

WELFARE REFORM

FISCAL RELIEF FOR STATES

Explanation of Committee Decisions

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



JUNE 5, 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*

MICHAEL STERN, *Assistant Chief Clerk*

(II)

CONTENTS

	Page
Fiscal Relief for States.....	1
A. Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled.....	5
B. Federal Funding of Aid to Families with Dependent Children.....	10
1. Fiscal Relief for the States in the Last 6 Months of Calendar Year 1972.....	10
2. Federal Funding in Calendar Year 1973.....	10
3. Federal Funding in Calendar Year 1974 and There- after.....	14
Tables:	
1. State Savings in Welfare Payment Costs, 1974.....	2
2. Impact on States of Committee Decision with Respect to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled in Fiscal Year 1974..	7
3. Impact of Committee Decision on State AFDC costs for 1972 and 1973.....	11
4. Impact of Committee Decision on 1974 State Costs of Aid to Families with Dependent Children.....	15

FISCAL RELIEF FOR STATES

The Finance Committee provisions will provide \$5 billion in fiscal relief to the States in the 2½ years between July 1972 and December 1974.

The fiscal relief for each State under the Committee decision is summarized in table 1. Overall, an estimated \$2.6 billion in fiscal relief would be provided in 1974, once the employment program approved by the Committee goes into effect. This contrasts with comparable savings of \$1.9 billion under H.R. 1 as it passed the House.

The Committee also provided for more than \$400 million in fiscal relief in the last six months of calendar year 1972 and more than \$800 million in fiscal relief in 1973; both savings figures relate to Aid to Families with Dependent Children. Additional savings related to Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled are estimated at about \$1 billion in calendar year 1973.

In summary, the committee decision would provide these savings to the States:

(dollars in billions)

	1972	1973	1974	Total
Aid to the Aged, Blind, and Disabled.....	\$0.2	\$1.0	\$1.2	\$2.4
Aid to Families with Dependent Children.....	0.4	0.8	1.4	2.6
Total.....	0.6	1.8	2.6	5.0

The details of the Committee decision are shown in the material following table 1.

TABLE 1.—STATE SAVINGS IN WELFARE PAYMENT COSTS, 1974¹

[In millions of dollars]

State	Committee proposal			Estimated savings under H.R. 1
	Adult categories	Family welfare benefits	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	
Total.....	1,230.4	1,378.9	2,609.3	1,859.2
Alabama.....	27.1	12.9	40.0	31.1
Alaska.....	2.6	2.9	5.5	3.5
Arizona.....	10.6	32.0	42.6	40.5
Arkansas.....	14.0	7.5	21.5	21.5
California.....	298.9	163.3	462.2	180.9
Colorado.....	15.9	15.3	31.2	16.5
Connecticut.....	10.4	11.5	21.9	16.7
Delaware.....	4.5	3.7	8.2	4.7
District of Columbia.....	10.4	45.4	55.8	50.8
Florida.....	32.6	90.3	122.9	135.3
Georgia.....	24.9	36.5	61.4	58.9
Hawaii.....	3.6	8.7	12.3	9.4
Idaho.....	1.7	1.8	3.5	2.0
Illinois.....	45.4	100.6	146.0	167.0
Indiana.....	9.2	29.2	38.4	28.2

Iowa.....	19.4	10.1	29.5	22.7
Kansas.....	7.0	13.2	20.2	12.1
Kentucky.....	15.4	10.8	26.2	15.3
Louisiana.....	32.8	39.5	72.3	68.8
Maine.....	4.4	3.2	7.6	2.5
Maryland.....	17.1	52.8	69.9	72.3
Massachusetts.....	51.5	39.9	91.4	64.8
Michigan.....	45.3	94.9	140.2	97.4
Minnesota.....	13.1	14.5	27.6	17.5
Mississippi.....	14.6	5.5	20.1	20.8
Missouri.....	34.3	15.0	49.3	10.8
Montana.....	1.8	1.7	3.5	1.7
Nebraska.....	2.4	4.4	6.8	7.1
Nevada.....	.8	1.9	2.7	1.7
New Hampshire.....	4.0	1.2	5.2	2.2
New Jersey.....	20.1	30.0	50.1	48.5
New Mexico.....	4.0	3.6	7.6	3.7
New York.....	168.5	135.8	304.3	168.3
North Carolina.....	19.9	16.7	36.6	31.2
North Dakota.....	2.1	2.2	4.3	1.2
Ohio.....	29.9	94.0	123.9	103.0
Oklahoma.....	33.5	14.1	47.6	39.0
Oregon.....	6.7	14.9	21.6	15.4
Pennsylvania.....	46.8	57.1	103.9	70.0
Rhode Island.....	4.4	9.4	13.8	7.1

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 1.—STATE SAVINGS IN WELFARE PAYMENT COSTS, 1974 —Continued

[In millions of dollars]

State	Committee proposal			Estimated savings under H.R. 1
	Adult categories	Family welfare benefits	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	
South Carolina.....	5.9	7.0	12.9	12.9
South Dakota.....	.7	1.4	2.1	1.4
Tennessee.....	13.2	16.3	29.5	26.8
Texas.....	42.4	32.5	74.9	44.8
Utah.....	2.5	5.6	8.1	5.2
Vermont.....	2.3	1.6	3.9	3.7
Virginia.....	9.5	12.1	21.6	20.8
Washington.....	15.4	14.6	30.0	12.0
West Virginia.....	8.5	7.0	15.5	14.4
Wisconsin.....	17.9	32.0	49.9	44.6
Wyoming.....	.5	.8	1.3	.5

¹ Based on fiscal year 1974 data.

A. AID TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED

Under the Committee's decision with respect to the aged, blind, and disabled, States would be required to provide assistance in these categories which would guarantee an income of at least \$130 per month to an eligible individual with no other income and \$195 to an eligible couple. In addition, there would be a mandatory disregard of \$50 of any other type of income plus additional disregards applicable to earned income. As a result, an aged, blind or disabled individual who has at least \$50 in income from Social Security or other sources would be assured total income of at least \$180 and a couple with \$50 of Social Security or other income would be assured a total income of \$245.

The States will continue to administer aid to the aged, blind, and disabled under State eligibility rules. To give the States a fiscal stake in good administration, the cost of making assistance payments meeting the Federal payment level requirements would be borne entirely by the Federal Government up to a specified base amount under the following formula:

Federal funding would be provided for the costs of assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled up to the standards required by the bill (\$130 for an individual, \$190 for a couple with a \$50 disregard of all income and additional disregards of earned income). These costs would be fully Federal up to the higher of (1) the cost of meeting these standards for a State's existing caseload; or (2) the State's share of \$5 billion distributed among the States in proportion to the number of aged individuals with income below \$1,750 and aged couples with income below \$2,200 in 1969. If State costs involved in meeting the Federally required payment levels exceeded the higher of these amounts, the Federal Government would also pay 90 percent of the excess. There would be no Federal funding with respect to assistance provided at levels above those required by the Committee decision.

Table 2.—The base amount would be the amount needed to meet the Federal requirements for the existing caseload (column 1 of Table 2) or, if higher, an amount equal to the State's share of \$5 billion allocated among the States in proportion to the number of aged individuals with income below \$1,750 and couples with income below \$2,200 in 1969 (column 2 of Table 2). A State which now has assistance standards near or above the minimum Federal requirements would presumably have few new recipients as a result of the imposition of the Federally required minimum payment level, so that the funding in column 1 would tend to cover almost all of the State's costs associated with the new Federal rules. States with lower standards, however, could have many new recipients when they are required to raise those standards. These same States would also tend to have relatively larger proportions of low income aged persons.

(5)

Accordingly, tying their base amount for Federal funding to the amount in column 2 of Table 2 (\$5 billion distributed by the relative proportion of low-income aged persons) should tend to equalize their position with that of the States which already have higher standards.

As can be seen from the total in column 3, the Federal Government could, under the Committee decision, pay 100 percent of the cost of payments, meeting the Federal standards up to as much as \$5.7 billion.

If State costs of implementing the new minimum standards for the aged, blind, and disabled exceeded the fully Federal base amount in column 3 of Table 2, the States would be required to pay 10 percent of the excess. For example, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that in California the Federally required payments to the aged, blind, and disabled under the Committee decision would total \$675.9 million in fiscal year 1974. Under the formula, the Federal Government would pay 100 percent of the cost up to \$617.5 million, with the State having to pay ten percent (\$5.8 million) of the remaining \$58.4 million. The State would also pay all costs (\$104.4 million) associated with payment levels in excess of the Federal requirement.

State costs under the proposal for fiscal year 1974 are shown in column 5 and the State savings (as compared with their share of assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled under current law) are shown in column 7. These costs and savings relate to the HEW estimate, projected from current law, that the Committee decision will result in payments to the aged, blind, and disabled of \$4.2 billion.

Column 5 indicates that most States would be required to pay a relatively small proportion of the costs involved in the Committee decision. A number of States are shown to have no costs at all for 1974; however, these States would also be required to pay small amounts in future years when their caseload grows to the point that the fully Federal base amount in column 3 is no longer sufficient to cover the payments required by the Federal standards. As a result, all States would be relieved of all but a very small amount of responsibility for the funding of aid to the aged, blind, and disabled and would enjoy the savings shown in column 7. However, there would be an incentive for the States to exercise control over caseload growth since they would be required to pay a part of the costs related to all additional recipients once the Federal base amount in column 3 is exceeded.

TABLE 2.—IMPACT ON STATES OF COMMITTEE DECISION WITH RESPECT TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED IN FISCAL YEAR 1974

[Dollars in millions]

State	Cost of proposal for current caseload (1)	\$5 billion distributed by proportion of low-income aged (2)	100 percent Federal funding of proposal up to higher of cols. 1 or 2 (3)	Federal costs under proposal ¹ (4)	State costs under proposal ² (5)	State costs under current law (6)	State savings (7)
Total.....	\$3,792.1	\$5,000.1	\$5,651.7	\$4,231.5	\$241.9	\$1,472.3	\$1,230.4
Alabama.....	171.5	135.7	171.5	185.4	1.6	28.7	27.1
Alaska.....	2.6	1.5	2.6	3.0	1.7	4.3	2.6
Arizona.....	132.9	36.3	132.9	137.8	.6	11.2	10.6
Arkansas.....	98.9	103.3	103.3	103.5	0	14.0	14.0
California.....	617.5	297.3	617.5	670.1	110.2	409.1	298.9
Colorado.....	46.9	42.7	46.9	54.5	4.3	20.2	15.9
Connecticut.....	20.7	44.2	44.2	23.0	3.3	13.7	10.4
Delaware.....	6.4	9.5	9.5	7.2	0	4.5	4.5
District of Columbia.....	15.7	13.5	15.7	18.8	3.2	13.6	10.4
Florida.....	100.4	225.4	225.4	124.5	0	32.6	32.6
Georgia.....	177.4	139.2	177.4	190.7	1.5	26.4	24.9
Hawaii.....	5.8	8.1	8.1	6.3	.3	3.9	3.0
Idaho.....	8.4	18.5	18.5	9.4	.4	2.1	1.7
Illinois.....	90.4	238.9	238.9	101.5	22.9	68.3	68.3
Indiana.....	35.3	119.2	119.2	38.7	0	9.2	9.2

See footnotes at end of table, p. 5.

TABLE 2.—IMPACT ON STATES OF COMMITTEE DECISION WITH RESPECT TO THE AGED, BLIND, AND DISABLED IN FISCAL YEAR 1974—Continued

[Dollars in millions]

State	Cost of proposal for current caseload (1)	\$5 billion distributed by proportion of low-income aged (2)	100 percent Federal funding of proposal up to higher of cols. 1 or 2 (3)	Federal costs under proposal ¹ (4)	State costs under proposal ² (5)	State costs under current law (6)	State savings (7)
Iowa.....	38.7	88.6	88.6	45.1	0	19.4	19.4
Kansas.....	13.3	68.7	68.7	16.8	0	7.0	7.0
Kentucky.....	110.9	124.7	124.7	121.7	0	15.4	15.4
Louisiana.....	185.4	122.6	185.4	194.4	1.0	33.8	32.8
Maine.....	13.2	28.6	28.6	15.0	0	4.4	4.4
Maryland.....	36.7	60.1	60.1	42.4	0	17.1	17.1
Massachusetts.....	84.6	106.7	106.7	98.8	14.2	65.7	51.5
Michigan.....	81.8	165.0	165.0	86.7	7.7	53.0	45.3
Minnesota.....	30.6	96.9	96.9	33.6	2.1	15.2	13.1
Mississippi.....	180.0	113.2	180.0	185.1	.6	15.2	14.6
Missouri.....	184.9	161.2	184.9	192.6	.8	35.1	34.3
Montana.....	16.5	17.1	17.1	18.3	.1	1.9	1.8
Nebraska.....	17.8	46.4	46.4	19.9	2.2	4.6	2.4
Nevada.....	3.3	6.3	6.3	3.7	.5	1.3	.8
New Hampshire.....	1.3	18.0	18.0	1.8	1.1	5.1	4.0

New Jersey.....	35.2	120.5	120.5	44.2	5.3	25.4	20.1
New Mexico.....	20.9	23.7	23.7	23.1	0	4.0	4.0
New York.....	276.7	388.6	388.6	326.7	33.4	201.9	168.5
North Carolina.....	85.8	150.0	150.0	98.7	0	19.9	19.9
North Dakota.....	9.0	16.2	16.2	10.1	.5	2.6	2.1
Ohio.....	90.3	232.7	232.7	108.8	.6	30.5	29.9
Oklahoma.....	94.3	103.9	103.9	110.6	.8	34.3	33.5
Oregon.....	19.5	50.0	50.0	24.8	0	6.7	6.7
Pennsylvania.....	84.9	283.8	283.8	111.4	9.5	56.3	46.8
Rhode Island.....	7.6	23.5	23.5	9.8	.4	4.8	4.4
South Carolina.....	33.3	75.9	75.9	36.9	0	5.9	5.9
South Dakota.....	7.1	22.7	22.7	8.0	.7	1.4	.7
Tennessee.....	107.0	150.8	150.8	116.1	0	13.2	13.2
Texas.....	229.7	314.1	314.1	268.4	0	42.4	42.4
Utah.....	9.8	18.7	18.7	10.9	0	2.5	2.5
Vermont.....	6.8	11.0	11.0	7.8	.9	3.2	2.3
Virginia.....	24.6	105.3	105.3	27.4	2.2	11.7	9.5
Washington.....	43.6	70.8	70.8	53.8	7.3	22.7	15.4
West Virginia.....	37.3	71.1	71.1	40.4	0	8.5	8.5
Wisconsin.....	34.0	102.5	102.5	37.8	0	17.9	17.9
Wyoming.....	4.9	6.9	6.9	5.5	0	.5	.5

¹ Based on HEW estimated cost of the committee decision on the aged, blind, and disabled if State-administered under State eligibility rules.

² State costs are equal to 10% of the amount in excess of column 3 needed to guarantee \$130 to an individual and \$195 to a couple (\$180 and \$245 respectively, if they receive social security) plus 100% of amounts provided above these levels.

B. FEDERAL FUNDING OF AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Under the Committee's decision, the Federal Government would make a flat grant to the States as its share of the costs of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program:

For the last 6 months of calendar year 1972 and for calendar year 1973, this grant would be based on the funding for calendar year 1972. The grant for 1973 would equal the 1972 Federal share, plus an additional amount equal to one-half of the 1972 State share, or if less the amount needed in 1972 to bring family income up to \$1,600, \$2,000, or \$2,400 for families with two, three, or four or more members, respectively. In no case, however, would the Federal block grant be less than 110 percent of the Federal share in 1972. For the last 6 months of calendar year 1972, the grant would be one-half of the 1973 grant.

After the employment program becomes effective in January 1974, the Federal grant for AFDC would be reduced somewhat in recognition of the fact that families with no children under age 6 would no longer be eligible for AFDC. This reduced grant would remain the same in future years, except that it would be increased or decreased to reflect changes in total State population.

For example, the Federal block grant for AFDC in California would be \$689.4 million in 1973. After the employment program becomes effective, this would be reduced to \$526.7 million. The \$526.7 million would remain as the annual amount of the Federal grant to California for AFDC except that it would be adjusted each year to reflect any percentage increase or decrease in the State's population.

Tables 3 and 4 illustrate the effects of the Committee's decision before and after the employment program becomes effective. The amounts shown in these tables are estimated on the basis of the best information that was available.

1. Fiscal Relief for the States in the Last 6 Months of Calendar Year 1972

In the last 6 months of calendar year 1972, the Committee provision would save the States more than \$400 million, as shown in column 1 of table 3. Since the exact amount under the formula cannot be determined until after the end of calendar year 1972, an amount estimated to equal 75 percent of the State entitlement would be paid within two months of enactment, with the final accounting and payment due by April 1, 1973.

2. Federal Funding in Calendar Year 1973

Table 3 also shows the impact of the Committee's decision in 1973. Columns 2 through 4 show the current law costs for fiscal year 1973. Using these fiscal year 1973 current law costs as the base, columns 5 through 7 show the effect of the Committee decision. Column 5 shows the amount of the Federal block grant. Column 6 shows the amount that the States would be required to pay to maintain current assistance levels, and column 7 shows the amounts the States would save by comparison with current law.

TABLE 3.—IMPACT OF COMMITTEE DECISION ON STATE AFDC COSTS FOR 1972 AND 1973

[In millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1973						
	1972 State and local savings	Total cost	Current law		Committee decision		
			Federal share	State and local share	Federal share	State and local share	State and local savings
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Total.....	410.8	7,973.5	4,379.7	3,594.1	5,201.4	2,772.4	821.5
Alabama.....	3.0	55.4	43.4	11.9	49.5	5.9	6.0
Alaska ¹	1.3	11.5	3.7	7.7	6.4	5.1	2.6
Arizona ¹	12.6	65.5	28.7	36.8	53.8	11.7	25.1
Arkansas.....	1.8	33.6	26.6	6.9	30.2	3.4	3.5
California.....	39.9	1,219.0	609.5	609.5	689.4	529.6	79.9
Colorado.....	5.4	68.9	39.7	29.2	50.4	18.5	10.7
Connecticut.....	2.6	106.6	53.3	53.3	58.6	48.0	5.3
Delaware.....	1.6	15.7	9.2	6.6	12.4	3.3	3.3
District of Columbia.....	16.9	135.7	67.8	67.8	101.8	33.9	33.9
Florida.....	25.5	259.3	157.3	102.0	208.3	51.0	51.0
Georgia.....	9.4	154.2	116.7	37.5	135.5	18.7	18.8
Hawaii.....	3.0	38.4	19.5	18.9	25.4	13.0	5.9
Idaho.....	.6	17.3	12.4	4.9	13.6	3.7	1.2
Illinois.....	25.4	653.2	326.6	326.6	377.3	275.9	50.7
Indiana.....	13.0	114.9	63.3	51.7	89.1	25.8	25.9

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 3.—IMPACT OF COMMITTEE DECISION ON STATE AFDC COSTS FOR 1972 AND 1973—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

State	Fiscal year 1973						
	1972 State and local savings	Total cost	Current law		Committee decision		
			Federal share	State and local share	Federal share	State and local share	State and local savings
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Iowa.....	3.1	60.0	34.8	25.2	41.0	19.0	6.2
Kansas.....	4.9	64.8	38.2	26.5	48.1	16.7	9.8
Kentucky.....	4.6	65.4	47.0	18.4	56.2	9.2	9.2
Louisiana.....	9.2	137.9	101.3	36.6	119.6	18.3	18.3
Maine.....	2.8	36.8	25.6	11.2	31.2	5.6	5.6
Maryland.....	19.2	137.8	61.0	76.8	99.4	38.4	38.4
Massachusetts.....	8.5	340.9	170.4	170.4	187.5	153.4	17.0
Michigan.....	28.0	467.0	233.5	233.5	289.6	177.4	56.1
Minnesota.....	3.6	124.4	70.7	53.7	77.8	46.6	7.1
Mississippi.....	1.2	30.0	24.9	5.1	27.5	2.5	2.6
Missouri.....	7.0	96.5	68.8	27.7	82.7	13.8	13.9
Montana.....	.7	11.5	7.7	3.8	9.1	2.4	1.4
Nebraska.....	1.8	27.5	13.0	14.5	16.7	10.8	3.7
Nevada.....	.8	10.0	6.8	3.2	8.4	1.6	1.6

New Hampshire.....	.4	13.9	8.2	5.6	9.1	4.8	.8
New Jersey.....	8.7	348.6	174.3	174.3	191.7	156.9	17.4
New Mexico.....	1.5	24.7	18.8	5.9	21.8	2.9	3.0
New York.....	29.8	1,190.3	595.1	595.1	654.7	535.6	59.5
North Carolina.....	5.2	76.8	56.0	20.9	66.4	10.4	10.5
North Dakota.....	.6	11.2	8.0	3.2	9.3	1.9	1.3
Ohio.....	35.0	277.7	137.9	139.8	207.8	69.9	69.9
Oklahoma.....	5.2	56.7	35.8	20.9	46.3	10.4	10.5
Oregon.....	5.6	60.8	34.9	25.9	46.0	14.8	11.1
Pennsylvania.....	15.6	562.5	311.9	250.6	343.1	219.4	31.2
Rhode Island.....	3.2	43.6	21.9	21.7	28.3	15.3	6.4
South Carolina.....	1.6	32.8	26.3	6.5	29.6	3.2	3.3
South Dakota.....	.6	16.6	11.6	5.0	12.8	3.8	1.2
Tennessee.....	4.6	75.8	57.5	18.3	66.7	9.1	9.2
Texas.....	13.2	199.6	147.1	52.5	173.4	26.2	26.3
Utah.....	2.0	32.8	23.1	9.7	27.0	5.8	3.9
Vermont.....	.6	20.4	13.2	7.2	14.5	5.9	1.3
Virginia.....	3.6	113.4	72.6	40.8	79.9	33.5	7.3
Washington.....	2.9	116.7	58.3	58.3	64.2	52.5	5.8
West Virginia.....	2.0	33.9	26.1	7.8	30.0	3.9	3.9
Wisconsin.....	11.5	105.3	59.2	46.0	82.3	23.0	23.0

¹ Under the committee decision the Federal grant for Arizona and Alaska would be computed under the formula described on p. 10 except that current law costs would be assumed to be funded under the medicaid matching formula which is not now available to those 2 States.

3. Federal Funding in Calendar Year 1974 and Thereafter

Table 4 shows how the Committee's decision would work after the employment program becomes effective, except that it does not take account of any increases related to population growth. Column 1 shows the Federal grant for 1973 as it would be reduced to take account of the number of families with no children under age 6. Specifically, the Federal grant would be reduced by 10 percentage points less than the percentage of the AFDC caseload representing families no longer eligible to receive their basic income from welfare once the employment program becomes effective. This 10 percentage point factor in effect represents revenue sharing since the reduction in the Federal grant does not fully reflect the impact of initiating the employment program on reducing welfare costs. Column 2 shows the State costs under the Committee bill and column 3 shows State costs under current law. Net State savings (column 3 minus column 2) are shown in column 4. States would enjoy additional savings to the extent that mothers with children under age 6 elect to voluntarily participate in the employment program instead of staying on welfare, and to the extent that States take advantage of their greater flexibility under the Committee bill to tighten administration of their AFDC programs.

TABLE 4.—IMPACT OF COMMITTEE DECISION ON 1974 STATE COSTS OF AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

	Federal grant	State costs under committee decision ¹	State costs under current law	State savings ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Total.....	3,679.9	2,504.9	3,883.7	1,378.9
Alabama.....	29.1	0	12.9	12.9
Alaska.....	4.2	5.4	8.3	2.9
Arizona.....	37.0	7.8	39.8	32.0
Arkansas.....	16.3	0	7.5	7.5
California.....	526.7	494.9	658.2	163.3
Colorado.....	39.1	16.2	31.5	15.3
Connecticut.....	44.3	46.1	57.6	11.5
Delaware.....	9.7	3.4	7.1	3.7
District of Columbia.....	75.2	27.9	73.3	45.4
Florida.....	131.4	19.9	110.2	90.3
Georgia.....	83.6	4.0	40.5	36.5
Hawaii.....	19.5	11.7	20.4	8.7
Idaho.....	9.9	3.5	5.3	1.8
Illinois.....	282.6	252.1	352.7	100.6
Indiana.....	55.9	26.6	55.8	29.2
Iowa.....	27.0	17.1	27.2	10.1
Kansas.....	34.7	15.4	28.6	13.2
Kentucky.....	30.3	9.1	19.9	10.8
Louisiana.....	64.1	0	39.5	39.5
Maine.....	19.0	9.0	12.2	3.2
Maryland.....	77.0	30.1	82.9	52.8
Massachusetts.....	141.2	144.2	184.1	39.9
Michigan.....	206.8	157.3	252.2	94.9
Minnesota.....	52.5	43.5	58.0	14.5
Mississippi.....	17.6	0	5.5	5.5
Missouri.....	53.4	14.9	29.9	15.0
Montana.....	6.3	2.4	4.1	1.7
Nebraska.....	11.4	11.2	15.6	4.4
Nevada.....	6.6	1.5	3.4	1.9
New Hampshire.....	6.1	4.9	6.1	1.2
New Jersey.....	136.5	158.2	188.2	30.0
New Mexico.....	15.1	2.8	6.4	3.6
New York.....	493.0	506.9	642.7	135.8
North Carolina.....	38.5	5.8	22.5	16.7
North Dakota.....	6.1	1.3	3.5	2.2

TABLE 4.—IMPACT OF COMMITTEE DECISION ON 1974 STATE COSTS OF AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN—Con.

	Federal grant	State costs under committee decision ¹	State costs under current law	State savings ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Ohio.....	150.0	57.1	151.0	94.0
Oklahoma.....	30.0	8.4	22.5	14.1
Oregon.....	33.8	13.1	28.0	14.9
Pennsylvania.....	252.9	213.5	270.6	57.1
Rhode Island.....	21.5	14.0	23.4	9.4
South Carolina.....	14.3	0	7.0	7.0
South Dakota.....	8.9	4.0	5.4	1.4
Tennessee.....	41.5	3.4	19.7	16.3
Texas.....	112.0	24.2	56.7	32.5
Utah.....	21.4	4.9	10.5	5.6
Vermont.....	10.6	6.2	7.8	1.6
Virginia.....	50.7	32.0	44.1	12.1
Washington.....	45.1	48.4	63.0	14.6
West Virginia.....	19.0	1.4	8.4	7.0
Wisconsin.....	58.4	17.7	49.7	32.0
Wyoming.....	2.1	1.5	2.3	.8

¹ Where State costs under the Committee decision are shown as zero, the amount of the Federal grant may actually exceed the costs of AFDC payments by a small amount. In these cases, the State would benefit from any such excess in addition to saving the full amount of its current law costs shown in column 4.