Public assistance programs, financed from Federal, State, and, in some instances, local funds, provide aid to families or persons on the basis of need and usually also of other eligibility conditions. The programs furnish assistance primarily to families or individuals in their homes, although they may also assist recipients living in boarding or nursing homes or in some types of public or private institutions. The assistance may be in the form of money (cash or check) or vendor payments for goods or services, including payments for medical care. The cost of remedial care may be included in vendor payments for medical care. Public programs providing allowances or benefits to persons on a basis other than need are not considered public assistance. There are four special types of assistance-the State-Federal programs-and the State-local programs of general assistance.

## Special Types of Public Assistance

Old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to dependent children, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled are designated as special types of public assistance because they aid special groups of needy persons. These categories of persons are broadly defined by the assistance titles of the Social Security Act and are specifically defined for each State by State law and administrative regulation.

The data presented in the monthly series are for programs administered under plans approved by the Social Security Administration for Federal financial participation and for similar programs in States in which the only public program for a particular category is administered without Federal funds. The data exclude a few small programs, similar in type, that are financed from State or local funds only but administered concurrently with State-Federal programs.

## **General** Assistance

General assistance is administered and financed by State and/or local governments and is designed to aid individuals and families when their needs are not otherwise met. General assistance is variously called general relief, home relief, direct relief, indigent aid, and so on. The term excludes programs that are limited to special groups, such as statutory veterans' relief or foster-family care for children, but it may include programs limiting eligibility on the basis of employability. Since the unifying influence of Federal participation is lacking in general assistance, variations in State and local practices affect the comparability of such data even more than they affect data for the special types of assistance.

## Recipients

Data on recipients of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled represent the number of persons to whom or on whose behalf payments are made for a specified month. Data on recipients of aid to dependent children are shown in terms of (a) the number of children on whose behalf payments of this type of aid are made, (b) the number of families in which these children are living, and (c) the number of recipients, which includes the children and one parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least one such adult are considered in determining the amount of assistance. In some cases the needs of more than one parent may be included in the budget for families receiving aid to dependent children, but not more than one adult is counted as a recipient in each family.

Under general assistance, recipients represent the number of cases receiving assistance. The unit of count follows the administrative practice of the agency. Thus two families in a single household may be regarded as a single case by one agency and as two cases by another agency. The number of general assistance cases is increased in some States by the practice of supplementing payments of the special types of assistance. Such supplementation may be for either maintenance or medical care. Cases in which the allowance is for burial only are generally excluded.

The numbers of recipients in the several States are imperfect gauges of differences in the numbers of needy individuals because of variations in eligibility conditions and the unequal ability of States to aid needy persons.

Because some recipients receive more than one type of assistance, the total number of recipients of public assistance in a State may be smaller than the sum of the recipients of the various types.

## **Payments**

The data represent payments for a specified month made to or on behalf of recipients and charged by the State or local agency to the specified type of assistance. Payments for the special types of assistance are money payments to recipients and vendor payments for medical care.

Data on general assistance show payments to cases in cash or kind and orders on vendors for goods or services supplied to general assistance cases. A relatively high rate of case turn-over and payment periods shorter than a month increase the number of small payments of general assistance and reduce the average payment. Likewise, the practice in a few States of using general assistance to supplement other types of assistance for maintenance needs increases the caseload and lowers their average general assistance payment. On the other hand, the average payment is raised in those States in which supplementation takes the form of payment of large medical bills.

For all programs, expenditures for burials are generally excluded.

## Initial Effect of the 1952 Amendments on Assistance Payments

Effective October 1, 1952, the maximums on assistance payments in which the Federal Government will share was raised from \$50 to \$55 for persons who are aged, blind, or permanently and totally disabled.<sup>1</sup> The formula for determining the Federal share of these payments was changed from three-fourths of the first \$20

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The Federal maximums apply to the sum of the money payment to a recipient plus any payments made in his behalf to a physician, hospital, or other supplier of medical services. This analysis is based only on changes in money payments to recipients.

of the average payment per recipient plus one-half of the balance within the maximum to four-fifths of the first \$25 of the average payment per recipient plus one-half of the balance of the matchable portion. In aid to dependent children the maximums were raised from \$27 for a needy adult caring for the children, \$27 for the first child in the family, and \$18 for each additional child to \$30, \$30, and \$21, respectively. The Federal share in the costs of this program was changed from three-fourths of the first \$12 of the average payment per person, plus one-half the balance within the maximums, to four-fifths of the first \$15 of the average per person, plus one-half of the balance of the matchable portion. The amendments made it possible for the States, without increasing the amount of State and local expenditures per recipient, to increase payments \$5 monthly for the aged, the blind, and the disabled and \$3 for each recipient in aid to dependent children.

Potential increases in payments, however, were offset for some re-

Table 1.—Special types of public assistance: Change in average payments per recipient in States affected by the 1952 amendments to the Social Security Act, by program and State, September-October 1952

State	Old-age assistance	Aid to depend- ent children <sup>1</sup>	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled
United States average <sup>2</sup>	· +- <b>\$</b> 2.60	+\$1.50	+\$2.31	+\$2.23
Alabama Alaska Arkansas California. Colorado Colorado Connecticut Dela ware District of Columbia	$\begin{array}{r} +4.59 \\75 \\ +4.52 \\ +7.43 \\ +3.69 \\98 \\ +1.86 \\ +.30 \\ +2.94 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} +.76\\14\\ +3.11\\ +3.07\\ +.33\\19\\ +2.16\\ +.03\\ +1.64\end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} +2.56 \\ (3) \\ +3.77 \\ +5.58 \\ +4.66 \\ +.12 \\ +3.95 \\ +3.30 \\ +3.76 \end{array}$	+3.91 +4.97 +.05 +.62 +4.42
Florida Georgia Hawaii Idaho Illinois Indiana Iowa Kansas Kentucky Louisinna Maine	+1.19 +4.67 +.28 +3.21 44 +.27 +4.27 +4.24	$\begin{array}{c} +1.05 \\ +4.54 \\31 \\ +2.51 \\ +.05 \\ +1.49 \\ +2.86 \\ +1.85 \\ +3.00 \\04 \\ +1.60 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} +2.03 \\ +4.89 \\ +1.87 \\ +3.93 \\10 \\ +.81 \\ +4.85 \\ +6.65 \\ +5.16 \\ +.25 \\ -1.45 \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{r} +5.06 \\ +.46 \\ +3.71 \\ +.07 \\ \hline \\ +3.50 \\ \hline \\ +.62 \\ \end{array} $
Maryland Massachusetts. Michigan Minnesota Mississippi Missouri. Montana. Nebraska Nevada. New Hampshire.	$ \begin{array}{r}64 \\ +.51 \\56 \\ +1.52 \\ +4.90 \end{array} $	$\begin{array}{r} +.14 \\ +.05 \\ +.04 \\ +.23 \\ +.01 \\ +2.22 \\ +2.21 \\ 0 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} + .54 \\ + .55 \\ + 1.55 \\ - 3.88 \\ + .02 \\ 0 \\ + 4.45 \\ + 1.03 \\ \end{array}$	+.35 +1.22 +1.98 +.05 +4.97 +5.00
New Jersey New Moxico North Carolina North Dakota Ohio Oklahoma Oregon Pennsylvania Rhode Island	+2.99 +1.02 +1.66 +.3962 +5.40 +3.37	$\begin{array}{c} +1.79 \\ +.71 \\ +1.00 \\ +.83 \\ +.59 \\ +1.64 \\ +9.49 \\ +2.80 \\ +1.96 \\ +.09 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}19 \\ +3.82 \\ +1.08 \\ +1.69 \\80 \\ +1.69 \\ +6.49 \\ +4.93 \\ +.09 \\ +.40 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} +1.32\\ +.21\\ +1.49\\ +3.09\\ -1.09\\ +4.05\\ +6.00\\ +3.55\\ +3.72\\ -1.63\end{array}$
South Carolina South Dakota Tennessee Utah Vermont Washington West Virginia Wisconsin Wyoming	+1.01 +4.00 +4.68 +.82	$\begin{array}{c} +1.00 \\ +1.58 \\ +.81 \\ +2.61 \\ +.81 \\ +.22 \\ +.81 \\ +.29 \\ +3.25 \\ +1.49 \\ +2.60 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} +8.29 \\ +1.23 \\ +1.82 \\ +5.14 \\ +2.00 \\11 \\ +.45 \\ +4.29 \\ +4.92 \\ +1.83 \\ +5.03 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r}06 \\ +1.97 \\ \hline \\ +2.90 \\ +.12 \\ +.93 \\ +.41 \\ +4.87 \\ +1.07 \\ +5.40 \end{array}$

<sup>1</sup> Recipients include the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least one such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance. <sup>2</sup> Excludes Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and, for aid to dependent children and aid to the blind, Nevada.

<sup>3</sup> Average not computed; base less than 50 recipients.

cipients who were also beneficiaries under the old-age and survivors insurance program. In February 1952, the last month for which data are available, 15 percent of the old-age assistance cases received old-age and survivors insurance benefits; in aid to dependent children, 5 percent of the families received such benefits.<sup>2</sup> Under the insurance program, higher benefits were paid, beginning with the month of September 1952, and most State agencies considered the increased income from this source in determining the amount of the assistance payments in October. In a State that planned to give recipients the full advantage of the additional Federal funds, average payments would therefore be likely to increase somewhat less than \$5 and \$3 per recipient.

To increase payments to recipients, it is necessary for a State to take some type of action. For States with maximums, an increase in their maximums results in increased payments to most of the cases receiving the maximum amount. For cases receiving payments at less than the maximums, and for States without maximums on individual payments, payments can be raised by increasing the amounts included in the budget for specified items or by adding items to the budget. Those States that had earlier found it necessary to reduce payments by making percentage cuts in the budget deficit or in requirements could raise payments by reducing the amount of such cuts or eliminating them. One or more of these types of action was taken by most of the States in October.<sup>3</sup>

Some States, however, had made recent increases in payments and in October effected few or relatively minor changes. A few States were providing assistance at a level that they believed met need at a reasonable standard and did not take any action to raise payments. Some States

<sup>2</sup> For State data on proportion of oldage assistance and aid to dependent children cases receiving old-age and survivors insurance benefits, see the *Bulletin*, August 1952, pp. 13–15.

<sup>3</sup> Data are excluded for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, which were not affected by the amendments, and for the Nevada programs for needy children and blind persons, which are administered without Federal financial participation. Table 2.—Specified types of public assistance: Number of States by amount of change in average payment per recipient, September-October 1952 <sup>1</sup>

	Number of States			
Interval	Old-age assist- ance	Aid to the blind	Aid to the perma- nently and totally disabled	
Total	51	50	37	
Payments increased: \$5.00 or more	2 11 7 2 11 9	7 6 2 9 11 1 7	$\begin{array}{r} 4\\5\\7\\1\\6\\11\\\end{array}$	

 $^{1}\,\mathrm{Excludes}$  Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and, for Nevada, aid to the blind.

will make changes in a later month, and a few States will adjust payments as cases are reinvestigated to determine continuing eligibility. The full effect of the amendments, therefore, is not reflected in the October figures. Some States, moreover, increase cost standards following a regular procedure for pricing items included in the standard and adjusting cost figures either at regular intervals or when the consumers' price index shows a specified percentage movement upward or downward. Increases in payments in these States cannot be related to the amendments, although in a few States the effective date of the amendments may have influenced the timing of the changes.

In old-age assistance, 41 of the 51 States made changes affecting payments in October. Twenty-one of the 36 States with maximums in September raised them in October. Oklahoma had removed the maximum on payments in July. A number of States have maximums in excess of the Federal limits, and in a few States they are high enough to meet the needs of practically all recipients. In some States, however, the maximums are lower than those specified in the Federal act.

Twenty-six States increased the cost figures for one or more items included in their assistance standards, and five States added items in October. In September, nine States were making percentage or other cuts in payments. In October, three of these States met 100 percent of need, within the maximums, and four States increased the percentage of need met. One State increased the percentage reduction but in relation to more adequate standards, and there was no change in the reduction in one State.

As a result of the various types of action taken by assistance agencies, average payments for old-age assistance increased \$2.60 from September to October. This change represents the net effect of higher payments in 42 States—ranging from \$0.24 to \$7.43 —and of slightly lower payments in nine States. Only Arkansas and Oklahoma raised payments as much as \$5.00 on the average; in 11 States the increases ranged from \$4.00 to \$4.99 (tables 1 and 2).

Some agencies made changes during July, August, or September that affected assistance payments. Agencies making changes in earlier months were less likely to adjust payments again in October, although a few did so. For the 51 States, the increase in average payments for oldage assistance from June to October was \$3.38, with 43 States showing increases, seven showing small decreases, and one having no change. From June to October, average payments increased by \$5.00 or more in five States and \$4.00-4.99 in 10 States.

The largest drop in the average payment for old-age assistance from June to October-\$1.67-occurred in Rhode Island, which in July began meeting part of the cost of medical care through direct payments to physicians, hospitals, and other suppliers medical services. Previously of amounts for some of these services were included in money payments to recipients. In Colorado, where September payments had increased \$10.00, there was a decrease of \$1.00 in October. Other States with small decreases in payments include those that were already making payments that they believed to be adequate and a few States with small increases for some recipients that were apparently offset by lower payments to other recipients. Adjustments of payments to reflect higher benefits under

the old-age and survivors insurance program may account for the drop in the average payment in a few States.

The difficulty of evaluating the effect of each type of action is illustrated by the situation in Kentucky, which raised maximums for each program and also increased cost standards for a number of items, including food and clothing. Beginning in October the circumstances in which nursing service could be supplied were restricted somewhat, and certain other changes were made in the assistance standards.

In September the agency had met 100 percent of need under the standards and within the maximums then in effect for old-age assistance and aid to the blind. October payments represented only 87 percent and 89 percent, respectively, of the budget deficit within the new maximums. In aid to dependent children, the percentages of need met were reduced from 68 in September to 59 in October. The net effect of all these changes was an increase in Kentucky of \$4.83 in the average payment for old-age assistance, \$5.16 for recipients of aid to the blind, and \$3.06 per person in families receiving aid to dependent children.

In aid to dependent children the average payment per family in the 50 States affected by the amendments rose \$5.36 from September to October. The average increase per recipient was \$1.50. Average payments were higher in 45 States and lower in four, with no change in one State (tables 1 and 3). Average payments per recipient rose as much as \$3.00 in seven States, and in nine States the

#### Table 3.—Aid to dependent children: Number of States by amount of change in average payment per recipient, September-October 1952 <sup>1</sup>

Interval	Number of States
Total Payments increased: \$3.00 or more 2.00-2.99_ 1.00-1.99_ Less than \$1.00 No change in payments Payments decreased	50 7 9 12 17 1 4

<sup>1</sup> Excludes Nevada, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

increase was \$2.00-2.99. Increases in payments for aid to dependent children were effected through higher maximums in 22 of the 30 States with maximums and increasing cost standards or adding items, or taking both types of action, in 26 States. Two States eliminated percentage or other cuts in payments in October. and three States reduced the amount of the cuts in payments. Four States made no change in the percentage reductions, and one State made greater reductions but in relation to the more adequate standards recently adopted. In two States, policies affecting reductions did not change, but precise information on the percentages used in October is not available.

Changes similar to those for oldage assistance occurred in the programs for the needy blind and disabled. In aid to the blind the average payment rose \$2.31. Payments were higher in 42 States: there were small decreases in seven States and no change in one State. In the program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, the average payment for the States affected by the amendments increased by \$2.23 from September to October; 34 of the 37 States reported higher averages.

The average payment to cases receiving general assistance increased \$1.53 in October. Payments were higher in 40 of the 48 States for which averages may be shown. In a few States, general assistance cases benefited indirectly from the 1952 amendments to the Social Security Act. Any across-the-board increase in cost standards by agencies administering general assistance as well as the special types of assistance tends to raise payments in all programs.

Total assistance payments in October exceeded the total in September by \$10.0 million. Payments to recipients of old-age assistance increased by \$6.5 million, and payments to families receiving aid to dependent children rose \$2.6 million. Total payments for each of the special types of assistance increased 5-6 percent. These assistance payments went to somewhat fewer aged persons and families with dependent children in October than in September. There was a small increase in the number of blind persons receiving assistance, and theoffice. Washington 25, D. C.

number of the permanently disabled continued to grow. General assistance caseloads dropped 1.4 percent. and the average rise in the assistance payments was somewhat less than for the other programs. As a result, total payments to these cases rose only 1.8 percent.

# Recent Publications\*

## Social Security Administration

CHILDREN'S BUREAU. Personnel in Public Child Welfare Programs, 1951. (Children's Bureau Statistical Series, No. 13.) Washington: The Bureau, 1952. 15 pp. Processed.

A report on the 4,465 full-time professional public child welfare employees. Limited free distribution; apply to the Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

DORNENBURG, ELEANOR B. Homemaker Service-A Preventive to Placement of Children in Foster Washington: The Chil-Care. dren's Bureau, 1952. 15 pp. Processed.

A paper presented at a session of the Child Welfare League of America at the National Conference of Social Work, Chicago, in May 1952, with discussions by Leon H. Richman and Mrs. Tracy C. Clough. Limited free distribution; apply to the Children's Bureau, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER. DIVI-SION OF THE ACTUARY. Summary of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System as Modified by the 1952 Amendments. Washington: The Division, Aug. 1952. 5 pp. Processed.

Limited free distribution; apply to the Division of the Actuary, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

VAN EENAM, WELTHA, and PENMAN, MARTHA E. Analysis of 346 Group Annuities Underwritten in 1946-50. (Actuarial Study No. 32.) Washington: Office of the Commissioner, Division of the Actuary, 1952. 64 pp. Processed.

Analyzes the benefit and contribution provisions of 346 contracts written in 1946-50 and compares them with 376 plans underwritten during 1942-46. Limited free distribution; apply to the Division of the Actuary, Social Security Administration, Washington 25, D. C.

## General

"Extension of Social Security in Ireland." Industry and Labour, Geneva, Vol. 8, Oct. 1, 1952, pp. 321-322. 25 cents.

Describes the June 1952 legislation liberalizing the social insurance, assistance, and children's allowance programs.

GLADIEUX, BERNARD L. "Civil Service Versus Merit." Public Administration Review, Chicago, Vol. 12, Summer 1952, pp. 173-177. \$6 a year.

Evaluates civil service and suggests improvements that "will make career service synonymous with merit."

- GREAT BRITAIN. MINISTRY OF LABOR AND NATIONAL SERVICE. Report for the Year 1951. (Cmd. 8640.) London: H. M. Stationery Office, 1952. 174 pp. 6s.
- INSTITUTE OF LIFE INSURANCE. Life Insurance Fact Book 1952. New York: The Institute, 1952. 107 pp. Includes information about group life insurance, annuities, insured pen-

sion plans, and social security.

- INSTITUTE OF LIFE INSURANCE. WOM-EN'S DIVISION. A Discussion of Family Money: How Budgets Work and What They Do. (Revised October 1952.) New York: The Institute, 1952. 24 pp. Copies available from the Director, Women's Division, Institute of Life Insurance, 488 Madison Avenue, New York 22, New York.
- KING, CLARENCE. Your Committee in Community Action. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952. 114 pp. \$2.

Designed as a guide for persons serving on public committees.

## **Retirement and Old Age**

COLBY, EVELYN, and FORREST, JOHN G. Ways and Means to Successful Re-New York: B. C. tirement. Forbes and Sons Publishing Co., Inc., 1952. 250 pp. \$3.50.

Discusses social security and pensions, self-employment, hobbies, living arrangements, health, recreation,

<sup>\*</sup> Prepared in the Library, Federal Security Agency. Orders for the publications listed should be directed to publishers and booksellers; Federal publications for which prices are listed should be be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing