

# 11

STAFF DATA WITH RESPECT TO H.R. 1

## AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

---

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE  
UNITED STATES SENATE  
RUSSELL B. LONG, *Chairman*



MARCH 21, 1972

Prepared by the staff and printed for the use of the Committee on Finance

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1972

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana, *Chairman*

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, New Mexico

HERMAN E. TALMADGE, Georgia

VANCE HARTKE, Indiana

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Connecticut

FRED R. HARRIS, Oklahoma

HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia

GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin

WALLACE F. BENNETT, Utah

CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska

JACK MILLER, Iowa

LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho

PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona

CLIFFORD P. HANSEN, Wyoming

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

TOM VAIL, *Chief Counsel*

(II)

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Present Law-----	1
H.R. 1-----	1
Comparison of H.R. 1 With 1970 Senate Bill-----	5
Major Issues Concerning Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled_	6
1. Federal vs. State Administration-----	6
2. Guaranteed Minimum Income Level and Relationship With Social Security-----	8
3. Pass-along of Social Security Increase to Welfare Recipients-----	16
4. Definitions of Blindness and Disability-----	16
5. Welfare Benefits for Alcoholics and Drug Addicts-----	17
Other Issues Related to Aid for Aged, Blind, and Disabled----	18
1. Disabled Children-----	18
2. Relative Responsibility-----	18
3. Earned Income Disregard-----	19
4. Prohibition of Liens in Aid to the Blind-----	19
Amendments to H.R. 1 Not Discussed Above Relating to Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled-----	20
Statistical Material-----	22



# AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

## Present Law

Three categories of adults are eligible for Federally supported assistance: persons 65 and over, the blind (without regard to age), and permanently and totally disabled persons 18 years of age and older. Each State establishes a minimum standard of living (needs standard) upon which assistance payments are based; any aged, blind or disabled person whose income is below the State needs standard will be eligible for some assistance, although the State need not pay the full difference between the individual's income and the needs standard.

Generally speaking, all income and resources of an aged, blind or disabled person must be considered in determining the amount of the assistance payment (though a portion of earnings may be disregarded as a work incentive). States also place limitations on the real and personal property an aged, blind or disabled individual may retain without being disqualified for assistance.

Monthly State payments to an aged, blind or disabled individual with no other income range between \$70 and \$250 and for an aged couple between \$97 and \$350. The amounts by State are shown on tables A and B at the end of this pamphlet.

States may either have separate assistance programs for the aged, blind and disabled, or may have a single combined program for all three groups.

Federal financial participation is based on one of two alternatives, at the State's option: (1) the Federal matching percentage for Medicaid (ranging from 50 percent to 83 percent, depending on State per capita income) is applied to all expenditures for assistance payments; or (2) Federal matching is based on a formula applied to average assistance payments up to certain limits. Under the second alternative, the average monthly payment in the State is calculated. Federal matching applies only to the first \$75; the Federal share is thirty-one thirty-sevenths of the first \$37 plus the "Federal percentage" (ranging from 50 percent to 65 percent, depending on State per capita income) times the next \$38 (or less).

The Federal Government in addition pays 75 percent of the cost of certain kinds of social and rehabilitative services which contribute to the ability of an aged, blind or disabled person to live as independently as possible. The Federal Government also pays 50 percent of the cost of program administration.

## H.R. 1

### *Guaranteed minimum income*

H.R. 1 would establish a Federal program for the aged, blind and disabled with nationally uniform levels of assistance. In the first year after the bill would become effective (from July 1972 to July 1973),

an aged, blind or disabled individual would be eligible for a Federal assistance payment sufficient to bring his monthly income up to \$130. For a married couple both of whom are aged, blind or disabled, the Federal minimum assistance level for fiscal year 1973 would be \$195 per month. In fiscal year 1974, these amounts would be increased to \$140 per month for an individual and \$200 per month for a couple. In fiscal 1975 and later years, the minimum Federal assistance level for an individual would be further increased to \$150 per month (\$1,800 per year). The amount for a couple would remain at \$200 per month (\$2,400 per year).

States could, if they wished, make assistance payments which would supplement the Federal benefits and assure aged, blind and disabled persons higher levels of total income.

In August 1971 the President requested that the effective date for the welfare provisions of H.R. 1 be delayed for one year. Thus the \$150 Federal guaranteed minimum income for the aged, blind and disabled would become effective in July 1975 rather than July 1974.

#### *Federal eligibility standards*

1. *Income*.—Aged, blind and disabled individuals and couples would be eligible for Federal assistance payments only if their total countable income from other sources was less than the minimum Federal assistance level (\$150 monthly for individuals, \$200 monthly for couples when the bill is fully effective). Countable income would not include the amount of any State supplemental assistance. Other forms of unearned income, such as social security benefits would generally be countable, with certain specified exceptions (for example irregular unearned income of \$60 or less per quarter).

2. *Resources*.—Eligibility under H.R. 1 for aid to the aged, blind and disabled could be established only if the resources of the individual (or the couple) were less than \$1,500. In determining this limitation the value of the home, household goods, personal effects and property needed for self-support would, if found reasonable, be excluded. Also, life insurance policies would not be counted if the face value of all policies was less than \$1,500.

3. *Definitions of blindness and disability*.—At present, each State determines the definition of blindness and disability. (However, Federally matched assistance based on disability is limited to persons aged 18 and over.) H.R. 1 would adopt essentially the definitions of disability and blindness used in the social security disability insurance program. It would also make assistance based on disability available to children under age 18.

4. *Drug and alcohol abuse*.—Under H.R. 1 individuals would not be eligible for assistance on the basis of disabilities caused, even partially, by drug or alcohol abuse unless they were undergoing appropriate treatment for these conditions at approved institutions. However, this limitation on eligibility would apply only if such treatment were available.

5. *Relative responsibility*.—Present law permits States to deny eligibility to aged, blind and disabled persons if they have relatives who can provide them with support. States may also require a lien against the individual's home as a condition of eligibility. H.R. 1

would take into account the income and resources of the relatives of applicants for assistance only if the relative were the applicant's spouse or the parent of an applicant who is a minor. There is no provision in H.R. 1 under which a lien could be imposed against the applicant's home.

6. *Value of room and board.*—In determining eligibility for and the amount of assistance under H.R. 1 the value of support and maintenance would be counted whether furnished in cash or kind. The room and board furnished to those living in someone else's household would be valued at one-third of the basic Federal assistance levels (i.e., one-third of \$150 for an individual or one-third of \$200 for a couple when the bill is fully effective).

7. *Food stamps.*—Persons eligible for assistance under H.R. 1 would not be eligible to participate in the food stamp program. There would, however, be no prohibition against their participation in the commodity distribution program.

*State supplementation of Federal benefits*

As of January 1972, 18 States have assistance levels for aged individuals which exceed \$150 and 26 States pay more than \$200 to aged couples.

States wishing to continue (or institute) higher levels of assistance for the aged, blind, and disabled than the Federal level specified in H.R. 1 could, at their option, supplement the Federal benefits. However, any such State supplementation would have to follow the Federal rules for the treatment of income (for example, the first \$720 earned in a year by an aged person and one-third of earnings in excess of \$720 would have to be disregarded).

1. *Federal administration of State payments.*—H.R. 1 would permit States to enter into agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Federal administration of State supplemental benefits. Under these agreements, supplemental payments would have to be made to all persons eligible for Federal assistance payments under H.R. 1 except that States could require a period of residence in the State as a condition of eligibility. (It should be noted that the General Counsel of HEW has already stated his opinion that this provision is unconstitutional.)

In addition, State supplementary payments if administered by the Federal Government would have to follow rules prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare as necessary "to achieve efficient and effective administration".

2. *Savings clause.*—The States would not be required to reimburse the Federal Government for any part of the costs of administering State supplementation. States would, however, have to pay for the full amount of the supplemental payments subject to a savings clause which limits the total amount of certain State expenditures for assistance to the aged, blind and disabled and to families to 1971 levels.

3. *Maintaining current welfare levels.*—H.R. 1 would require that all supplemental payments be at a level sufficient to maintain current welfare payment levels (adjusted upward for the loss of food stamp eligibility) until the State government took some affirmative action to eliminate or set a different level of supplementation.

4. *State administration of supplemental payments.*—If the State elected to administer its own supplemental payments, there would be no Federal sharing of administrative costs and the savings clause would not apply. The State would have to follow the Federal income exclusion rules but would otherwise be free to establish all terms and conditions of eligibility for supplementation.

*Administrative provisions*

1. *Federally administered.*—H.R. 1 would provide for the basic Federal program of aid to the aged, blind and disabled to be administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The bill would require the Secretary of HEW to prescribe requirements for the filing of applications, the furnishing of evidence and the reporting of events and changes in circumstances as necessary to determine eligibility for assistance. Individuals who failed promptly to make required reports or to furnish evidence required could be penalized by a reduction in their assistance payments. The penalty would be a \$25 reduction for the first failure, \$50 for the second, and \$100 for each failure after the first two. (The bill also includes criminal penalties for cases of fraud.) In addition, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare could require other Federal agencies to provide any information which was needed to determine or verify eligibility for or the amount of benefits.

2. *Advance payments.*—H.R. 1 would permit the Department to pay as an advance against future benefits up to \$100 to individuals who at the time they initially applied for assistance were facing a financial emergency and appeared to be eligible. Persons applying for assistance on the basis of disability could be paid benefits for up to 3 months pending the determination of whether they were disabled. *Payments under this provision would not be considered overpayments if the individual were subsequently determined not to be disabled.*

H.R. 1 also includes administrative provisions dealing with the frequency of payments, payments on behalf of eligibles to other persons, payments to the blind or disabled for 2 months following their recovery from blindness or disability, adjustment for overpayments and underpayments, procedures for hearings and review, and the representation of claimants.

3. *Incentives for choosing Federal administration of State welfare benefits.*—In addition to administering the basic Federal payments, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare would also administer State supplemental payments for those States agreeing to Federal administration. H.R. 1 would coerce States to enter into agreements of this sort by providing no Federal sharing in administrative costs if the State chooses to administer its own supplementation program, by providing 100 percent Federal funding of administrative costs if the program is federally administered, and by making Federal administration necessary in order for a State to benefit from the savings clause which limits certain of their welfare costs to 1971 levels.

*Treatment of State and local welfare employees*

The House bill as well as the House report makes no mention of present State and local welfare employees. The Administration has submitted an amendment to H.R. 1 dealing with the treatment



of these employees once the welfare programs are Federally administered. This issue has been of great concern to employee organizations.

Specifically, the Administration's amendment would provide for the following:

1. *Eligibility for appointment as Federal employee.*—Present State and local welfare employees whose jobs relate to the determining of eligibility for welfare or the making of welfare payments would be eligible for appointment as Federal welfare employees without regard to the usual requirements for Federal employment.

2. *Conditions of appointment.*—An individual holding a career or career-conditional appointment under a State or local merit system would be eligible for career or career-conditional Federal appointment.

3. *Employee pay.*—A former State or local employee would be paid for at least two years at the Federal pay rate which least exceeds his former pay rate; thereafter, the pay rate would be reduced to the top of the applicable grade or schedule under which he is serving if this rate is lower.

4. *Credit for prior service.*—For purposes of most employee benefits related to length of service, former State and local welfare employees would receive full credit for their prior service.

5. *Sick leave.*—Any State or local sick leave outstanding would be credited to the employee for Federal sick leave purposes.

6. *Retirement benefits.*—A former State or local employee with more than two years of State or local service who does not qualify for a State or local retirement benefit based on this service would have his Federal retirement benefit increased by \$10 per year for each full month of State or local service credited for State or local retirement annuity purposes prior to his Federal appointment.

### Comparison of H.R. 1 with 1970 Senate bill

The 1970 Senate bill would have established, effective April 1971, a nationally uniform minimum assistance level for the aged, blind and disabled of \$130 per month for an individual or \$200 for a couple. H.R. 1 would establish, effective July 1972, a nationally uniform minimum assistance level of \$130 per month for aged, blind or disabled individuals or \$195 per month for couples. H.R. 1 would also provide for further increases to \$140 and \$200 in fiscal year 1974 and to \$150 and \$200 in fiscal year 1975. (The President has subsequently requested that these effective dates in H.R. 1 be postponed 12 months.)

Although the 1970 Senate bill would have established Federal minimum assistance levels, it would have kept the programs of aid to the aged, blind and disabled as State-administered programs. It would have required States to follow the definitions of blindness and disability used in the social security program of disability insurance and would have prohibited the imposition of liens against a blind individual's property as a condition of eligibility for aid to the blind. Otherwise, however, the Senate bill would have left to the States the determination of such eligibility requirements as the level of allowable

resources. H.R. 1, by contrast, would make the basic program of assistance to the aged, blind and disabled a wholly Federal responsibility with Federal administration and Federal determination of all conditions of eligibility. State supplemental payments would have to conform to the Federal eligibility requirements if they were Federally administered, except that the States could impose a duration of residency requirement.

The 1970 Senate bill would also have retained the current law matching provisions under which the Federal Government pays a portion (50 percent to 83 percent, depending primarily upon State per capita income) of the total assistance payment. All States would, however, have been assured sufficient Federal funding that their costs in future years for assistance to the aged, blind and disabled at the levels required by the bill would not have had to exceed 90 percent of their costs for these programs in calendar year 1970. H.R. 1 would eliminate the matching provisions of present law. The basic Federal benefits for the aged, blind and disabled (\$150 for individuals or \$200 for couples when the bill is fully effective in 1975) would be financed entirely from Federal funds. Any State supplemental benefits would be financed entirely from State funds. As a result, it is estimated that in fiscal year 1973 there would be 21 States in which total Federal payments for persons in the aged, blind and disabled categories would be less under H.R. 1 than under current law. If these States provide supplemental payments, their total expenditures would be protected by a savings clause in the bill.

## MAJOR ISSUES CONCERNING AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

### *1. Federal vs. State Administration*

H.R. 1 proposes the establishment of an entirely Federal program of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, with Federal employees administering the program directly. Under the incentives in the bill, there would most likely also be Federal administration of State supplementary payments. The 1970 Senate bill instead proposed a continuation of the Federal-State program with States determining eligibility and payment levels (as long as they were at least as high as the minimum established in Federal law).

*Advantages of Federal administration.*—The following arguments have been made in favor of Federal administration of aid to the aged, blind and disabled:

1. *Uniform eligibility requirements.*—Each State currently sets its own asset, resource and other requirements of eligibility for aid to the aged, blind and disabled. H.R. 1 would set uniform eligibility requirements applicable to all States.

2. *Efficiency.*—Federal administration by the Social Security Administration would lead to economies of scale and more efficient operations.

3. *Fiscal control.*—By administering the program directly, the Federal Government would be able to control expenditures under

the program. As Secretary Richardson said in his opening statement at the Committee hearings on H.R. 1: "No longer will the Federal Government be in a situation in which it must match expenditures determined solely by the States. No longer will the Federal Government be required to monitor, in every detail, each State's compliance with Federal statutes and regulations." (Hearings on H.R. 1, p. 32)

*Advantages of continuing State administration.*—These are the major arguments in favor of continuing State administration of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled:

1. *Effective date.*—With State administration, the new guaranteed income level could be made effective within a few months, at the same time the social security benefit increase becomes effective. Representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have stated to the Committee that they will require at least 18 months from the date of enactment to put into effect a fully Federal system.

2. *New costs.*—Since State employees are already administering the programs of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled, massive efforts to recruit, hire and train new employees and to obtain office space and equipment for them would be unnecessary. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that there are currently about 10,000 State and local employees involved in administering aid to the aged, blind, and disabled; they project that the Social Security Administration will require 15,000 employees to administer the wholly Federal program.

3. *State and county employee rights.*—Continuing the present administrative structure would avoid the complex problems of dealing with employees who have earned rights as State or local employees and who would either have to be granted special privileges or lose those rights if they were to become Federal employees.

4. *The aged, blind, and disabled have not been part of the "welfare mess".*—Criticism of present welfare programs has revolved around Aid to Families with Dependent Children, not aid to the aged, blind, and disabled or the way it is administered. However, a recent Health, Education, and Welfare study has shown the aged, blind, and disabled categories involve an *ineligibility rate* of about 5 percent. At the same time the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has required States to use the "declaration method" in determining eligibility for assistance. Using the traditional method of determining eligibility, with verification of information provided by the applicant, as the staff suggests, should appreciably lower the ineligibility rate.

5. *State supplementation.*—Many witnesses before the Committee expressed their concern that under H.R. 1 States might regard the Federal benefit as sufficient and not provide a supplementary payment to maintain benefits at least at present levels. Under the approach adopted by the Committee in 1970, States would continue to be free to set payment levels providing they were no less

than the Federal minimum. State supplementation of Federal benefits would not be a problem because there would only be one payment, the State welfare payment, with Federal sharing.

6. *Different eligibility requirements.*—States today have various asset and resource eligibility requirements for aid to the aged, blind and disabled. A single Federal eligibility standard would either result in a number of persons being ineligible who are now receiving welfare or would require some form of grandfather clause.

7. *Separateness of Social Security Trust Funds.*—H.R. 1 contemplates the use of social security district offices, payment centers, automatic data processing, etc. Though the House contemplated that none of these costs could be borne by the social security trust funds, as a practical matter it might be difficult to allocate accurately between the social security and welfare functions. By attributing welfare administrative expenses to the social security programs (and there would be pressures to do so), the size of the Federal fund deficit would be reduced.

## **2. Guaranteed Minimum Income Level and Relationship With Social Security**

### *Present Law*

When the Social Security Act became law in 1935, it was anticipated that social insurance would provide a basic income for the elderly, while old-age assistance would decline as more and more persons became eligible for social security. Over the years, this anticipation has by and large been realized; the proportion of persons 65 and over receiving public assistance has declined from 23 percent in 1950 to 10 percent today. Generally speaking, public assistance has been considered a residual program, a source of income after all other sources have been taken into account. Each State has been allowed to set assistance payments at the level it has deemed appropriate. These levels are shown on tables A and B at the end of this pamphlet.

If a national guaranteed minimum income level is to be set for aged, blind and disabled persons, at what level should this be set? Present State payment levels are such that only about 7 percent of aged social security beneficiaries also receive assistance. (About three-fifths of all old-age assistance recipients also receive social security benefits.) A guaranteed minimum income of \$150 for an individual and \$200 for a couple would substantially increase both of these percentages.

Under present law, generally speaking all income from social security, railroad retirement, civil service annuity or other retirement benefit programs linked to work reduces welfare payments to an aged, blind, or disabled recipient on a dollar-for-dollar basis. This means that an aged person receiving a small social security benefit is virtually no better off than if he had never worked at all.

### *Effect of H.R. 1*

H.R. 1 would not change this situation; it would actually aggravate it. The bill would guarantee a minimum income for an aged person of \$130 a month beginning July 1972, rising to \$140 in July 1973 and to \$150 in July 1974 and thereafter—with this amount generally reduced \$1 for each \$1 of social security received. An individual who has worked all his life in low-wage employment will find that all those social security taxes he paid over the years will gain him nothing. For example, a man who has worked at the minimum wage for 30 or more years in employment covered by social security would, under H.R. 1, be eligible for social security benefits of \$150 monthly when he retires at age 65—exactly the same amount as he would get on welfare under H.R. 1 if he had never worked at all. If his average earnings under social security are \$250 monthly (\$3,000 annually), his social security benefits under H.R. 1 will be \$152.90 monthly—only \$2.90 more than if he had never worked. Average earnings of \$300 monthly (\$3,600 annually) will result in social security benefits of \$169 monthly under H.R. 1, and average earnings of \$333 monthly (\$4,000 annually) yield monthly social security benefits of \$180.10—\$19 and \$30.10 higher, respectively, than the welfare guarantee.

### *Alternative Proposal*

The Committee asked the staff to look into ways of assuring that a person who contributed to social security (or other similar programs) over his working lifetime, or who is the wife or widow of such a person, is always better off than someone who has not worked.

One way this could be done, at a far lower cost than the House bill, would be to require the States to pay a minimum income of \$130 for an individual and \$200 for a couple (as approved by the Senate in 1970, rather than \$150 for an individual and \$200 for a couple as in H.R. 1) but to require in addition that they disregard one-third of social security or other work-related retirement benefits (up to \$200 for an individual and \$300 for a couple) in determining need for welfare. The effect of this would be to assure that an individual with social security (or other work-related benefits) is always better off than an individual with no work-related benefits, as shown in the table below:

### 1. BENEFITS FOR AN INDIVIDUAL IN STATE NOW PAYING \$130 TO PERSON WITH NO OTHER INCOME

Social security and other work-related retirement benefits	Welfare payment under—		Total income under—	
	H.R. 1	Alternative proposal	H.R. 1 <sup>1</sup>	Alternative proposal
None.....	\$150	\$130	\$150	\$130
\$90.....	60	70	150	160
\$120.....	30	50	150	170
\$150.....	0	30	150	180
\$180.....	0	10	180	190

### 2. BENEFITS FOR AN INDIVIDUAL IN STATE PAYING \$150 TO PERSON WITH NO OTHER INCOME

None.....	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150
\$90.....	60	90	150	180
\$120.....	30	70	150	190
\$150.....	0	50	150	200
\$180.....	0	30	180	210
\$210.....	0	7	210	217

### 3. BENEFITS FOR A COUPLE IN STATE PAYING \$200 TO COUPLE WITH NO OTHER INCOME

None.....	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200
\$120.....	80	120	200	240
\$150.....	50	100	200	250
\$180.....	20	80	200	260
\$210.....	0	60	210	270
\$240.....	0	40	240	280
\$270.....	0	20	270	290
\$300.....	0	0	300	300

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of simplicity, neglects the effect of a disregard of small amounts of social security income under present law.

It should be noted that under the alternative proposal, most welfare recipients who also receive social security would be assured of receiving a part of any social security benefit increase, eliminating the need for the special pass-along provisions in present (or future) law.

If this alternative were to be adopted, along with certain improvements in social security benefits the Committee may wish to consider, the effect would be to shift funds in the House bill to place much higher priority in distributing additional funds to persons who have worked for long periods in low-income jobs. This is shown clearly in the table below:

**COMPARISON OF BENEFITS UNDER H.R. 1 AND ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL FOR AN INDIVIDUAL RETIRING AT AGE 65 IN A STATE NOW PAYING AID TO THE AGED OF \$130 TO A PERSON WITH NO OTHER INCOME**

[Rounded to nearest dollar]

Average wages under social security	Years worked under social security	Social security benefit		Welfare payment <sup>1</sup>		Total income	
		Present law	H.R. 1	Alternative proposal	Present law	H.R. 1	Alternative proposal
.....	None	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
\$150.....	20	\$112	\$118	\$123	\$130	\$150	\$130
\$150.....	25	112	125	160	38	32	130
					38	25	130
\$200.....	20	129	135	141	1	15	130
\$200.....	25	129	135	160	1	15	130
\$200.....	30	129	150	200	1	.....	130
\$250.....	20	146	153	160	.....	.....	146
\$250.....	25	146	153	160	.....	.....	146
\$250.....	30	146	153	200	.....	.....	146

<sup>1</sup> For sake of simplicity, neglects the effect of disregard of small amounts of social security income under present law.

Under the alternative proposal, welfare recipients would not be eligible for food stamps, but States would be reimbursed the full cost of adjusting assistance levels to make up for the loss of entitlement to food stamps.

*Staff suggestion.*—It is recommended that the Committee approve the alternative proposal outlined above. The costs of H.R. 1 and the alternative proposal are compared in the table below:

COMPARISON OF COST OF AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND  
DISABLED UNDER H.R. 1 AND ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

[Dollars in billions]

	H.R. 1 <sup>1</sup>	Alternative proposal
1. Federal share of payments under present law, fiscal year 1974.....	\$2.2	\$2.2
2. Increased welfare costs under proposal:		
a. Guaranteed income level <sup>2</sup> .....	3.4	1.1
b. Partial disregard of work-related retirement income.....		.6
3. Decreased food stamp costs.....	-.4	-.4
4. Welfare savings due to social security increase.....	-.2	-.1
5. Subtotal, net increased costs.....	2.6	1.2
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of comparability, assumes guaranteed monthly income of \$150 in fiscal 1974, although H.R. 1 does not actually reach a \$150 guarantee level until fiscal 1975.

<sup>2</sup> Includes cost of adjusting assistance level to make up for the loss of entitlement to food stamps.



*Higher Guaranteed Income Levels*

The Committee may wish to consider guaranteeing a higher minimum income than \$130 monthly to persons having no work-related retirement benefits. The cost associated with various guaranteed minimum income levels is shown in the following two tables. Table 1 shows the additional Federal cost of various guarantee levels if Federal administration (as contemplated in H.R. 1) is adopted; table 2 shows the additional Federal cost of various guarantee levels if aid to the aged, blind, and disabled remains State-administered under the alternative proposal.

**TABLE 1.—AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED: FEDERAL COST OF VARIOUS GUARANTEED MINIMUM INCOME LEVELS UNDER APPROACH IN H.R. 1**

[Dollars in billions]

	Guarantee level for individual/couple				
	\$130/ \$195	\$140/ \$200	\$150/ \$200	\$160/ \$215	\$170/ \$225
1. Federal share of payments, under present law, fiscal year 1974..	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$2.2
2. Increased welfare costs under proposal.....	2.0	2.6	3.4	4.2	4.8
3. Decreased food stamp costs.....	-.4	-.4	-.4	-.4	-.4
4. Welfare savings due to social security increase:					
5 percent increase....	-.1	-.2	-.2	-.2	-.3
10 percent increase...	-.3	-.3	-.4	-.5	-.5
5. Subtotal, net increased costs (with 5 percent social security increase).....	1.5	2.0	2.8	3.6	4.1
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>6.3</b>

**TABLE 2.—AID TO THE AGED, BLIND AND DISABLED: FEDERAL COST OF VARIOUS GUARANTEED MINIMUM INCOME LEVELS UNDER APPROACH IN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL**

[In billions of dollars]

	Guarantee level for an individual/couple				
	\$130/ \$200	\$140/ \$200	\$150/ \$200	\$160/ \$215	\$170/ \$225
1. Federal share of payments under present law, fiscal year 1974.	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$2.2
2. Increased welfare costs under proposal:					
a. Guaranteed income level . . .	1.1	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.9
b. Partial disregard of work-related retirement income . . . . .	.6	.7	.9	1.0	1.2
3. Decreased food stamp costs . . . . .	-.4	-.4	-.4	-.4	-.4
4. Welfare savings due to social security increase . . . . .	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.2
5. Subtotal, net increased costs . . . . .	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.2	2.5
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.7</b>

### ***3. Pass-along of Social Security Increase to Welfare Recipients***

*(Note: This section would be applicable only if the committee decides not to disregard a portion of social security benefits as discussed above.)*

*A. 1972 social security benefit increase.*—Under H.R. 1 social security benefits would be increased by 5 percent with the minimum basic social security benefit increased from \$70.40 to \$74.00. If no modification were made in the present welfare law, many needy aged, blind and disabled persons would get no benefit from the social security increases since offsetting reductions would be made in their welfare grants.

For example, an aged widow in the State of New Jersey is now eligible for a public assistance grant which will assure her of a total monthly income of \$157. If she now gets the minimum social security benefit of \$70.40, her assistance grant would be \$86.60. If her social security benefit is raised to \$74, her welfare grant would be reduced

to \$83, leaving her with the same total monthly income of \$157 and no net benefit from her social security increase.

To assure that such individuals would enjoy at least some benefit from the social security increase, the Committee may wish to require States to raise their standards of need for aged, blind and disabled welfare recipients by \$4 a month for a single individual and by \$6 a month for a couple. With such a provision, all recipients of aid to the aged, blind and disabled, including those who are not social security beneficiaries as well as those who are, would enjoy an increase in total monthly income of at least \$4 (\$6 in the case of a couple). Thus, in the above example, the widow in New Jersey would receive a total monthly income of \$161 as compared with the present \$157, and would receive the full benefit of the social security increase.

This approach was used in an amendment adopted by the Committee and the Senate as part of the 1970 social security bill, and it is the approach taken in Ribicoff Amendment No. 905.

Senator Cranston has introduced a bill (S. 3328) which would require States to increase their needs standards under aid to the aged, blind, and disabled by the amount of the general social security benefit increase each time such an increase occurs. The Cranston bill would include in this passalong not only the social security benefit increase under H.R. 1. but also would require a 10 percent immediate increase in needs standards related to the 10 percent social security benefit increase which became effective last year.

*B. Disregard of certain retroactive benefits.*—A number of the social security cash benefit provisions in H.R. 1 are effective retroactive to January 1972 (for example, the increase in a widow's benefit from 82½ percent to 100 percent of her deceased husband's benefit). If any of these increases remain retroactive in the Committee bill, the Committee may wish to consider requiring States to disregard any separate retroactive benefit increase check received by welfare recipients as a result of the enactment of H.R. 1. A similar disregard of a retroactive increase check was provided with respect to both the 1970 and 1971 social security benefit increases.

*C. Extension of pass-along of portion of 1970 social security benefit increase.*—When social security benefits were increased in 1970, the Congress required States to insure that at least \$4 of the benefit increase was passed on to recipients of Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled. If no further action is taken, this provision will expire at the end of December 1972. H.R. 1 would make the provision permanent.

#### **4. Definitions of Blindness and Disability**

*Present Law.*—Under present law each State is free to prescribe its own definition of blindness and disability for purposes of eligibility for aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

*Senate Action in 1970.*—The Committee and the Senate in 1970 approved provisions setting a Federal definition of blindness and disability for purposes of the welfare programs.

The term "disability" was defined in the 1970 bill as "inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to

result in death or has lasted or can be expected to last for a continuous period of not less than 12 months." Under the disability insurance program, this definition is now found in section 223(d)(1) of the Social Security Act. The provisions of the disability insurance program further specify that this definition is met only if the disability is so severe that an individual "is not only unable to do his previous work but cannot, considering his age, education, and work experience, engage in any other kind of substantial gainful work which exists in the national economy, regardless of whether such work exists in the immediate area in which he lives, or whether a specific job vacancy exists for him, or whether he would be hired if he applied for work." (Sec. 223(d)(2)(A).) This same test would have applied in determining eligibility for welfare under the 1970 bill.

The term "blindness" was defined as central visual acuity of 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lens. (Sec. 216(i)(1)(B).) Also included in this definition was the particular sight limitation which is referred to as "tunnel vision."

The 1970 bill would have permitted States to continue assistance to disabled or blind individuals who were already on the rolls under the existing State definition, but who would not have met the Federal definition of blindness or disability.

*H.R. 1.*—The House bill would also apply these definitions of disability and blindness to all new applicants for assistance to the blind and disabled.

*Staff Suggestion.*—It is recommended that the Committee approve again the amendment it approved in 1970.

### **5. Welfare Benefits for Alcoholics and Drug Addicts**

*H.R. 1.*—Under the House-passed bill, an individual whose disability results in whole or part from drug abuse or alcohol abuse is eligible for welfare benefits only if he is "undergoing any treatment that may be appropriate for such abuse at an institution or facility approved for purposes of this paragraph by the Secretary *so long as such treatment is available.*" (section 2011(e)(3); emphasis added)

The House report contains the following statement:

"Your committee believes that those people who are disabled, in whole or in part, as a result of the use of drugs or alcohol should not be entitled to benefits under this program unless they undergo appropriate, available treatment in an approved facility, and the bill so provides. Your committee, while recognizing that the use of drugs or alcohol may indeed cause disabling conditions, believes that when the condition is susceptible to treatment, appropriate treatment at Government expense is an essential part of the rehabilitation process of people so disabled." (H. Rept. on H.R. 1, p. 149.)

Despite this statement in the report, there is no provision in the bill assuring that any treatment, at Government expense or otherwise, will actually be available.

*Staff suggestion.*—It is recommended that the Committee exclude alcoholics and drug addicts from eligibility for Federally shared welfare payments or at least limit Federal matching only to cases when

the maintenance payments are made as part of a program of rehabilitation and active treatment.

## **OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO AID FOR THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED**

### ***1. Disabled Children***

*Present Law.*—Under the Social Security Act today, Federally shared Aid to the Permanently and Totally Disabled is available only to disabled individuals 18 years of age or older. If a disabled child is a member of a needy family, he may be eligible along with the other members of the family for Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

*H.R. 1.*—The House-passed bill would extend Federal benefits to permanently and totally disabled persons under age 18. The benefits would be substantially higher than benefits for these children if they received family assistance. Parents' income and resources would have to be taken into account in determining the eligibility and benefits of children under 21, and the benefit would be reduced by one-third to reflect the value of room and board provided by the parent to the child.

*Cost.*—The cost of extending disability benefits to children under age 18 in H.R. 1 is estimated at about \$100 million.

*Elements of Consideration.*—The Committee on Ways and Means justified its inclusion of disabled children under age 18 under title XX, if it is to their advantage, rather than under the program for families with children, on the grounds that their needs are often greater than those of nondisabled children. The needs of disabled children, however, are generally greater only in the area of health care expenses. In all but the two States that do not have Medicaid programs, children now eligible for cash assistance are covered under existing State medical assistance programs. Disabled children's needs for food, clothing, and shelter are usually no greater than the needs of nondisabled children.

*Staff suggestion.*—It is recommended that aid to the disabled continue to be limited to persons 18 years of age and older.

### ***2. Relative Responsibility***

Under the present law, the States are permitted to deny welfare payments to aged, blind or disabled people if they have relatives who, under State law, are required to support them. Under H.R. 1, there would be no relative responsibility except for disabled or blind children under age 21 who are living with their parents. The 1970 Senate-passed bill contained a floor amendment by Senator Percy which would have prohibited the States from taking into account the financial responsibility of a relative in determining a blind adult's eligibility for assistance.

*Staff suggestion.*—It is recommended that the matter of determining relative responsibility be left to the States as under present law, but that States be required to actually seek the support they assume is available from relatives.

### 3. Earned Income Disregard

*Present law.*—Under present law, States are required to disregard a portion of the earnings of the aged, blind, and disabled:

(1) For the *aged* and for the *disabled*, an amount equal to work expenses must be disregarded; in addition, the State may at its option disregard the first \$20 of monthly earnings plus one-half of the next \$60;

(2) For the *blind*, the first \$85 of monthly earnings plus one-half of all earnings in excess of \$85 must be disregarded, in addition to an amount equal to work expenses; and

(3) For *blind and disabled persons participating in a plan for achieving self-support*, a State may disregard any income and resources as may be necessary for the fulfillment of the plan, for up to 36 months (for the blind, this additional disregard is required for at least 12 months).

*H.R. 1.*—The House bill would modify the earnings disregarded provisions of present law as follows:

(1) For the *aged*, work expenses would not be permitted as a separate income exemption, but the earnings disregard would be increased to \$60 monthly plus one-third of additional earnings;

(2) For the *blind*, the disregard of work expenses and a portion of earnings would remain as in present law; however, any income necessary for the fulfillment of a plan for achieving self-support would be disregarded with no limitation on the time necessary to complete the plan; and

(3) For the *disabled*, work expenses would not be allowed as a separate income exemption, but the earnings disregard would be increased to \$85 monthly plus one-half of additional earnings; in addition, any income necessary for the fulfillment of a plan for achieving self-support would be disregarded with no limitation on the time necessary to complete the plan.

The liberalizations of the earned income disregard provisions for the aged, blind, and disabled are estimated to cost about \$50 million in fiscal year 1973.

*Percy Amendment No. 875.*—Senator Percy has introduced an amendment endorsed by the American Council of the Blind to provide for the aged, blind, and disabled a disregard of \$133 of monthly earnings plus one-half of additional earnings, in addition to work expenses and income necessary for the fulfillment of a plan for achieving self-support. The \$133 disregard would be increased automatically as the cost of living rises. This amendment would cost an estimated \$181 million in fiscal year 1973.

*Staff suggestion.*—It is recommended that the Committee retain the earned income disregard provisions of present law without change.

### 4. Prohibition of Liens in Aid to the Blind

*Present Law.*—Under present law, States may at their discretion impose liens against the property of recipients of cash assistance grants.

*Senate Action In 1970.*—The Committee and the Senate in 1970 approved an amendment prohibiting the imposition of liens against

the property of blind individuals as a condition of eligibility for aid to the blind.

### **Amendments to H.R. 1 Not Discussed Above Relating to Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled**

#### **AMENDMENT NO. 800 (EAGLETON)**

*Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled.*—Eliminates the transitional payment levels in fiscal years 1971 and 1974 and instead guarantees minimum income to aged, blind, and disabled of \$150 for an individual and \$200 for a couple beginning July, 1972; H.R. 1 reaches these levels by July, 1974. Provides for automatic increases in guaranteed minimum as cost of living rises.

*Cost.*—The amendment will cost an estimated \$700 million in fiscal year 1974.

#### **AMENDMENT NO. 801 (EAGLETON)**

*Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled.*—Requires States to supplement Federal welfare payments to the aged, blind, and disabled to assure that they will receive at least as much as they would have received in June, 1972; provides 30 percent Federal matching for State supplementary payments.

*Cost.*—The H.R. 1 cost estimates already assume State supplementation at these levels, and there would thus be no additional cost associated with the amendment.

#### **AMENDMENT NO. 962 (HUMPHREY)**

*Adult Assistance Benefit Levels.*—Provides that the benefit levels under the adult assistance program shall be at the rate of \$2,000 a year for an individual and \$2,600 for a couple, starting July 1972.

#### **AMENDMENT NO. 1030 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Benefit Levels.*—Provides that the benefit levels under the adult assistance programs shall be set at the poverty level; the poverty level is defined as \$2,005 for an individual and \$2,589 for a couple for fiscal year 1973 and would be automatically increased for each fiscal year thereafter according to rises in the Consumer Price Index.

#### **AMENDMENT NO. 1031 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance State Supplementation.*—Provides that State supplementary payments under the adult assistance program will be equal to the amount that the individual (or couple) would have received under the State law in effect for June 1972, plus the bonus value of food stamps the individual (or couple) could have purchased for June 1972 minus the Federal adult assistance payment.

#### **AMENDMENT NO. 1032 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Income Exclusions.*—Excludes from the definition of income for the adult assistance programs irregularly received amounts of up to \$60 a quarter, earned income up to 75 percent of the



poverty level (as determined by the Secretary of HEW) plus one-half of any earnings above that amount; and amounts equal to expenses attributable to earning income.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1033 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Residence Requirements.*—Prohibits the States from imposing any residence requirement as a qualification for supplementary payments under the adult assistance program.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1034 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Emergency Payment.*—Provides that in addition to other benefits payable an applicant for adult assistance who appears to be eligible and who is in need may be paid an emergency payment of up to \$100. Under H.R. 1 a similar payment is authorized as a cash advance against future benefits.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1035 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Hearings and Review.*—Provides that an applicant for adult assistance payments may have a hearing on any adverse action taken on his application and that such hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1036 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Eligibility Requirements.*—Provides that an individual or a couple whose resources are less than the poverty level can qualify for adult assistance payments. Provides that in determining resources the cash value of insurance policies will be excluded if the total cash value does not exceed \$1,500. (H.R. 1 would exclude the value of insurance policies if the total face value is not more than \$1,000.)

**AMENDMENT NO. 1037 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Emergency Payments for Nonrecurring Expenses.*—Provides that when a person whose resources are insufficient to meet basic needs of a nonrecurring type makes initial application for adult assistance, he can receive payments sufficient to meet these needs if he is presumptively eligible for benefits.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1038 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Guarantee.*—Provides that the payments under the new adult assistance program will be increased to the level payable under the present State programs for people who could be entitled under the State programs if such programs had continued in existence.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1040 (TUNNEY)**

*Adult Assistance Applications.*—Requires the Secretary of HEW to conduct a study of the feasibility of using a single application for social security benefits and for payments under the adult assistance program. A report on the study with the Secretary's recommendations would be sent to Congress not later than July 1, 1973.

## Statistical Material

**TABLE A.—OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE: MONTHLY AMOUNT FOR BASIC NEEDS UNDER FULL STANDARD AND LARGEST AMOUNT PAID FOR BASIC NEEDS BY STATE, NOVEMBER 1971**

	Aged individual		Aged couple	
	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs
Alabama.....	\$146	\$103	\$242	\$206
Alaska.....	250	250	350	350
Arizona.....	118	118	164	164
Arkansas.....	149	105	249	210
California.....	178	178	320	320
Colorado.....	140	140	280	280
Connecticut.....	176	176	224	224
Delaware.....	140	140	197	197
District of Columbia.....	150	113	206	155
Florida.....	114	114	210	210
Georgia.....	100	91	165	165
Guam.....	140	140	201	201
Hawaii.....	132	132	205	205
Idaho.....	182	182	219	219
Illinois.....	183	183	224	224
Indiana.....	185	80	247	160
Iowa.....	122	117	186	178
Kansas.....	141	110	190	147
Kentucky.....	96	96	160	160
Louisiana.....	147	100	235	188
Maine.....	115	115	198	198
Maryland.....	130	96	187	131
Massachusetts.....	189	189	280	280
Michigan.....	165	165	218	218
Minnesota.....	158	158	210	210
Mississippi.....	150	75	218	150
Missouri.....	181	85	257	170
Montana.....	120	111	192	175
Nebraska.....	182	182	235	235
Nevada.....	169	169	271	271

TABLE A.—**OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE: MONTHLY AMOUNT FOR BASIC NEEDS UNDER FULL STANDARD AND LARGEST AMOUNT PAID FOR BASIC NEEDS BY STATE, NOVEMBER 1971—Continued**

	Aged individual		Aged couple	
	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs
New Hampshire.....	\$173	\$173	\$238	\$238
New Jersey.....	162	162	222	222
New Mexico.....	116	116	155	155
New York.....	159	159	219	219
North Carolina.....	115	115	150	150
North Dakota.....	125	125	190	190
Ohio.....	126	126	208	208
Oklahoma.....	130	130	212	212
Oregon.....	141	113	200	160
Pennsylvania.....	138	138	208	208
Puerto Rico.....	54	22	88	34
Rhode Island.....	163	163	211	211
South Carolina.....	87	80	121	121
South Dakota.....	180	180	220	220
Tennessee.....	102	97	142	142
Texas.....	119	119	192	192
Utah.....	106	106	142	142
Vermont.....	177	177	233	233
Virgin Islands.....	52	52	103	103
Virginia.....	152	152	199	199
Washington.....	192	192	247	247
West Virginia.....	146	76	186	97
Wisconsin.....	108	108	164	164
Wyoming.....	139	108	195	186

**TABLE B.—AID TO THE BLIND AND AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED: MONTHLY AMOUNT FOR BASIC NEEDS UNDER FULL STANDARD AND LARGEST AMOUNT PAID FOR BASIC NEEDS BY STATE, NOVEMBER 1971**

	Blind individual		Disabled individual	
	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs
Alabama.....	\$105	\$75	\$122	\$71
Alaska.....	250	250	250	250
Arizona.....	118	118	118	118
Arkansas.....	149	105	149	105
California.....	192	192	172	172
Colorado.....	103	103	123	123
Connecticut.....	176	176	176	176
Delaware.....	189	150	117	117
District of Columbia.....	150	113	150	113
Florida.....	114	114	114	114
Georgia.....	100	91	100	91
Guam.....	140	140	140	140
Hawaii.....	132	132	132	132
Idaho.....	182	182	182	182
Illinois.....	183	183	183	183
Indiana.....	185	125	185	80
Iowa.....	161	156	122	117
Kansas.....	141	110	141	110
Kentucky.....	96	96	96	96
Louisiana.....	106	101	84	66
Maine.....	115	115	115	115
Maryland.....	130	96	130	96
Massachusetts.....	223	223	178	178
Michigan.....	165	165	165	165
Minnesota.....	158	158	158	158

**TABLE B.—AID TO THE BLIND AND AID TO THE PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED: MONTHLY AMOUNT FOR BASIC NEEDS UNDER FULL STANDARD AND LARGEST AMOUNT PAID FOR BASIC NEEDS BY STATE, NOVEMBER 1971—Con.**

	Blind individual		Disabled individual	
	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs	Monthly amount for basic needs	Largest amount paid for basic needs
Mississippi.....	\$150	\$75	\$150	\$75
Missouri.....	255	100	170	80
Montana.....	132	123	120	111
Nebraska.....	182	182	182	182
Nevada.....	155	155	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
New Hampshire.....	173	173	173	173
New Jersey.....	162	162	162	162
New Mexico.....	116	116	116	116
New York.....	159	159	159	159
North Carolina.....	126	126	115	115
North Dakota.....	125	125	125	125
Ohio.....	126	126	126	116
Oklahoma.....	130	130	130	130
Oregon.....	151	151	141	113
Pennsylvania.....	150	150	138	138
Puerto Rico.....	54	22	54	22
Rhode Island.....	163	163	163	163
South Carolina.....	104	95	87	80
South Dakota.....	180	180	180	180
Tennessee.....	102	97	102	97
Texas.....	116	110	116	105
Utah.....	116	116	106	106
Vermont.....	177	177	177	177
Virgin Islands.....	51	52	52	52
Virginia.....	153	153	152	152
Washington.....	192	192	190	190
West Virginia.....	146	76	146	76
Wisconsin.....	108	108	108	108
Wyoming.....	139	108	127	108

<sup>1</sup> No program.

TABLE C.—NUMBER OF PERSONS AGED 65 OR OVER RECEIVING OASDHI CASH BENEFITS, OAA MONEY PAYMENTS, OR BOTH, BY STATE, FEBRUARY 1971

State	Number			Number per 1,000 aged population				
	Unduplicated total	OASDHI <sup>2</sup>	OAA	Both OASDHI and OAA	Unduplicated total	OASDHI <sup>2</sup>	OAA	Both OASDHI and OAA
Total.....	18,193,000	17,390,000	2,080,000	1,277,000	888	849	102	62
Alabama.....	302,000	261,000	115,000	74,300	916	792	350	225
Alaska.....	6,000	5,200	1,800	1,000	852	743	257	147
Arizona.....	144,000	138,000	12,500	6,900	859	826	75	41
Arkansas.....	220,000	198,000	58,100	36,000	916	824	242	150
California.....	1,639,000	1,546,000	332,000	229,000	897	846	176	126
Colorado.....	169,000	158,000	38,600	28,200	885	830	202	147
Connecticut.....	257,000	254,000	8,200	4,800	880	868	28	16
Delaware.....	40,000	39,400	2,400	1,800	910	895	56	42
District of Columbia.....	52,800	50,900	3,700	1,800	754	727	53	26
Florida.....	846,000	823,000	60,000	37,700	827	805	59	37
Georgia.....	338,000	294,000	92,400	48,600	902	785	247	130
Hawaii.....	41,300	40,400	2,400	1,600	917	898	53	34
Idaho.....	63,600	62,500	3,300	2,200	922	906	48	32
Illinois.....	957,000	939,000	34,500	17,000	867	851	31	15
Indiana.....	448,000	443,000	16,100	11,200	899	889	32	22

See footnotes at end of table.

Iowa.....	332,000	313,000	23,000	14,000	912	886	65	40
Kansas.....	237,000	232,000	11,800	6,900	880	862	44	26
Kentucky.....	310,000	285,000	62,800	37,300	910	835	184	109
Louisiana.....	276,000	232,000	118,000	74,100	886	745	379	238
Maine.....	108,000	105,000	10,700	7,900	937	912	93	68
Maryland.....	253,000	249,000	8,800	4,300	830	815	29	14
Massachusetts.....	543,000	531,000	50,800	38,300	857	838	80	60
Michigan.....	712,000	696,000	40,200	23,900	933	912	53	31
Minnesota.....	369,000	362,000	19,600	12,500	889	872	47	30
Mississippi.....	210,000	178,000	77,200	46,100	932	793	343	205
Missouri.....	504,000	474,000	94,600	64,300	889	836	167	133
Montana.....	62,700	61,300	3,600	2,100	909	888	52	31
Nebraska.....	164,000	161,000	7,600	4,600	883	867	41	25
Nevada.....	26,700	26,100	3,000	2,400	835	816	95	76
New Hampshire.....	73,000	72,100	4,500	3,500	913	901	56	44
New Jersey.....	616,000	609,000	18,700	11,600	873	863	26	16
New Mexico.....	64,300	59,300	9,200	4,200	893	824	128	59
New York.....	1,748,000	1,709,000	108,000	68,600	885	866	55	35
North Carolina.....	386,000	366,000	36,400	16,200	915	867	86	39
North Dakota.....	61,500	60,000	3,800	2,300	918	896	56	34
Ohio.....	885,000	862,000	54,600	30,800	880	856	54	31
Oklahoma.....	274,000	243,000	71,600	40,500	902	800	235	133
Oregon.....	210,000	207,000	8,100	5,000	909	896	35	22
Pennsylvania.....	1,134,000	1,113,000	50,500	29,200	883	867	39	23
Puerto Rico.....	155,000	133,000	22,200	260	1,000	866	144	2

TABLE C.—NUMBER OF PERSONS AGED 65 OR OVER RECEIVING OASDHI CASH BENEFITS, OAA MONEY PAYMENTS, OR BOTH, BY STATE, FEBRUARY 1971—Continued

State	Number			Number per 1,000 aged population				
	Unduplicated total	OASDHI <sup>1</sup>	OAA	Both OASDHI and OAA	Unduplicated total	OASDHI <sup>1</sup>	OAA	Both OASDHI and OAA
Rhode Island.....	93,000	92,200	4,000	3,200	886	878	38	31
South Carolina.....	177,000	164,000	18,500	5,700	907	842	95	29
South Dakota.....	74,700	72,800	4,200	2,300	922	899	52	29
Tennessee.....	350,000	324,000	53,000	27,400	900	834	136	70
Texas.....	896,000	805,000	233,000	142,000	884	794	230	140
Utah.....	69,200	67,500	3,100	1,400	876	854	40	18
Vermont.....	44,400	43,200	4,400	3,300	924	900	93	68
Virgin Islands.....	2,100	1,800	340	17	643	545	102	5
Virginia.....	320,000	313,000	13,500	6,600	863	844	36	18
Washington.....	296,000	289,000	21,900	14,700	899	878	66	45
West Virginia.....	178,000	171,000	12,200	4,900	911	873	62	25
Wisconsin.....	483,000	431,000	18,400	11,200	916	901	39	23
Wyoming.....	26,900	26,400	1,600	1,100	868	852	50	34

<sup>1</sup> Massachusetts data for February 1970.

<sup>2</sup> State data estimated as of Jan. 31, 1971, by the Social Security Administration.