				
Payments to the poor (in billions).....	4.2			
Percent of families removed from poverty:				
Total.....		35.6	40.3	26.8
With some children under 6.....		50.2	53.5	42.8
With children aged 6–17 only.....		12.2	8.2	14.8
Percent of children in families removed from poverty:				
Total children.....		42.7	47.9	31.8
In families with some children under 6.....		56.8	60.2	49.0
In families with children aged 6–17 only.....		23.5	40.4	23.2
Percent of persons in families removed from poverty ²		33.8	35.8	28.4

¹ Eliminating \$600 exemption and minimum standard deduction for each child receiving allowance.

² Based on total of 27.1 million persons in poor families including persons in families with no children.

Source: Prepared by the Social Security Administration as background material for Citizens' Committee for Children, Conference on Children's Allowances, October 1967.

families initially below the poverty line, but under the program highest in net cost no more than 30 percent of the money went to families poor before receiving their allowance payments. In the remaining four illustrative programs the proportion of net outlay reaching families who were poor before payment was one-third under the tapered benefit plan and about two-fifths for the others.

In very crude outline the overall reduction in poverty achieved by the programs is roughly proportional to the cost: Paying \$50 a month per child raised 3 out of 4 poor children out of poverty; paying \$25 a month—and then only to third and subsequent children—rescued only 1 out of 4.

Though the allowances proposed are in behalf of children, they will incidentally affect the economic well-being of the entire family. As a result the changes in family income under the most costly program would eliminate poverty for 3 out of 5 of all the 27 million persons in any families counted poor in 1965, and the minimum payment program would eliminate poverty for 1 in 6. Any of the four intermediate-high programs chosen for illustration lifted from 37 to 46 percent of children in poverty to nonpoor

status and simultaneously reduced the overall poverty tally of all persons in families by about one-third.

It was pointed out earlier that poor families with a man at the head had actual income more nearly adequate in terms of requirements postulated by the poverty criteria than was true for poor families headed by a woman. In consequence all the allowance proposals examined were more effective in reducing poverty among children in families headed by men than in families headed by women. On the other hand, because so large a proportion of the men at the head of families with children rated poor are employed regularly, there would be more concern about any possible disincentive effect of an allowance program on work in the families of men than in the families of women.

It is recognized that there may well be considerations other than poverty status relevant to embarking on a program to pay allowances to families with children, and other ways to evaluate its efficacy than merely appraising its immediate effect on the poverty roll. Such considerations are beyond the scope of this article.

PUBLIC INCOME-SUPPORT PROGRAMS AND POVERTY

The Economic Opportunity Act authorized a number of new mechanisms to combat poverty, aimed for the most part at increasing earning power. The main task of providing income to those who are out of the labor force remains, as before, the function of income-maintenance programs already in operation for a number of years. Among the most prominent are social security, public assistance, veterans' pensions and compensation, unemployment insurance, and workmen's compensation. In the main, these programs make payments only when earnings are interrupted or stopped altogether, and almost always the payments are less than the earnings for which they can substitute.

Information on the amount of payments under these separate programs and the persons to whom they go are available on a regular basis in the operating statistics of the various administering agencies, but it is only infrequently and through special studies that it is possible to learn much about the other resources of recipients and to

TABLE 17.—Cost and antipoverty effect on families with children under age 18 of tapered monthly allowance payments for children in 1965¹

Payment program	Amount	Families with children under age 18		
		Total	With male head	With female head
<i>Program cost</i>				
Payment (in billions).....	\$21.1			
Tax recovery potential (in billions).....	9.8			
Eliminating exemption ²	6.5			
Tax on the allowance.....	3.3			
<i>Reduction in poverty status</i>				
Payments to the poor (in billions).....	3.7			
Percent of families removed from poverty.....		33.6	37.9	25.7
Percent of children in families removed from poverty.....		37.0	49.5	26.4
Percent of persons in families removed from poverty ³		32.8	36.1	24.5

¹ Monthly payment of \$35 for first child in family; \$25 for second child; \$15 each for third or fourth child; \$10 for fifth child; and \$5 each for all other children.

² Eliminating \$600 exemption and minimum standard deduction for each child receiving allowance.

³ Based on total of 27.1 million persons in poor families including persons in families with no children.

Source: Prepared by the Social Security Administration as background material for Citizens' Committee for Children, Conference on Children's Allowances, October 1967.

determine how the individual programs complement each other. For the year 1965, such an opportunity is provided in the data collected by the Bureau of the Census in the Current Population Survey for 1966.

From this source, information for 1965 is available separately on the amount of family income received from OASDHI benefits or public assist-

ance payments and on the amount from all other public programs as a group. The data have obvious limitations. In the brief interview, one cannot always be sure that the respondent identifies accurately the particular program of which he is a beneficiary. Moreover, in preparing income statistics, the Bureau of the Census uses a definition of a family—all related persons sharing a household at the time of the interview—that may not jibe with the definition of recipient unit used by the agency administering the program. An elderly woman or a mother-child unit may be eligible to receive public assistance or payments from a veterans' program because their own other resources are very low, yet the relatives whose home they share may be better off financially.

It must be remembered also that the family characteristics relate to the situation at time of interview—that is, March 1966—and the income data refer only to receipts in the calendar year 1965. Changes occurring either in living arrangements or income sources would not be identifiable. Thus, an aged person or a family group might in March 1966 be part of a family unit reporting a financial situation considerably different in both amount and source of income from what it had been when they were deemed eligible for public assistance—an elderly woman who received old-age assistance when she was living alone but who now lives with her son, for example, or perhaps

TABLE 18.—Antipoverty effect on families with specified number of children under age 18 of specified monthly allowance payments for children in 1965

Payment program	Any children	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
<i>Reduction in poverty status of families with children</i>							
Median family income deficit before payment.....	\$1,220	\$1,000	\$1,100	\$1,210	\$1,380	\$1,560	\$1,760
Percent of families removed from poverty by—							
Payment of \$25 a month to—							
All children.....	36.2	14.1	29.5	37.4	44.6	48.1	62.8
Third and subsequent children.....	15.2			13.2	24.0	27.9	46.6
Payment of \$50 a month to—							
All children.....	64.3	29.9	54.9	71.5	77.3	83.1	96.4
Third and subsequent children.....	28.7			26.1	44.6	56.1	83.8
Payment of \$50 a month to children under age 6 and \$10 to all others.....	35.6	14.8	31.3	40.2	44.8	45.0	52.8
Payment of tapered monthly allowances ¹	33.6	19.9	34.0	37.4	41.3	38.4	38.5
<i>Reduction in low-income status of families with children</i>							
Median family income deficit before payment.....	\$1,575	\$1,295	\$1,225	\$1,620	\$1,820	\$2,270	\$2,530
Percent of families removed from low-income status by—							
Payment of \$25 a month to—							
All children.....	27.2	11.8	26.8	27.7	32.5	34.5	43.0
Third and subsequent children.....	9.6			8.1	15.7	21.0	30.6
Payment of \$50 a month to—							
All children.....	53.6	25.3	49.1	54.7	65.3	68.3	86.3
Third and subsequent children.....	20.3			17.4	32.5	42.2	66.5

¹ Monthly payment of \$35 for first child in family; \$25 for second child; \$15 each for third or fourth child; \$10 for fifth child; and \$5 each for all other children.

Source: Prepared by the Social Security Administration as background material for Citizens' Committee for Children, Conference on Children's Allowances, October 1967.

TABLE 19.—Households receiving income from public programs in 1965, by age and sex of head and poverty status

[Numbers in thousands]

Age and sex of head	Total number of households	Households receiving public income payments ¹											
		Any programs			Social security			Public assistance			Programs other than social security or public assistance		
		Total number	Percent poor		Total number	Percent poor		Total number	Percent poor		Total number	Percent poor	
			Before payment	After payment		Before payment ²	After payment		Before payment ²	After payment		Before payment	After payment
All households.....	60,410	19,510	55.2	30.9	12,990	59.3	31.8	2,910	81.2	66.8	6,740	28.7	12.4
Under age 65.....	48,840	9,580	38.0	25.0	3,900	41.1	24.8	1,760	77.1	65.5	4,980	21.1	11.1
Unrelated individuals.....	7,460	1,330	68.1	46.7	620	81.5	58.0	250	95.0	79.3	600	45.0	24.1
Men.....	3,200	530	56.3	42.2	160	89.0	67.0	110	91.5	83.0	310	32.6	19.4
Women.....	4,270	800	76.0	49.7	460	78.8	54.7	140	97.8	76.5	290	58.2	29.1
Families.....	41,390	8,250	33.2	21.4	3,280	33.5	18.6	1,510	74.3	63.3	4,380	17.8	9.3
Male head.....	37,520	6,410	23.7	13.9	2,340	25.9	14.8	720	58.3	46.7	3,980	15.4	7.8
Without children.....	12,740	2,670	22.5	12.1	1,280	26.0	14.6	200	52.4	42.1	1,450	13.7	5.7
With children.....	24,780	3,740	24.5	15.1	1,060	25.8	14.9	520	60.6	48.5	2,530	16.4	9.0
Female head.....	3,870	1,830	66.4	47.9	940	51.8	28.0	800	88.8	78.3	400	41.4	24.6
Without children.....	1,180	520	34.8	21.9	370	29.2	18.2	100	60.8	42.2	120	29.4	12.6
With children.....	2,690	1,310	78.9	58.1	570	67.6	34.5	700	92.9	83.6	280	46.4	29.6
Aged 65 or over.....	11,570	9,930	71.7	36.7	9,090	67.2	34.7	1,150	87.3	68.9	1,760	50.3	16.0
Unrelated individuals.....	4,680	3,940	87.2	58.0	3,530	83.6	56.1	580	99.0	85.8	520	74.5	25.1
Men.....	1,280	1,110	84.5	47.0	1,000	80.9	45.2	140	97.9	83.8	190	77.5	18.3
Women.....	3,400	2,830	88.2	62.3	2,530	84.7	60.5	440	99.3	86.4	330	72.8	29.1
Families.....	6,890	5,990	61.5	22.7	5,560	56.7	21.1	570	75.3	51.5	1,240	40.3	12.3
Male head.....	5,770	5,030	63.4	21.2	4,740	58.6	20.2	350	81.0	55.5	1,060	40.2	10.8
Female head.....	1,130	960	51.3	30.1	820	45.5	26.4	220	66.2	45.2	180	41.1	20.5

¹ Payments to unrelated individual or any family member any time in 1965. Some households received income from more than one program.

² Before payment from specified programs, but with payments from any other program.

a family group who were receiving aid to families with dependent children until the mother could arrange to take a job. And, finally, some persons supported in whole or in part by public programs during part of 1965 would not be alive in March 1966, and thus no income report would be available for them.

Within the limitations outlined, it is possible, however, to estimate how many households in 1965 were receiving some income from transfer payments and how many not now counted poor would have been poor without such payments.

Of the 60½ million households in the United States in March 1966—counting as a household an unrelated individual as well as a family of two or more—19.5 million or just under 1 in 3 reported that someone in the household received payment from a public income-maintenance program sometime during 1965, as shown below. For

Public income programs	All households	Households poor before payments	Households remaining poor after payments
Percent receiving payments under:			
Any program.....	31	32	54
Social security ¹	22	48	37
Public assistance.....	5	15	17
All other.....	11	12	7

¹ Includes railroad retirement benefits.

two-thirds of these households, social security benefits made up at least part of the public income payment.

As expected, households with an aged head were much more likely to receive support from a public program than households with a head under 65—6 in 7 of the older households, compared with only 1 in 5 of the younger ones. Even among young families of a woman with children under age 18, only half received any help from a public program, and the program involved was more often public assistance than social security.

Among the households with payment from public assistance, which makes payments only to those considered in need by the standard of the State in which they live, 81 percent of the recipient households in 1965 had so little income otherwise that they would be below the poverty line in the absence of any assistance payments. But the amounts of assistance were so small that, even with the payments counted in, two-thirds of all households receiving assistance were found among the 11.2 million households designated poor in 1965—as the poor are counted in terms of money income including public transfer payments. In other words, of the households poor before receiving any public assistance, 5 out of 6 were still poor after they got it.

TABLE 20.—Effect of public income-maintenance programs on poverty status of households in 1965, by age and sex of head and presence of children under age 18

[In thousands]

Age and sex of head	Number counted poor ¹	Added number who would be counted poor ² but for transfer payments			
		Excluding any public income maintenance payments	Excluding social security benefits ³	Excluding public assistance payments ³	Excluding payments other than social security or public assistance
Total.....	11,220	4,730	3,580	420	1,100
Under age 65.....	7,100	1,250	640	210	500
Unrelated individuals.....	2,140	280	150	40	130
Men.....	700	70	40	10	40
Women.....	1,440	210	110	30	90
Families.....	4,960	970	490	170	370
Male head.....	3,400	630	280	80	300
Without children.....	810	280	140	20	120
With children.....	2,590	350	120	60	180
Female head.....	1,560	340	230	80	70
Without children.....	180	70	40	20	20
With children.....	1,380	270	190	70	50
Aged 65 or over.....	4,120	3,480	2,950	210	600
Unrelated individuals.....	2,620	1,150	970	80	250
Men.....	570	420	360	20	110
Women.....	2,050	730	610	60	140
Families.....	1,500	2,330	1,980	140	350
Male head.....	1,170	2,120	1,820	90	310
Female head.....	330	200	160	50	40

¹ Poor as now defined, in terms of money income in 1965 after all transfers.
² Households receiving payments from public programs currently nonpoor

but whose income without such payments is below the poverty line.
³ But with all other program payments.

In contrast, among households with a payment from the social security program, which does not limit its payments with a means test, only about half of those poor before they drew their OASDHI checks were still poor afterwards: Before OASDHI benefits were added, for about 6 out of 10 households receiving benefit checks income was below the poverty line; after OASDHI benefits were added to income, only 3 in 10 were still below the poverty line (tables 19 and 20).

For reasons already stated the estimates of households receiving transfers who are or were poor are understatements, but this is particularly true in the case of assistance: by definition, public assistance payments will not be made unless income from all other sources is below State standards. Some households whose income for the year is above the standard would nevertheless have needed assistance at some point to tide them over until entitlement under other public programs is in effect or until income from employment or other relatives is assured.

Thirty-seven percent of the households currently defined as poor in 1965, in terms of money income including any transfer payments, received OASDHI benefits, and a total of 54 percent received payments under some public program. A number of households classed as nonpoor achieved such status only because of these payments. If it had not been for the public programs, the num-

ber of households poor in 1965 would have been 15.9 million instead of the 11.2 million now shown in the poverty series. The social security program itself was responsible for keeping at least 3½ million households off the poverty roster: If there had been no OASDHI payments but only payments under other public programs the number of poor households would have been 14.8 million (table 20).

Obviously, OASDHI benefits would be a better protector against poverty for the aged than for those under age 65. The number of households with an aged head counted poor would have been two-thirds higher—7.1 million rather than the 4.1 million now shown as poor—were it not for OASDHI benefits. Of the 9 million aged households enjoying these benefits in 1965, 67 percent were poor in terms of money income before adding in the benefits, but only 35 percent of all aged beneficiary households were still in poverty after counting in their benefits with other money income.

Even for households headed by a person under age 65, OASDHI benefits played a sizable role in correcting poverty. (In some of the young households, it was undoubtedly an aged "other relative" who was the actual beneficiary.) Instead of the 7.1 million households with a non-aged head counted poor in 1965—in terms of money income, including public transfer pay-

ments—there would have been 7.7 million households poor if there were no OASDHI benefits, or 8 percent more in poverty.

Among families with children under age 18 and a woman younger than age 65 at the head, the number below the poverty line would be 14 percent greater than at present, but for the existence of the social security program. About 0.6 million of these 2.7 million families reported drawing OASDHI benefits in 1965. For two-thirds of these beneficiary families, their income with the benefits excluded was below the poverty line. When the OASDHI benefits were added, only a third of these young beneficiary families were left with money income below the poverty line.

Additional analyses now under way will explore the relation of transfer payments to other

sources of income and to the amounts by which income falls below the estimate of minimum requirements. It is already clear that for many already receiving help from public programs it is the degree of that help that must be increased if they are to escape poverty but that new programs or extensions of existing ones are required for those now in poverty and receiving no help at all. A majority of aged persons today already receive income from one public program or another. As a group then, aged households now poor or near poor will benefit more from increased amounts payable under such programs than from changed eligibility requirements. But both types of improvements will be needed for poor or near poor households headed by persons younger than age 65.

TABLE A.—Weighted average of poverty and low-income criteria¹ for families of different composition by household size, sex of head, and farm or nonfarm residence, March 1966

Number of family members	Weighted average of incomes at poverty level						Weighted average of incomes at low-income level					
	Nonfarm			Farm			Nonfarm			Farm		
	Total	Male head	Female head	Total	Male head	Female head	Total	Male head	Female head	Total	Male head	Female head
1 member.....	\$1,570	\$1,635	\$1,530	\$1,110	\$1,145	\$1,070	\$1,890	\$1,980	\$1,840	\$1,340	\$1,385	\$1,290
Head under age 65.....	1,615	1,685	1,560	1,140	1,180	1,090	1,950	2,040	1,880	1,380	1,425	1,315
Head age 65 or over.....	1,500	1,515	1,495	1,055	1,060	1,045	1,805	1,835	1,790	1,265	1,285	1,255
2 members.....	2,030	2,040	1,975	1,415	1,420	1,365	2,725	2,745	2,610	1,905	1,910	1,800
Head under age 65.....	2,100	2,110	2,025	1,475	1,480	1,410	2,810	2,835	2,665	1,980	1,985	1,860
Head age 65 or over.....	1,890	1,895	1,880	1,325	1,325	1,325	2,545	2,550	2,500	1,785	1,785	1,760
3 members.....	2,495	2,505	2,405	1,740	1,745	1,660	3,265	3,275	3,175	2,280	2,285	2,210
4 members.....	3,200	3,200	3,180	2,250	2,255	2,205	4,145	4,150	4,050	2,920	2,920	2,825
5 members.....	3,765	3,770	3,730	2,640	2,640	2,640	4,835	4,845	4,730	3,395	3,395	3,370
6 members.....	4,235	4,235	4,220	2,970	2,970	3,055	5,440	5,445	5,345	3,820	3,820	3,860
7 or more members.....	5,205	5,215	5,090	3,630	3,635	3,560	6,615	6,630	6,455	4,610	4,615	4,515

¹ Required income in 1965 according to Social Security Administration poverty or low-income index for a family of given size and composition. Family income criteria weighted together in accordance with percentage distribution of total units by number of related children and sex of head, as

of Current Population Survey, March 1966.

For detailed description of the Social Security Administration measures of poverty and low income and their rationale, see the *Social Security Bulletin* for January 1965 (pages 5-11) and July 1965 (pages 3-10).

TABLE B.—1965 income of families: Percentage distribution of poor and nonpoor families by amount of income, by number of children under age 18

Income	Total families	With no children	With children						
			Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
All families									
Number (in thousands).....	48,279	20,178	28,101	8,721	8,395	5,388	2,977	1,353	1,267
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	2.9	3.1	2.7	3.4	2.2	2.3	2.8	2.0	3.8
\$1,000-1,499.....	2.7	3.7	2.0	2.6	1.4	1.5	2.0	1.6	3.1
\$1,500-1,999.....	3.3	4.9	2.1	2.4	1.7	2.1	1.6	2.9	3.3
\$2,000-2,499.....	3.5	4.7	2.6	2.7	1.8	2.7	2.8	4.2	4.5
\$2,500-2,999.....	3.7	4.9	2.8	2.7	2.2	2.9	2.7	4.7	6.1
\$3,000-3,499.....	3.9	4.9	3.2	3.1	2.7	2.9	3.8	4.3	6.0
\$3,500-3,999.....	3.8	4.3	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.5	3.8	5.9
\$4,000-4,999.....	7.9	8.2	7.6	8.0	7.0	7.1	8.0	7.8	11.0
\$5,000-5,999.....	9.3	8.6	9.8	9.7	10.2	9.6	8.8	10.6	10.4
\$6,000-6,999.....	9.5	8.3	10.4	9.8	10.8	10.7	10.2	11.7	9.7
\$7,000-7,999.....	9.7	8.1	10.9	10.3	11.6	11.7	11.9	8.4	8.2
\$8,000-8,999.....	8.1	6.5	9.3	8.6	10.5	9.7	8.6	10.0	5.1
\$9,000-9,999.....	6.4	5.5	7.1	6.3	7.5	8.2	7.3	5.9	5.2
\$10,000-11,999.....	10.1	9.3	10.7	11.0	11.3	10.8	9.3	10.3	7.4
\$12,000-14,999.....	7.6	7.5	7.7	8.4	7.9	7.2	7.7	5.8	5.2
\$15,000-24,999.....	6.2	6.1	6.2	6.3	6.5	5.8	7.2	4.8	3.9
\$25,000 and over.....	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.3	1.1
Median income.....	\$6,957	\$6,315	\$7,291	\$7,225	\$7,594	\$7,439	\$7,318	\$6,699	\$5,610
Poor families ¹									
Number (in thousands).....	6,450	2,202	4,248	955	820	836	630	451	556
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	21.6	28.9	17.8	30.4	22.7	14.6	13.2	6.0	8.7
\$1,000-1,499.....	19.8	33.1	12.9	23.8	14.5	9.8	9.5	4.7	7.0
\$1,500-1,999.....	19.9	32.1	13.6	20.1	17.3	13.6	7.8	8.6	7.6
\$2,000-2,499.....	12.3	5.4	15.9	18.7	18.2	17.7	13.3	12.6	10.3
\$2,500-2,999.....	8.3	.3	12.4	5.0	13.7	17.5	12.9	14.2	13.8
\$3,000-3,499.....	7.2	.1	10.9	1.3	10.7	14.8	16.5	12.9	13.7
\$3,500-3,999.....	4.8	0	7.3	.6	2.0	8.9	13.7	11.1	13.5
\$4,000-4,999.....	4.8	0	7.3	0	.9	2.4	12.4	20.4	20.7
\$5,000 and over.....	1.2	0	1.9	0	0	.7	.8	9.1	4.9
Median income.....	\$1,715	\$1,318	\$2,177	\$1,411	\$1,870	\$2,338	\$2,741	\$3,151	\$3,099
Nonpoor families									
Number (in thousands).....	41,829	17,976	23,853	7,765	7,575	4,552	2,347	903	711
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under \$1,000.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,000-1,499.....	.1	.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
\$1,500-1,999.....	.7	1.6	.1	.2	0	0	0	0	0
\$2,000-2,499.....	2.1	4.7	.2	.7	0	0	0	0	0
\$2,500-2,999.....	3.0	5.4	1.1	2.4	1.0	.2	0	0	0
\$3,000-3,499.....	3.4	5.5	1.8	3.3	1.8	.7	0	0	0
\$3,500-3,999.....	3.6	4.8	2.7	3.8	3.1	2.1	.3	0	0
\$4,000-4,999.....	8.3	9.2	7.7	9.0	7.7	7.9	6.9	.2	3.4
\$5,000-5,999.....	10.6	9.7	11.2	10.9	11.4	11.2	10.9	11.3	14.8
\$6,000-6,999.....	11.0	9.3	12.3	11.0	12.0	12.6	12.9	17.5	17.3
\$7,000-7,999.....	11.2	9.1	12.9	11.6	12.8	13.9	15.1	12.5	14.6
\$8,000-8,999.....	9.4	7.3	11.0	9.7	11.7	11.5	11.0	15.0	9.1
\$9,000-9,999.....	7.4	6.2	8.3	7.1	8.4	9.7	9.2	8.9	9.3
\$10,000-11,999.....	11.7	10.4	12.6	12.4	12.5	12.8	11.8	15.5	13.2
\$12,000-14,999.....	8.8	8.4	9.0	9.4	8.8	8.5	9.8	8.6	9.3
\$15,000-24,999.....	7.1	6.8	7.3	7.1	7.2	6.9	9.1	7.2	7.0
\$25,000 and over.....	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.7	1.9	2.3	1.9	2.0
Median income.....	\$7,644	\$6,974	\$7,999	\$7,753	\$8,018	\$8,120	\$8,294	\$8,478	\$7,995

¹ Families with 1965 income below SSA poverty level.
Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special

tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population Survey for March 1966.

TABLE C.—Income deficit of low-income families: Percentage distribution of low-income families with 1965 income below SSA low-income level by amount of income deficit, by number of children under age 18 and sex of head

Income deficit	Total low-income families	With no children	With children						
			Total	1 child	2 children	3 children	4 children	5 children	6 or more
All families									
Number (in thousands).....	9,852	3,611	6,241	1,386	1,334	1,227	928	644	723
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
\$1-249.....	10.2	14.1	8.0	9.4	12.9	6.4	6.2	5.4	3.6
\$250-499.....	11.0	15.0	8.7	11.9	9.7	8.4	6.7	6.1	6.6
\$500-749.....	10.4	15.0	7.7	9.9	10.6	6.8	6.9	6.5	1.9
\$750-999.....	9.5	12.1	8.0	8.7	8.6	10.4	6.2	5.0	6.4
\$1,000-1,249.....	8.5	11.0	7.1	8.2	9.1	6.8	8.1	4.5	3.0
\$1,250-1,499.....	9.3	10.5	8.6	11.1	7.9	8.6	8.6	7.0	6.2
\$1,500-1,749.....	6.8	7.7	6.3	7.9	5.9	6.0	5.0	7.1	5.7
\$1,750-1,999.....	5.9	5.5	6.1	7.5	4.3	7.5	8.1	3.1	4.4
\$2,000-2,499.....	9.2	5.0	11.7	10.8	12.6	12.9	11.9	9.8	11.5
\$2,500-2,999.....	7.1	2.7	9.6	8.9	7.2	10.1	8.8	13.8	12.2
\$3,000 and over.....	12.1	1.7	18.1	5.9	11.2	16.3	23.5	31.7	38.6
Families with male head									
Number (in thousands).....	7,455	3,013	4,442	885	941	850	685	521	559
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
\$1-249.....	11.2	14.0	9.3	10.3	15.7	7.8	7.0	6.7	4.1
\$250-499.....	12.5	15.7	10.3	14.5	10.6	10.5	8.3	6.7	8.6
\$500-749.....	11.0	15.1	8.2	9.6	10.6	8.1	7.9	8.1	2.5
\$750-999.....	10.0	12.0	8.7	8.2	9.2	12.0	7.2	5.8	7.9
\$1,000-1,249.....	8.6	10.6	7.2	7.7	8.9	6.9	8.6	5.6	3.6
\$1,250-1,499.....	9.6	10.8	8.9	10.7	7.3	8.4	10.5	8.1	8.1
\$1,500-1,749.....	6.2	7.2	5.4	6.1	5.0	5.5	3.5	7.5	5.5
\$1,750-1,999.....	5.9	5.3	6.3	8.2	4.7	7.6	8.6	2.3	5.4
\$2,000-2,499.....	8.3	4.9	10.5	10.3	11.8	9.9	9.8	8.4	12.7
\$2,500-2,999.....	6.2	2.6	8.6	6.9	5.5	9.9	7.9	12.5	11.6
\$3,000 and over.....	10.6	1.7	16.7	7.6	10.7	13.4	20.6	28.6	30.4
Families with female head									
Number (in thousands).....	2,397	598	1,799	501	392	377	242	122	164
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
\$1-249.....	7.3	14.4	5.0	8.0	6.1	3.2	4.5	0	1.8
\$250-499.....	6.5	11.4	4.9	7.4	7.4	3.7	2.1	3.3	0
\$500-749.....	8.4	14.0	6.5	10.4	10.2	3.7	4.1	0	0
\$750-999.....	7.8	12.4	6.2	9.4	7.1	6.6	3.3	1.6	1.2
\$1,000-1,249.....	8.4	12.9	6.9	9.0	9.7	6.4	6.6	0	1.2
\$1,250-1,499.....	8.1	9.2	7.8	11.8	9.2	9.0	2.9	3.3	0
\$1,500-1,749.....	8.9	9.9	8.6	11.2	8.2	7.2	9.5	5.7	6.1
\$1,750-1,999.....	5.6	6.4	5.4	6.2	3.3	7.2	6.2	6.6	1.2
\$2,000-2,499.....	12.3	5.2	14.6	11.4	14.5	19.9	17.8	15.6	7.3
\$2,500-2,999.....	9.9	2.7	12.3	12.6	11.2	10.6	11.6	18.9	14.0
\$3,000 and over.....	16.7	1.5	21.7	3.0	12.5	22.5	31.4	45.9	67.1

Source: Derived by the Social Security Administration from special tabulations by the Bureau of the Census from the Current Population

Survey for March 1966.