

# State Public Assistance Legislation, 1957

by MARGUERITE WINDHAUSER and GEORGE J. BLAETUS\*

*In 1957 the legislatures of most States met for the first time since Congress passed the Social Security Amendments of 1956. These amendments include measures significantly affecting the public assistance programs, and students and observers of developments in public welfare will be interested in the extent to which they are reflected in the 1957 State legislation. Other laws were enacted in response to attitudes and conditions in the individual States.*

THE major changes made in public assistance programs by State legislatures during 1957 dealt to a great extent with program developments and revisions related to the amendments to the Social Security Act adopted by Congress in 1956. Other changes reflect State interest in eliminating and simplifying requirements that were unproductive, difficult and costly to administer, and not closely related to the purpose of the programs. Although complete information was not available at the time this article was prepared, it reflects to a substantial extent the actions taken by the States affecting their public assistance programs.

The amendments to the Federal law clarified the service objectives of the public assistance program, stressed the importance of trained social workers in administration, and established a program of research and development projects in social security. They also included separate financing provisions for assistance in the form of medical care payments on behalf of recipients and provisions increasing the maximum on the individual monthly assistance payment in which the Federal Government can participate financially. Other changes concern the conditions under which Federal grants for public assistance are available to the States.<sup>1</sup>

To take advantage of these changes in the Federal law, the States must amend the plans for the provision

of public assistance that they had submitted earlier to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If a State has authority, under existing law, to take the action required by the Federal amendments, no special legislative modification of the State assistance law is necessary.

## Welfare Services

Many State welfare laws have long included provisions for various welfare services, as well as for financial assistance to needy individuals. The Social Security Act has permitted Federal sharing in the costs of providing such services to applicants for and recipients of public assistance on a fifty-fifty basis as a cost of administration. The Eighty-fourth Congress, however, added language to the four public assistance titles of the Act that places greater emphasis on the development of services. This emphasis is in terms of helping the aged to attain self-care; of helping the blind, the disabled, and relatives caring for dependent children toward self-support and self-care; and of strengthening family life in the program of aid to dependent children. To this end, Congress specifically identified the provision of services as a purpose of each title, added a requirement that State plans describe the services the State would make available, and specified that the services provided by agency staff are a proper charge to the administrative costs in which the Federal Government shares. This emphasis on services has been reflected in State program activities in nearly all States and in the laws adopted by a number of States.

Alaska, South Dakota, and Wash-

ington, for example, added to their public assistance laws service provisions that follow the lines of the Federal amendments. Oregon extended the authority of its Public Welfare Commission and authorized expenditures for services in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children. An Illinois amendment authorizes self-support and self-care services. Georgia clarified the legal basis on which the State Welfare Department operates with respect to the expenditure of State funds for activities encouraging self-support and self-care.

Wyoming added to its general welfare and health law a provision giving the welfare department the responsibility to initiate or to cooperate with other agencies in developing measures and procedures within the scope of public welfare services.

## Training of Public Welfare Personnel

The 1956 amendments authorized a Federal appropriation equal to 80 percent of the total amount spent in the States for training public welfare personnel—a provision designed to assist the States in increasing the number of adequately trained personnel available for work in the public assistance programs. Although no Federal funds have been appropriated to carry out this provision, some State legislatures were stimulated by the amendments to enact cooperating laws on this subject.

In a few States the new legislation relates directly to the Federal amendment and makes it possible for the States to take prompt action under the amendment whenever Federal funds become available. Other State legislation provides authority, funds, or a more specific legal base for training and staff development activities carried on by the State welfare departments. California law, for example, provides authorization under which both State and county staff may benefit from Federal funds

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

<sup>1</sup> See Charles I. Schottland, "Social Security Amendments of 1956: A Legislative History," *Social Security Bulletin*, September 1956.

for this purpose. Under enabling acts adopted in Alaska and Illinois, the State agency may take advantage of the Federal amendment.

The Utah Legislature authorized the Public Welfare Commission to cooperate with the Federal Government in a personnel training program for more effective and efficient operation. This law then follows the specifications of the Federal Act in authorizing grants to public or non-profit institutions of higher learning. The amount of State funds expended under this authorization may not exceed  $\frac{1}{4}$  of 1 percent of all funds appropriated to the welfare agency. Oregon empowered the State agency, with the cooperation and financial assistance of the Federal Government, to spend necessary funds for training personnel employed or preparing for employment and to do so directly or indirectly through fellowships or grants to institutions of higher learning or through any other method for which Federal funds may be made available.

Montana directed the Department of Welfare to develop policies relating to educational leave of employees and prospective employees and to the staff development needs of employees. Ohio authorized the State agency to spend appropriated funds and to contract for the education and training of professional personnel. Wisconsin established a legal basis for a new educational leave program under its 1957 appropriation act.

The Georgia Legislature passed a resolution permitting a constitutional amendment to be submitted for referendum in 1958 that would enable all State agencies to use State funds for educational leave purposes and thus be able to receive Federal funds for training.

### **Research and Demonstration**

Five States passed enabling legislation in the field of research. Illinois, Oregon, and Wyoming may now enter into agreements with the Federal Government for cooperative research and demonstration projects and expend the necessary funds to do so. New York appropriated funds to the Department of Social Welfare for research and demonstration projects directed toward preventing or

reducing indigence among the aged. Ohio legislation permits the State agency to expend appropriated funds and enter into contracts for research. No Federal funds have, however, been appropriated for this purpose.

### **Medical Care**

The separate matching formula adopted by Congress in 1956 for financing medical care for recipients of public assistance caused some States to review their legislative bases. Many States were already providing medical care under their assistance programs, some financing it entirely from State and/or local funds and some with Federal financial participation. Ever since the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act were established, some States included medical care items in the standards used in determining the amount of the assistance payment. Other States paid the suppliers of medical services directly and without Federal participation until 1950, when the definition of assistance in the Social Security Act was amended to allow Federal sharing in the cost of those payments.

Thus, before the 1956 amendments providing for separate financing of direct payments for medical care, many States already had a legal base that permitted them to meet the costs of medical care under their assistance programs. The 1956 legislation permits the Federal Government to participate on a fifty-fifty basis in medical care expenditures up to a maximum determined by multiplying \$6 a month by the number of adult recipients in a State and \$3 a month by the number of children receiving assistance.<sup>2</sup>

Five States passed enabling legislation with a broad base for furnishing medical and remedial care for public assistance recipients. They are California, Nevada, South Dakota, Utah, and Vermont. The authorization is limited in both Nevada and Vermont to the three categorical programs for adults and excludes aid to dependent children; Nevada, however, has no program of aid to the

permanently and totally disabled, and California did not include that program in its medical care legislation. South Dakota failed to appropriate funds to carry out the enabling law.

Other States enacted legislation that permits payments to be made directly to the suppliers of medical care. Such laws were enacted in Georgia, Montana, Nebraska, Tennessee, and Wyoming to cover the four federally aided programs. Iowa received authorization to make payments to suppliers of medical care in its three programs (the State does not have a program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled). The State public assistance agency in Montana is authorized to administer and supervise the making of medical care payments on behalf of recipients.

Michigan, Ohio, and Tennessee permit the establishment of a pooled fund from which payments can be made to the suppliers of medical care. Such a fund is made up of a monthly per capita payment to meet the medical care requirements of the needy. Tennessee and Michigan received authorization to pay the costs of hospital care for public assistance recipients. Under the Michigan law, 90 percent of the costs of hospitalization will be paid through the pooled fund, and the balance will be paid by the general assistance agencies. In Ohio, only the costs for aged recipients are met by the fund.

In Maryland the indigent have been receiving medical care under a law authorizing its provision by the State Health Department. Legislation was passed to bring the responsibility for the medical care of public assistance recipients under the Welfare Department and thus obtain Federal participation in these expenditures. The Arkansas Legislature appropriated \$1 million for hospitalization, drugs, and outpatient clinical care at the State University Hospital for public assistance recipients. Funds are also provided for additional staff for this activity.

### **Money Payments**

In 1956 Congress raised from \$55 to \$60 the maximum on assistance payments to the needy aged, the blind, and the disabled in which the

<sup>2</sup> An amendment to the Social Security Act adopted in 1957 gives each State the option of operating under the 1956 provision or of using the formula previously in effect.

Federal Government will participate. In aid to dependent children the maximums were raised to \$32 each for the first child and the relative with whom the child lives and to \$23 for each additional child. Previously, also, the amount of the Federal share was determined in relation to an individual maximum on the total of monthly money payments to and payments for medical care on behalf of a recipient. Under present law, beginning July 1, 1957, these maximums apply only to Federal financial participation in money payments, with Federal sharing in payments for medical care on behalf of recipients computed separately (except in those States that choose, under the 1957 amendment, to operate on the old basis).

Many States with State-established maximums on assistance payments already have the legislative authority necessary to relate their maximums to the new dollar amounts established by Federal law. Thus few States needed legislation to obtain Federal participation in higher payments to the needy. South Dakota increased to \$65 the maximum payments for the aged, the blind, and the disabled. In aid to dependent children the maximums were set at \$75 for the one-child family, \$100 for the two-child family, \$118 for the three-child family, and \$136 for the four-child family. No change was made in the maximums for larger families. In Utah, new legislation set higher maximums on payments to needy households under the State assistance programs. The maximum payment for a one-person case is now \$75, for two persons it is \$120, and for three persons it is \$142; the maximum is \$18 for each additional person up to and including seven persons, and \$12 for each additional person beyond seven in the case.

California made legislative changes affecting the aged, the blind, and dependent children. In old-age assistance, payments to recipients who have special needs requiring an additional amount may be increased as much as \$16 above the new maximum of \$89 for basic needs (formerly \$85). In aid to the blind the maximum for basic requirements was increased from \$95 to \$99, and payments may go up to \$110 for recip-

ients with special needs. In aid to dependent children, the maximum payment for one-child families was increased from \$115 to \$145.

Minnesota increased from \$65 to \$71 the maximum money payments to the needy aged and from \$65 to \$70 the payments to the disabled. The maximum for aged recipients living in licensed homes was increased from \$75 to \$90. Nebraska raised the maximums in old-age assistance from \$65 to \$70 and in aid to the blind from \$80 to \$100. An Illinois law removed the \$65 maximum in aid to the blind.

Arkansas, Colorado, and Washington enacted other types of legislation affecting public assistance payments. Under Arkansas law, \$55 a month is declared the minimum amount necessary to provide an adequate subsistence standard for aged persons. The minimum assistance payment will be the difference between any available income and \$55. A qualifying clause was added to the effect that this language is not to limit payments for nursing-home care for the aged.

Colorado enacted legislation that implements a constitutional amendment approved in the general election of 1956 and that provides for a basic minimum monthly amount of \$100 to eligible aged persons. The State Board of Public Welfare is authorized to adjust this minimum upward if changes in living costs justify an increase.

Washington amended its basic public assistance law to increase from \$65 to \$75, on the average, the minimum cost of consumption items in its assistance standards and repealed the provisions relating to reductions in payment when funds are not sufficient to pay full grants.

### *Definition of 'Dependent' Child Extended*

In 1956 Congress extended the program of aid to dependent children by providing Federal financial participation in assistance to small additional groups of needy children. It deleted the provision that permitted Federal sharing in assistance to children aged 16 and 17 only if they were regularly attending school and added first cousin, nephew, and niece to the list of relatives with whom a

dependent child may be living and receive aid. Although the number of children affected is comparatively small, the States regard the 1956 Federal legislation as highly important in helping them reach additional needy children.

Fourteen States made related changes in their laws to extend the services of aid to dependent children to additional groups of children. Alaska, Arkansas, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Montana, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Washington brought their laws into agreement with the provisions of the Federal Act. Nevada included the specified relatives but placed a limit of 16 on the age of eligible children. Missouri made the same addition to the list of specified relatives; it raised the age limit for eligible children from 16 to 18 years but requires school attendance for children from age 7 up to 18. Maryland included the relatives listed in the Federal law, as well as all other relatives who may be included later by the Social Security Act. Connecticut now aids dependent children who are over age 18, but without Federal participation in these assistance expenditures.

### *New State Programs*

Two States, California and Texas, established new programs for aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Forty-eight of the 53 jurisdictions are now providing assistance to needy disabled persons with Federal grants under the provisions of title XIV of the Social Security Act. The definition of a disabled person in the two State laws is more narrow than the governing interpretations of the Federal Act.

### *Residence*

In South Dakota the programs of old-age assistance and aid to the permanently and totally disabled were liberalized to conform to the residence requirement in aid to the blind—that is, 1 year of residence immediately preceding the application or, if the person is receiving assistance from another State, the same period of residence that would be required of a South Dakota resident moving to that State. Minnesota, with a 1-year requirement in

old-age assistance, enacted a provision similar to that of South Dakota with respect to persons receiving assistance from another State who apply in Minnesota. Vermont legislation establishes uniform residence requirements in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. Under a regulation approved by the attorney general, the residence requirement in these programs is now 5 years in the last 9 and 1 year immediately preceding the application.

Wisconsin, which previously had no residence requirement for aid to dependent children, enacted an amendment making the requirement the same as in the other programs—that is, 1 year of residence.

Tennessee amended the 1-year residence requirement in each program to make it possible to grant assistance to persons who abandon Tennessee residence but return to the State within the year. In Kansas, there was further relaxation in residence requirements for certain veterans, their wives, widows, and children under age 14 for all types of assistance; all requirements are waived if the veteran was a resident of the State at the time he enlisted in the Armed Forces. Iowa and North Carolina in aid to the blind and California in old-age assistance and aid to dependent children made technical amendments relating to residence. A Maine law grants authority to enter into reciprocal agreements with other States concerning out-of-State payments.

### ***Property Reserves***

Eight States liberalized their laws governing the amount of property that an assistance recipient may hold. The Maine Legislature raised the existing limitations on personal property in old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled to \$500 for the individual recipient and spouse. In aid to dependent children, \$500 was set as the limitation for the eligible child and the adult whose requirements are not included in the payment and \$800 for two or more individuals whose requirements are included.

The amount of reserves that an

old-age assistance recipient may hold was increased in Colorado, Georgia, and Minnesota. In Colorado the recipient is allowed to retain up to \$1,000 in cash and be eligible for aid. The Georgia statute, in raising the amount of personal property reserve from \$600 to \$800, declared it "for the purpose of taking care of unexpected serious illness, funeral, and other unforeseen happenings or events." Minnesota increased the equity in property used as a homestead from \$7,000 to \$10,000.

Wisconsin brought the program of aid to dependent children into conformity with the other public assistance programs by a slight liberalization that placed holdings of \$500 in cash or other liquid assets outside agency control.

California increased from \$3,500 to \$5,000 (assessed valuation, less encumbrances) the amount of real property a recipient of old-age assistance or aid to the blind may retain and qualify for assistance. In aid to dependent children, the amount was increased from \$3,000 to \$5,000. California law also dealt with the sale of real property that had provided a home for the aged, blind, or disabled recipient. The proceeds from the sale may be held indefinitely as trust deed, promissory note, or mortgage, when all payments are to be applied to the balance due on a new home.

Vermont clarified its law relating to the ownership of real and personal property and provided that an eligible individual may not have an interest in real property other than a home. Utah legislation provides that when assistance is granted on a temporary basis to persons having property worth more than the maximum amounts specified in the law, the assistance shall be on such terms or conditions as the State agency considers equitable.

### ***Citizenship***

Maine and Nevada, without citizenship requirements in their other programs, repealed the citizenship requirements in old-age assistance. Minnesota did the same in old-age assistance and aid to the permanently and totally disabled. California, in its new program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled, ac-

cepts residence in the United States since July 1, 1932, in lieu of citizenship, if the noncitizen meets certain other conditions. Florida, which has no requirement of citizenship for the needy blind and for dependent children, liberalized its present limitation for the aged and the disabled by accepting 20 years of residence in the United States as a substitute for citizenship.

### ***Special Requirements in Aid to Dependent Children***

Although a few State legislatures considered bills making eligibility conditions more restrictive for certain groups of needy children, only Arkansas enacted such legislation. One law adds to the existing provisions related to the denial of assistance to children in "unsuitable" homes. Another requires that the relative with whom the child lives present reasonable proof that the assistance payment has been spent for the child's benefit. Both laws carry a saving clause making them effective only if they are in conformity with the Federal law. New legislation in Illinois provides that, as a condition of eligibility, applicants for and recipients of aid to dependent children must avail themselves of legal remedies for obtaining child support.

The Louisiana Legislature established in 1956 a committee charged with making a study of illegitimacy as it relates to public assistance. The committee is to submit its recommendations to the next legislature.

### ***Relatives' Responsibility***

Several States enacted legislation relating to the responsibility of relatives for support of persons receiving public assistance. The new laws show recognition of the complexity of factors that affect family relationships and responsibility. A Connecticut law relieves children of liability for the support of parents if it is established that, for a 10-year period before the child reached his majority, there was total failure to provide reasonable support and care within the parent's financial capability. Maine also removed the legal liability of adult children whose ties with parents were broken during minority.

Oregon legislation provides that relatives of public assistance recipients will not be liable for monthly contributions until their gross income reaches a higher figure than that formerly specified. Under the revised statute the contribution rates go into effect when there is a gross annual income of \$5,000 if one person is dependent upon the income and at \$6,000 if two persons are dependent on it. The law also exempts the child of a needy person from responsibility for support if during his minority the parent abandoned or deserted the child or, without good cause, had been responsible for the child's being dependent. New Mexico's law modified provisions enacted 2 years earlier by reducing the number of relatives considered liable for support and the amount they must contribute. Under a Colorado amendment, no aged person will be denied assistance because his relatives may be financially able to contribute to his support and maintenance.

### ***Standard-Setting Authorities for Institutions***

During 1957, nursing-home fires occurred in Iowa and Missouri and resulted in legislation in both States to prevent further disasters of this sort. Iowa revised its law extensively to tighten the provisions governing the licensing of nursing homes. Missouri passed stringent inspection and licensing laws for nursing homes and continued administrative responsibility in the State Division of Health.

Illinois amended its law relating to the licensing of nursing homes and homes for the aged to provide for higher standards and stricter enforcement and to extend the law's application to shelter-care homes furnishing personal services to infirm persons not requiring professional or practical nursing. New York authorized the attorney general, when requested, to bring injunction proceedings for violations or threatened violations of the licensing laws; this move was made to help enforce provisions relating to the operation of private proprietary and nursing convalescent homes and homes for adults. Legislation in Indiana established a nursing home council and provided for the licensing of nursing homes and for their regulation by

the State Board of Health with the council's advice; previously the State Welfare Department was the responsible body.

Georgia law provides for an inspection of physical plants housing aged people. Certain group-care facilities providing personal care or service for four or more aged, infirm, or handicapped persons (excluding facilities providing skilled nursing care or medical supervision) must be licensed in Nevada. Connecticut and Maryland passed legislation regarding assistance recipients receiving institutional care. In Connecticut assistance payments may now be made to recipients in homes with life-care contracts under specific conditions. Maryland repealed sections of its law that had prohibited payments to recipients in public institutions.

### ***Guardianship***

Each legislative year reflects concern in some States about old-age assistance recipients and their capacity to manage their affairs. Maryland repealed its law setting up special guardianship provisions for public assistance recipients. The State has a general guardianship law for persons mentally incompetent and passed a new law providing that persons who are not mentally incompetent but who have difficulty managing their affairs may by their own written request have a conservator appointed.

Oregon amended its law relating to assistance payments made to guardians to include payments to conservators as well, provided that such payments do not result in the loss of Federal matching funds. The general guardianship law of Idaho now permits fees and bonds to be waived when the estate of the ward consists primarily of income essential to his subsistence.

### ***Liens and Recoveries***

Several States eliminated or revised their provisions for the recovery of assistance granted to needy individuals, and a few States enacted provisions related to fraud.

Washington repealed a law providing for recovery of assistance payments from the estates of deceased recipients. New Mexico repealed, effective July 1, 1957, a lien law en-

acted 2 years earlier. The law allowing claims against the estates of deceased old-age assistance recipients was repealed in Nevada. Connecticut revised its provisions for preferred claims under its programs of assistance to the aged, the blind, and the disabled to provide that the State shall have a claim against the estate of a deceased recipient to the extent that the estate is not needed for the support of the surviving spouse, parent, or dependent children. In aid to dependent children, a similar provision was adopted concerning a claim against the estate of a deceased parent. In North Carolina the lien law was amended to permit cancellation of an old-age assistance lien on payment of a lump sum.

The Illinois Legislature made several changes to broaden the responsibility of applicants and recipients for reporting changes in income and resources and to strengthen the State agency's control in cases of overpayments because of fraud and excess assistance payments. Provision was also made for voluntary repayments of assistance and for segregating such payments from compulsory repayments required when there had been an excess payment or fraud. In Oregon there was legislation placing the welfare recovery division on a more permanent basis in the Department of Justice. The division will, on the request of the State Welfare Commission, investigate and prosecute cases of fraud and overpayment and initiate petitions for support under the reciprocal-enforcement law in public assistance cases and actions for failure to support.

A California amendment states that whenever old-age assistance or aid to the blind is obtained illegally, restitution should be sought by request, civil action, or other suitable means before criminal action is started. Washington provides that the total amount of an assistance payment obtained by fraud is a debt to the State and becomes a lien against the real and personal property of the recipient.

### ***Miscellaneous***

Missouri removed the age limit of 65 set for recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

*(Continued on page 23)*

**Table 2.—Contributions and taxes collected under selected social insurance and related programs, by specified period, 1955-57**

[In thousands]

Period	Retirement, disability, and survivors insurance				Unemployment insurance		
	Federal insurance contributions <sup>1</sup>		Federal civil-service contributions <sup>3</sup>	Taxes on carriers and their employees	State unemployment insurance contributions <sup>4</sup>	Federal unemployment taxes <sup>5</sup>	Railroad unemployment insurance contributions <sup>6</sup>
	Retirement and survivors	Disability <sup>2</sup>					
<b>Fiscal years:</b>							
1955-56 <sup>7</sup> .....	\$6,442,370		\$808,207	\$634,323	\$1,328,722	\$324,656	\$34,043
1956-57 <sup>8</sup> .....	6,539,887	\$337,161	1,170,998	616,013	1,537,127	330,031	77,894
<b>4 months ended:</b>							
October 1955.....	1,881,493		421,549	178,260	453,467	22,772	6,277
October 1956.....	1,800,696		723,155	183,192	563,998	3,680	19,668
October 1957 <sup>8</sup> .....	1,969,905		348,772	187,537	584,422	2,986	25,290
<b>1956</b>							
October.....	218,116		51,738	24,959	109,393	598	617
November.....	606,322		53,677	74,306	208,899	865	10,352
December.....	248,790		52,326	54,580	12,033	699	7,731
<b>1957</b>							
January.....	291,274		63,435	21,165	80,086	40,242	386
February.....	775,301	52,079	45,449	82,796	152,570	269,886	7,133
March.....	572,293	65,796	66,966	49,861	15,155	10,166	11,402
April.....	632,911	31,249	45,650	14,939	169,528	1,511	562
May.....	1,141,249	122,338	67,058	83,134	322,447	1,400	12,048
June <sup>8</sup> .....	471,051	65,699	53,280	52,040	12,409	1,583	8,613
July <sup>8</sup> .....	365,844	38,806	51,752	19,359	173,916	754	765
August.....	829,053	112,664	75,757	83,581	283,805	882	11,065
September.....	433,600	54,899	102,791	53,858	10,495	623	12,650
October.....	341,408	34,791	118,472	30,740	116,206	726	810

<sup>1</sup> Represents contributions of employees, employers, and the self-employed in employments covered by old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (beginning December 1952, adjusted for employee-tax refunds); from May 1951, includes deposits in the trust fund by States under voluntary coverage agreements; beginning January 1951, on an estimated basis.

<sup>2</sup> Under the 1956 amendments to title II of the Social Security Act.

<sup>3</sup> Represents employee and Government contributions to the civil-service retirement and disability fund.

<sup>4</sup> Represents deposits in State clearing accounts of contributions plus penalties and interest collected from employers and, in 3 jurisdictions, contributions

from employees; excludes contributions collected for deposit in State temporary disability insurance funds. Data reported by State agencies.

<sup>5</sup> Represents taxes paid by employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

<sup>6</sup> Beginning 1947, also covers temporary disability insurance.

<sup>7</sup> Except for State unemployment insurance, as shown in the *Final Statement of Receipts and Expenditures of the U. S. Government*.

<sup>8</sup> Preliminary.

Source: *Monthly Statement of Receipts and Expenditures of the U. S. Government* and other Treasury reports, unless otherwise noted.

## STATE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE LEGISLATION

(Continued from page 7)

Colorado enacted legislation providing a more specific statutory base for its existing program of aid to the disabled.

West Virginia added a provision that permits the names and addresses of recipients and amounts of assistance to be available for public inspection in the office of the clerk of each county. This legislation is in accordance with the provision in the Revenue Act of 1951 that permits the States to make certain records available for public inspection, without the penalty of losing Federal funds, provided that political or commercial use of the names is prohibited. There are 32 States that permit inspection of the lists. The North Dakota Legislature instructed the Legislative Research Committee, which studies and makes recom-

mendations to the legislature, to study provisions in public welfare statutes that relate to the confidential nature of information.

Legislation in Illinois, Nevada, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania enlarges the responsibilities of the State welfare departments in various ways or makes organizational and administrative changes in various programs. In Illinois, where the county departments of welfare generally do not have responsibility for the general assistance program, the legislature transferred the administration of general assistance within the City of Chicago to the Cook County Department of Welfare, which administers the federally aided programs. Other legislation changes the name of the county departments, effective July 1, 1958, to county departments of public aid.

Nevada transferred the responsibility for the vocational rehabilitation

of the blind from the State Education Department to the State Welfare Department. In Oklahoma the duties of the former Emergency Relief Board, which had responsibility for general assistance and commodity distribution programs, were transferred to the Oklahoma Public Welfare Commission. Pennsylvania legislation provides for the merger, on or before June 1, 1958, of two existing agencies—the Department of Public Assistance and the Department of Public Welfare—into one new Department of Public Welfare.

Three States established commissions with broad authority to carry out specific assignments related to public welfare laws and administration. Illinois legislation created a Commission on Public Aid and Assistance with membership drawn from both Houses of the legislature and from the public (appointed by the Governor), to study all aspects

**Table 3.—Status of the old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds, by specified period, 1937–57**

[In thousands]

Period	Receipts		Expenditures		Assets		
	Net contribution income and transfers <sup>1</sup>	Interest received <sup>2</sup>	Benefit payments	Administrative expenses <sup>3</sup>	Net total of U.S. Government securities acquired <sup>4</sup>	Cash balance at end of period	Total assets at end of period
<b>Old-age and survivors insurance trust fund</b>							
Cumulative, January 1937–October 1957 <sup>5</sup> .....	\$50,587,757	\$4,523,376	\$31,468,732	\$1,156,070	\$21,781,477	\$704,853	\$22,486,330
Fiscal year:							
1955–56 <sup>6</sup> .....	6,442,370	494,889	5,360,813	124,339	1,462,540	550,078	22,593,109
1956–57 <sup>5</sup> .....	6,539,887	560,558	6,514,581	150,057	220,287	765,598	23,028,916
4 months ended:							
October 1955.....	1,881,493	42,225	1,714,504	41,117	206,490	522,116	21,309,097
October 1956.....	1,800,696	42,850	1,946,026	46,646	—217,576	618,492	22,443,991
October 1957 <sup>5</sup> .....	1,969,905	45,019	2,501,340	56,170	—481,841	704,853	22,486,330
<b>1957</b>							
October.....	218,116	19,121	489,791	14,940	—249,759	618,492	22,443,991
November.....	606,322	5,381	488,599	11,997	127,383	602,280	22,555,097
December.....	248,790	235,215	507,764	12,186	—122,285	688,601	22,519,153
<b>1957</b>							
January.....	291,274	1,174	527,202	11,027	—243,750	686,569	22,273,371
February.....	775,301	3,902	535,443	12,826	86,922	830,582	22,504,306
March.....	572,293	14,969	574,628	13,014	141,534	688,668	22,503,927
April.....	632,911	20,493	646,696	17,248	—391,059	1,069,188	22,493,388
May.....	1,141,249	8,088	648,202	12,359	782,195	775,768	22,982,163
June <sup>6</sup> .....	471,051	228,477	640,021	12,755	56,923	765,598	23,028,916
July <sup>5</sup> .....	365,844	1,449	625,719	13,907	—293,440	786,705	22,756,583
August.....	829,053	7,842	608,520	11,578	226,646	776,856	22,973,380
September.....	433,600	15,399	626,766	13,353	—317,683	903,390	22,782,231
October.....	341,408	20,329	640,336	17,302	—97,364	704,853	22,486,330
<b>Disability insurance trust fund <sup>7</sup></b>							
Cumulative, January–October 1957 <sup>5</sup> .....	578,322	1,747	29,297	2,287	530,620	17,865	548,485
Fiscal year 1956–57 <sup>6</sup> .....	337,161	1,363	-----	1,305	325,363	11,857	337,220
<b>1957</b>							
February.....	52,079	-----	-----	438	-----	51,641	51,641
March.....	65,796	-----	-----	219	109,600	7,618	117,218
April.....	31,249	-----	-----	216	32,900	5,752	148,252
May.....	122,338	-----	-----	216	108,200	19,674	270,374
June <sup>6</sup> .....	65,699	1,363	-----	216	74,663	11,857	337,220
July <sup>6</sup> .....	38,806	17	-----	245	34,900	15,536	375,799
August.....	112,664	47	8,528	245	86,737	32,737	479,737
September.....	54,899	171	9,333	245	29,489	48,741	525,230
October.....	34,791	148	11,437	248	54,131	17,865	548,485

<sup>1</sup> For July 1940 to December 1950 equals taxes collected; beginning January 1951, equals amounts appropriated (estimated tax collections) and, from May 1951, deposits by States under voluntary coverage agreements. For 1947–51 includes amounts appropriated to meet costs of benefits payable to certain veterans' survivors. Beginning 1952, includes deductions for refund of estimated amount of employee-tax overpayment.

<sup>2</sup> Includes interest transferred from the railroad retirement account under the financial interchange provision of the Railroad Retirement Act, as amended in 1951 and 1956.

<sup>3</sup> Represents net expenditures for administration. Beginning November 1951, adjusted for reimbursements to trust fund of small amounts for sales of

services. Beginning October 1953, includes amounts for expenses of plans and preparations for construction authorized by P. L. 170, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

<sup>4</sup> Includes accrued interest and repayments on account of accrued interest on bonds at time of purchase.

<sup>5</sup> Preliminary.

<sup>6</sup> Revised to correspond with *Final Statement of Receipts and Expenditures of the U. S. Government*.

<sup>7</sup> Established under the Social Security Act, as amended in 1956.

Source: *Monthly Statement of Receipts and Expenditures of the U. S. Government* and unpublished Treasury reports.

of the programs and their administration and report their findings to the Seventy-first General Assembly. Minnesota established an Interim Commission on Public Welfare to study all laws pertaining to the programs administered by the Department of Public Welfare (except the corrections program) and to revise and codify existing laws and make recommendations for needed improvements. Florida established a joint legislative committee to inquire into all phases of the State welfare program and recommend any needed

legislation.

Legislative interest in the problems of the aged was reflected in the authorization for study groups in three States. Oregon established a State Council on Aging, with appointments to be made by the Governor. In Connecticut a Commission on Services for Elderly Persons will have agency and citizen representation. Illinois continued the Commission on the Aging and Aged to study the special problems of persons aged 45–64 and established a Gerontological Committee at the University of

Illinois. Minnesota legislation provided for a special consultant on aging in the Department of Public Welfare. The county agencies may designate a staff member as a coordinator of services to the aging, but the State gives no financial aid. In Iowa the legislature established the Iowa Study Committee on the Care of the Aging to study all phases of the care of the aged by both public and private agencies. Represented on the 11-member committee will be State agencies, the legislature, and the general public.