

# Financing Public Child Welfare Services

by SETH LOW\*

CHILD welfare services furnished by the States and localities are financed from Federal, State, and local funds. A study of expenditures made by State and local public welfare agencies for child welfare services in the year ended June 30, 1956, shows that, although the States vary in the amounts expended, some patterns become apparent when they are grouped according to region, urban-rural character, and income level. The following pages show not only the expenditures of 1955-56 but also trends for selected earlier years.

The expenditures reported do not represent a complete account of outlays for all child welfare programs under public auspices. The data exclude expenditures for public institutions, whether or not they are administered by public welfare departments; expenditures for services that are made directly and not through the public welfare agencies (for example, amounts spent for services provided by juvenile courts and youth authorities and appropriations made directly by a State legislature to voluntary organizations); and public assistance payments. Payments for foster care of children made from State public assistance funds are, however, included. Because these limitations affect individual States differently, they should be taken into account in any comparison of State expenditures.

## Expenditures in 1955-56

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, State and local public welfare agencies spent an estimated \$145 million from Federal, State, and local funds for child welfare services.<sup>1</sup>

\* Division of Research, Children's Bureau. Adapted from Seth Low, *Financing Public Child Welfare Services: 1956, with Selected Trend Data* (Children's Bureau Statistical Series, No. 46, 1958). For a fuller treatment of the subject, see the report.

<sup>1</sup> The estimate is based on information received from the 45 State public welfare agencies that submitted "substantially complete" expenditure reports for 1955-56—that is, reports including at least 90 percent of the child welfare expenditures of State and local agencies in the reporting State.

This outlay is the highest on record and is 8 percent higher than the amount spent in 1954-55; the total included \$6.9 million from Federal funds.

For the Nation as a whole expenditures were higher in the fiscal year 1955-56 than in the preceding year. The amounts spent from all three sources showed an increase. State funds went up 10 percent; local funds, 6 percent; and Federal funds, 1 percent. The more rapid rise in State funds is attributable mainly to a change in Connecticut's program, under which the State assumed full responsibility for neglected children who are committed to public guardianship; the responsibility had previously been shared with local communities.

Expenditures were lower in 10 of the 39 States that reported completely for both years. The percentage decreases, ranging from 1 percent in New Hampshire to 26 percent in the Virgin Islands, were greatest in States with small total outlays—for example, Idaho, the Virgin Islands, and Wyoming. Twenty-nine States reported increases, which ranged from less than 1 percent in Puerto Rico to 22 percent in Louisiana.

Most of the outlay was made by a few States. California, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—the five States with the largest expenditures—spent 54 percent of the estimated total. New York alone spent \$41.7 million or 29 percent of the total. The five States (excluding the Virgin Islands) with the smallest expenditures were Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, and their combined expenditures amounted to less than 1 percent.

Public expenditures for child welfare services have two major purposes: (1) to provide for children receiving foster care, and (2) to provide professional services for all children (those receiving foster care and the much larger group living in their own homes) as well as to meet operating costs. The cost of professional services, as such, cannot be measured

from the data now available. The best available data are the reported expenditures for personnel—largely salaries of professional personnel but including also those of clerical and other workers—and the reported expenditures for educational leave to provide professional training. Other expenditures for "facilitating" services include those for office space, supplies, communication, and travel. In 1955-56 an estimated \$104 million, or 72 percent of the total national expenditure, was used to pay for the foster care of children, \$35 million (24 percent) for personnel, \$500,000 (0.4 percent) for educational leave, and \$6 million (4 percent) for other expenditures (table 1).

State and local funds are used primarily for foster-care payments, and Federal funds are used to support professional services for children by helping to pay the salaries of professional personnel and finance their education. Until 1951, in fact, Federal funds could not, as a matter of policy, be used to finance foster-care payments except in a very limited way. In 1955-56, 70 percent of State funds and 81 percent of local funds went for foster-care payments, and 95 percent of Federal expenditures were for professional and facilitating services, as shown below.

Purpose of expenditure	Source of funds			
	Total	Federal	State	Local
Total.....	100	100	100	100
Foster care payments.....	72	5	70	81
Professional and facilitating services.....	28	95	30	19
Personnel and other costs.....	28	87	30	19
Educational leave.....	(1)	8	0	0

<sup>1</sup> Less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1 percent.

In recent years foster-care payments have constituted nearly three-fourths of all reported public child welfare expenditures. The States vary widely, however, in the percentage of their expenditures devoted to this purpose. In 1955-56 the range was

from 3 percent in Idaho to 93 percent in Pennsylvania. The percentage was greatest in the Northeast, in the most urban States, and in the highest-income States (table 2). It was smallest in the South, in the most rural States, and in the lowest-income States. These factors are often interrelated; many of the rural and low-income States, for example, are found in the South.

The regional differences between the Northeast and the South reflect

several factors in addition to rurality and income level. There is a long history in the Northeast, going back more than 300 years in some States, of public responsibility for child welfare, chiefly in the area of foster care; in many Southern States acceptance of this responsibility is a much more recent development. The Northeast also has a well-established tradition, which does not exist on a comparable scale in the South, of public payments to voluntary agen-

cies and institutions for the care of children. In addition, relatively fewer of the children served by public welfare agencies in the South in 1955-56 were receiving foster care, and more were living in their own homes, than in the Northeast.

The variations between States must also be considered in the light of the character and organization of foster-care services in individual States, since these services absorb the greater part of child welfare funds. Indiana

Table 1.—Amount and percentage distribution of public child welfare expenditures, by purpose and by State, fiscal year 1955-56<sup>1</sup>

State	Amount					Percentage distribution				
	Total	Foster-care payments	Personnel	Educational leave	Other	Total	Foster-care payments	Personnel	Educational leave	Other
United States, estimated total...	\$145,000,000	\$104,000,000	\$34,700,000	\$500,000	\$5,800,000	100.0	71.7	23.9	0.4	4.0
45 States, total <sup>2</sup> .....	133,007,878	95,503,338	31,793,719	434,855	5,275,966	100.0	71.8	23.9	0.3	4.0
Alabama <sup>3</sup> .....	968,087	394,705	547,078	5,944	20,360	100.0	40.8	56.5	0.6	2.1
Arizona.....	446,389	<sup>4</sup> 303,826	121,354	6,760	14,449	100.0	68.1	27.2	1.5	3.2
Arkansas.....	438,952	227,538	146,903	8,110	56,401	100.0	51.8	33.5	1.8	12.9
California.....	<sup>5</sup> 12,193,598	7,281,096	4,225,956	-----	686,546	100.0	59.7	34.7	-----	5.6
Colorado.....	741,754	<sup>4</sup> 485,501	206,138	7,875	42,240	100.0	65.4	27.8	1.1	5.7
Connecticut.....	4,628,136	3,801,323	711,145	5,949	109,719	100.0	82.1	15.4	0.1	2.4
Delaware.....	527,332	323,156	166,941	4,462	32,773	100.0	61.3	31.7	0.8	6.2
District of Columbia.....	1,374,652	<sup>6</sup> 806,751	538,274	-----	29,627	100.0	58.7	39.2	-----	2.1
Florida.....	607,774	307,266	247,278	14,112	39,118	100.0	50.6	40.7	2.3	6.4
Georgia.....	968,692	<sup>7</sup> 543,669	371,318	9,683	44,022	100.0	56.1	38.3	1.0	4.6
Hawaii.....	565,386	386,581	158,622	2,654	17,529	100.0	68.4	28.0	0.5	3.1
Idaho.....	39,011	1,258	32,013	1,788	3,952	100.0	3.2	82.1	4.6	10.1
Illinois.....	4,491,516	3,164,887	<sup>8</sup> 1,093,073	46,962	186,594	100.0	70.5	24.3	1.0	4.2
Indiana <sup>3</sup> .....	3,429,114	2,228,781	1,024,755	-----	175,578	100.0	65.0	29.9	-----	5.1
Iowa.....	694,702	154,077	391,819	17,087	131,719	100.0	22.2	56.4	2.4	19.0
Louisiana.....	2,468,101	1,672,456	657,239	15,868	122,538	100.0	67.8	26.6	0.6	5.0
Maine.....	1,423,522	<sup>6</sup> 1,038,676	304,816	2,966	77,064	100.0	73.0	21.4	0.2	5.4
Maryland.....	3,476,008	2,215,334	1,038,583	4,143	217,948	100.0	63.7	29.9	0.1	6.3
Massachusetts.....	5,093,929	4,082,266	846,920	1,620	<sup>9</sup> 163,123	100.0	80.2	16.6	( <sup>10</sup> )	3.2
Michigan.....	1,643,743	537,008	930,825	-----	175,910	100.0	32.7	56.6	-----	10.7
Minnesota.....	4,396,054	1,950,409	2,037,555	28,067	380,023	100.0	44.4	46.4	0.6	8.6
Mississippi.....	724,091	176,990	425,474	14,322	107,305	100.0	24.4	58.8	2.0	14.8
Missouri.....	1,248,544	673,058	472,039	16,110	87,337	100.0	53.9	37.8	1.3	7.0
Montana.....	368,872	157,367	165,855	15,127	30,523	100.0	42.6	45.0	4.1	8.3
New Hampshire.....	723,683	536,478	142,947	10	44,248	100.0	74.1	19.8	( <sup>10</sup> )	6.1
New Mexico.....	660,375	272,983	232,140	7,797	147,455	100.0	41.3	35.2	1.2	22.3
New York.....	41,763,337	<sup>7</sup> 35,934,498	<sup>8</sup> 5,225,023	15,678	<sup>9</sup> 588,138	100.0	86.1	12.5	( <sup>10</sup> )	1.4
North Dakota.....	373,353	234,032	110,676	5,894	22,751	100.0	62.7	29.6	1.6	6.1
Ohio.....	6,841,567	4,798,472	1,820,932	10,902	211,261	100.0	70.1	26.6	0.2	3.1
Oklahoma.....	634,373	173,727	312,619	21,136	126,891	100.0	27.4	49.3	3.3	20.0
Oregon.....	2,300,606	<sup>4</sup> 1,508,119	645,000	20,400	127,087	100.0	65.6	28.0	0.9	5.5
Pennsylvania.....	12,353,391	11,422,619	878,569	12,196	40,007	100.0	92.5	7.1	0.1	0.3
Puerto Rico.....	743,668	240,664	411,523	2,915	88,566	100.0	32.4	55.3	0.4	11.9
Rhode Island.....	710,095	<sup>7</sup> 456,946	222,625	6,225	24,299	100.0	64.3	31.4	0.9	3.4
South Carolina.....	404,573	197,392	190,209	-----	16,972	100.0	48.8	47.0	-----	4.2
South Dakota.....	273,033	127,420	115,145	525	<sup>9</sup> 29,943	100.0	46.7	42.2	0.2	10.9
Tennessee.....	876,569	329,128	449,050	30,037	68,354	100.0	37.6	51.2	3.4	7.8
Texas.....	1,030,985	293,462	598,909	13,745	124,869	100.0	28.5	58.1	1.3	12.1
Utah.....	464,030	286,933	146,238	3,328	27,531	100.0	61.9	31.5	0.7	5.9
Vermont.....	709,779	504,203	127,212	2,432	75,932	100.0	71.0	17.9	0.4	10.7
Virgin Islands.....	64,531	23,718	34,757	-----	6,056	100.0	36.7	53.9	-----	9.4
Washington.....	3,959,016	2,203,887	1,529,326	13,214	212,589	100.0	55.7	38.6	0.3	5.4
West Virginia.....	1,264,031	841,221	350,022	10,676	62,112	100.0	66.6	27.7	0.8	4.9
Wisconsin.....	3,722,700	2,097,300	1,333,300	22,800	269,300	100.0	56.4	35.8	0.6	7.2
Wyoming.....	176,224	106,157	55,524	5,336	9,207	100.0	60.3	31.5	3.0	5.2

<sup>1</sup> For year ended June 30, 1956, with the following exceptions: Arizona, fiscal year 1954-55; Ohio and Pennsylvania, calendar year 1955.

<sup>2</sup> States making substantially complete reports (including at least 90 percent of the total child welfare expenditures of State and local public welfare agencies). Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, Nevada, and North Carolina transmitted incomplete reports. No reports were received from Alaska, New Jersey, and Virginia.

<sup>3</sup> Because of improved reporting, data not comparable with those for earlier years.

<sup>4</sup> Excludes some expenditures for medical care and services.

<sup>5</sup> Includes a small amount for licensing of boarding homes and institutions for the aged.

<sup>6</sup> Includes some payments in behalf of children living with relatives.

<sup>7</sup> Includes contributions and payments from relatives, private organizations, and other sources.

<sup>8</sup> Excludes some expenditures for part-time and other personnel.

<sup>9</sup> Excludes some expenditures for rent, light, heat, and other administrative costs.

<sup>10</sup> Less than 0.05 percent.

**Table 2.—Percentage distribution of public child welfare expenditures, by purpose and by specified State group, fiscal year 1955-56<sup>1</sup>**

State group	Purpose of expenditures		
	Total	Foster-care payments	Professional and facilitating services
Estimated total, 53 States	100	72	28
Region:			
Northeast.....	100	86	14
North Central.....	100	59	41
South.....	100	54	46
West.....	100	59	41
Urban-rural character: <sup>2</sup>			
Most urban.....	100	78	22
Semirural.....	100	56	44
Most rural.....	100	48	52
Income level: <sup>3</sup>			
Highest-income.....	100	77	23
Middle-income.....	100	54	46
Lowest-income.....	100	53	47

<sup>1</sup> Data for 45 reporting States.

<sup>2</sup> Classification based on a ranking of States according to the percentage of their population living in urban places as defined in the 1950 Census.

<sup>3</sup> Data for 42 States; excludes the Territories, for which per capita income statistics are not available.

and Ohio, for example, have extensive programs serving children in county homes. The juvenile courts in Michigan often provide foster care, as well as other services for children. Certain expenditures for foster care in Illinois were financed out of a special fund, not administered by the welfare agencies. In Iowa the State Board of Control furnishes some foster-care services, and Idaho makes legislative appropriations directly to certain voluntary agencies and institutions. If all public expenditures for foster care in these States were included in the reports, both the amounts of expenditure and the proportions of the total spent for foster care probably would be considerably higher than the figures shown here.

### Source of Funds

Child welfare is one of the public welfare programs in which there is heavy reliance on local funds. The estimated total of \$145 million spent for these programs in 1955-56 included \$64 million or 44 percent from local funds, \$74 million or 51 percent from State funds, and slightly less than \$7 million, or 5 percent, from Federal funds (table 3).

State and Federal funds were used

for the child welfare programs in all 45 reporting States. No local funds were expended in 14 States,<sup>2</sup> where the programs are State-administered through county or district offices of the State welfare agency, but in Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania the local share of expenditures exceeded 90 percent.

There is no relationship between the total amount spent by a State from State and local funds and the relative proportions of State and local funds that are used. States with a high proportion of expenditures from State-appropriated funds are as likely to have low public child welfare expenditures per child under age 21 in the population as they are to have high expenditures. Among the 45 reporting States, the 14 in which all non-Federal expenditures came from State-appropriated funds ranked from third to forty-fifth in per capita expenditures.

State and local funds almost exclusively, and in about equal measure, financed the board and care of foster children in 1955-56; the Federal expenditure for this purpose was small (less than 1/2 of 1 percent of the total). For professional and facilitating services, however, the Federal share amounted to 16 percent of the national expenditure and financed educational leave almost completely. Of the expenditures for professional and facilitating services other than educational leave, the largest outlay (55 percent) was from State funds, and 30 percent was from local funds.

Among the States, the Federal share of total expenditures for professional and facilitating services varied markedly. The percentage was less than 5 percent in California and New York, but in 20 States it represented more than 30 percent and in six States (Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, South Carolina, the Virgin Islands, and Wyoming) it was more than 50 percent.

The Federal share was substantially larger in (1) the most rural States, (2) the lowest-income States, (3) States with relatively small public

<sup>2</sup> Alabama, Arizona, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Utah, the Virgin Islands, and Washington.

child welfare programs, and (4) the South. These differences result, in large part, from the way Federal funds are distributed to the States. To strengthen child welfare services in predominantly rural areas, the Social Security Act provides that each State's grant, above a flat amount (not to exceed \$40,000), shall be proportional to the size of its rural child population. The 1956 pattern of Federal expenditures shows the effect of this provision. By no means all the variation that is found in the Federal share of State expenditures is, how-

**Table 3.—Percentage distribution of public child welfare expenditures, by source of funds and by State, fiscal year 1955-56<sup>1</sup>**

State	Percentage distribution			
	Total	Federal funds	State funds	Local funds
United States, estimated total.....	100.0	4.8	51.2	44.0
45 States, total <sup>2</sup> .....	100.0	4.3	51.5	44.2
Alabama.....	100.0	22.3	77.7	.....
Arizona.....	100.0	16.6	83.4	(3)
Arkansas.....	100.0	35.9	54.8	9.3
California.....	100.0	2.0	65.2	32.8
Colorado.....	100.0	9.3	49.9	40.8
Connecticut.....	100.0	1.5	94.5	4.0
Delaware.....	100.0	8.5	91.5	.....
Dist. of Col.....	100.0	2.1	97.9	.....
Florida.....	100.0	19.5	37.2	43.3
Georgia.....	100.0	23.0	8.7	68.3
Hawaii.....	100.0	7.3	92.7	.....
Idaho.....	100.0	79.6	20.4	.....
Illinois.....	100.0	4.2	73.2	22.6
Indiana.....	100.0	3.0	0.4	96.6
Iowa.....	100.0	21.2	50.1	28.7
Louisiana.....	100.0	7.0	93.0	.....
Maine.....	100.0	4.9	95.1	.....
Maryland.....	100.0	2.9	59.8	37.3
Massachusetts.....	100.0	1.5	92.2	6.3
Michigan.....	100.0	13.5	79.8	6.7
Minnesota.....	100.0	4.3	17.7	78.0
Mississippi.....	100.0	30.0	65.2	4.8
Missouri.....	100.0	14.3	21.7	64.0
Montana.....	100.0	17.0	38.4	44.6
New Hampshire.....	100.0	7.9	18.0	74.1
New Mexico.....	100.0	11.1	88.9	.....
New York.....	100.0	0.5	51.7	47.8
North Dakota.....	100.0	17.5	46.6	35.9
Ohio.....	100.0	3.2	1.7	95.1
Oklahoma.....	100.0	22.3	74.4	3.3
Oregon.....	100.0	3.1	85.5	11.4
Pennsylvania.....	100.0	1.4	0.5	98.1
Puerto Rico.....	100.0	26.2	73.8	.....
Rhode Island.....	100.0	5.4	94.6	.....
South Carolina.....	100.0	45.7	38.1	16.2
South Dakota.....	100.0	23.6	60.1	16.3
Tennessee.....	100.0	22.2	50.5	27.3
Texas.....	100.0	33.2	23.7	43.1
Utah.....	100.0	11.8	88.2	.....
Vermont.....	100.0	7.5	63.0	29.5
Virgin Islands.....	100.0	46.9	53.1	.....
Washington.....	100.0	2.8	97.2	.....
West Virginia.....	100.0	12.8	27.9	59.3
Wisconsin.....	100.0	4.8	58.2	37.0
Wyoming.....	100.0	20.9	51.1	28.0

<sup>1</sup> See footnote 1, table 1.

<sup>2</sup> See footnote 2, table 1.

<sup>3</sup> A small but unknown amount was expended for medical payments.

ever, accounted for by the formula applied in allotting Federal funds. Even if all States were to receive an equal amount, the Federal percentage would still vary since the level of State and local expenditures varies widely.

The proportion of expenditures from Federal funds was greatest in the groups of States in which the localities provide the least. The local share, for example, was only 3 percent in the most rural States but 34 percent in the most urban. Federal funds may therefore be said to "compensate" for the low level, or absence, of local expenditures in certain groups of States. The western region was an exception; there the relatively low local share (15 percent) was accompanied by the highest level of State expenditure among the four regions.

### Relation to Child Population

States with larger child populations tend, as would be expected, to have larger absolute amounts of expenditure for public child welfare services, but the correlation between the two factors is far from perfect. Texas, for example, which in 1955-56 ranked fourth among the States in child population, was twentieth in total expenditures. Florida and South Carolina, ranking fifteenth and nineteenth in child population, were thirty-third and thirty-ninth in expenditures. These extreme differences cannot be attributed fully to a lack of comparability of the reported expenditures of these States with those of other States.

Perhaps a more significant way of relating expenditures to child population is in terms of per capita expenditures (expenditures per child under age 21 in the population). Per capita expenditures, by holding constant, in a sense, the child population factor, make it possible to compare States of different size. In 1955-56, State per capita expenditures ranged from \$3.00 in New York to \$0.15 in Idaho; the estimated national average was \$2.31 (table 4).

In general, the Northeast and the West had the highest per capita expenditures and the South the lowest. Per capita expenditures were more than five times as large in the Northeast as in the South, four times as

large in the most urban States as in the most rural, and more than three times as large in the highest-income States as in the lowest-income States.

California's per capita expenditure was less than that of the other West Coast States—perhaps a reflection, at least in part, of the extraordinary in-

Table 4.—Public child welfare expenditures per capita for population under age 21, by State, fiscal years 1951-52 through 1955-56

State	Per capita expenditure for population under age 21				
	1951-52	1952-53	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56
United States, estimated total <sup>1</sup> .....	\$2.03	\$2.11	\$2.14	\$2.22	\$2.31
Ala.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	.72
Alaska.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Ariz.....	1.30	1.12	1.13	1.11	1.11
Ark.....	.44	.47	.53	.61	.59
Calif.....	2.77	2.84	2.71	2.63	2.69
Colo.....	.97	.96	1.02	1.09	1.20
Conn.....	5.22	5.27	5.54	5.61	6.20
Del.....	3.16	3.43	3.39	3.39	3.71
D. C.....	5.38	5.03	4.98	5.08	5.85
Fla.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	.47
Ga.....	.46	.51	.58	.60	.63
Hawaii.....	3.56	3.37	3.17	2.74	2.52
Idaho.....	.33	.22	.24	.19	.15
Ill.....	1.48	1.36	1.31	1.36	1.40
Ind.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	2.09
Iowa.....	.54	.59	.59	.67	.69
Kans.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Ky.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
La.....	1.12	1.18	1.40	1.66	1.96
Maine.....	3.76	3.94	4.15	4.24	4.17
Md.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	2.95	3.22	3.21	3.42
Mass.....	3.59	3.58	3.49	3.28	3.16
Mich.....	.59	.56	.58	.59	.68
Minn.....	2.68	2.78	3.04	3.33	3.56
Miss.....	.44	.62	.81	.73	.75
Mo.....	.70	.66	.75	.80	.84
Mont.....	1.34	1.44	1.39	1.36	1.46
Nebr.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Nev.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
N. H.....	3.61	3.70	3.72	3.79	3.67
N. J.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
N. Mex.....	1.46	1.49	1.52	1.56	1.80
N. Y.....	6.94	7.47	7.47	7.46	8.00
N. C.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
N. Dak.....	1.03	1.30	1.37	1.24	1.36
Ohio.....	1.83	1.98	2.06	2.02	2.07
Okla.....	.50	.54	.69	.89	.76
Oreg.....	2.78	2.85	2.95	3.46	3.66
Pa.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	3.23
P. R.....	.50	.47	.54	.61	.60
R. I.....	3.08	3.05	2.90	2.76	2.63
S. C.....	.27	.35	.40	.37	.38
S. Dak.....	.84	.85	.97	.98	.99
Tenn.....	.47	.59	.64	.67	.63
Tex.....	.22	.23	.25	.26	.30
Utah.....	1.36	1.38	1.25	1.20	1.27
Vt.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	5.00
V. I.....	3.59	4.16	3.69	7.24	5.38
Va.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
Wash.....	3.57	3.37	3.87	4.13	4.10
W. Va.....	1.25	1.40	1.40	1.45	1.52
Wis.....	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	2.55	2.65
Wyo.....	.94	1.19	1.51	1.77	1.41

<sup>1</sup> Estimated total expenditures, based on reports from the following number of States: 1951-52, 38 States; 1952-53 and 1953-54, 39 States; 1954-55, 40 States; 1955-56, 45 States.

<sup>2</sup> Report incomplete.

<sup>3</sup> No report.

crease in its child population in recent years. Between April 1, 1950, and July 1, 1955, California's population under age 21 rose 37 percent, compared with a rise of 21 percent in both Oregon and Washington and a 16-percent rise in the continental United States.<sup>3</sup> Factors that tend to lower reported expenditures in Idaho and in many of the North Central States (Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio) have already been indicated. Louisiana was a notable exception to the low level of per capita expenditures prevailing in the South.

A feature of the composition of the population that throws much light on the social characteristics and human needs of any community is the relationship between the size of the child population and the size of the adult population of working age. Since the child population is dependent for its care and support on the adult population of working age, the extent of adult responsibility for children in a community can be measured by determining the number of children under age 18 for every 100 adults aged 18-64. Where this "child dependency ratio" is high, family responsibilities and requirements for social welfare services are likely to be heavy. State child-dependency ratios and State child welfare expenditures may therefore usefully be considered together.

A State with a large child population may have a low dependency ratio, and one with a small child population may have a high ratio. As of July 1, 1955, New York and California, for example, ranked first and second, respectively, among States in the absolute size of the child population under age 18 but were forty-eighth and fortieth with respect to the child-dependency ratio.<sup>4</sup> Mississippi and New Mexico were twenty-fifth and thirty-sixth, respectively, in child population, and their child-dependency rates were the two highest.

As shown in table 5, there were 60

<sup>3</sup> Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-25, No. 151, Feb. 11, 1957.

<sup>4</sup> The ratio is based on Bureau of the Census estimates of the civilian population by age groups (*Current Population Reports*, op. cit.).

children under age 18 for every 100 adults aged 18-64 in the United States at the beginning of July 1955. Mississippi, with 87 children for every 100 adults, had the highest child-dependency ratio, followed by New Mexico (85 per 100), South Carolina (83), Utah (80), and Arkansas (78). At the other extreme was the District of Columbia (38 per 100), followed by New York (48), New Jersey (49), Connecticut (51), and Illinois and Massachusetts (53 each). The "burden" of child dependency clearly is distributed unequally among the States.

There was a fairly strong inverse relationship between the States' per capita expenditures for child welfare services in 1955-56 and their child-dependency ratios. The ratio was highest in the most rural States, the

**Table 5.—Child-dependency ratios and public child welfare expenditures per capita, by specified State group, fiscal year 1955-56<sup>1</sup>**

State group	Child-dependency ratio	Expenditure per capita
Continental United States.....	60	\$2.31
Region:		
Northeast.....	51	5.46
North Central.....	59	1.63
South.....	69	.98
West.....	60	2.51
Urban-rural character:		
Most urban States.....	54	3.36
Semirural States.....	65	1.67
Most rural States.....	75	.82
Income level:		
Highest-income States.....	54	3.47
Middle-income States.....	63	1.43
Lowest-income States.....	74	.96

<sup>1</sup> Based on Bureau of the Census population estimates as of July 1, 1955; child-dependency ratio represents number of children under age 18 per 100 adults aged 18-64.

lowest-income States, and the South—precisely the groups in which per capita expenditures were lowest. If States with relatively large proportions of children are likely to have greater need for child welfare services, then the pattern of variations in total expenditures tends to differ from the pattern of requirements. The distribution of Federal grants-in-aid on the basis of size of the States' rural child population results in relatively large allotments to the groups of States with high child-dependency ratios. Federal funds thereby serve to bring about a better balance na-

tionally between requirements and expenditures.

### State Fiscal Effort

It has been noted that per capita expenditures per child under age 21 in the population and per capita personal income levels of the States are related directly. The relationship between per capita expenditures from State and local funds and State personal income per capita is fairly strong. It would appear stronger if all public outlays for child welfare, and not only those of the public welfare agencies, were included in the reports of Illinois, Michigan, and other States whose data are not fully comparable with those of most States. Limitations in the data alone, however, cannot explain why, for example, Maine and Vermont, which rank twenty-fifth and twenty-ninth, respectively, in personal income per capita, are sixth and fourth in per capita expenditures for child welfare services.

These examples indicate a disparity between States in the extent to which their economic resources are drawn upon to finance public welfare services for children. A measure of this extent (or "fiscal effort") is the amount a State spends for public child welfare services for every \$1,000 of State personal income. State personal income, as defined by the Department of Commerce, has been widely accepted as an index of the relative economic capacities of the States.

For every \$1,000 of the Nation's personal income, 47 cents was spent in 1955-56 for public child welfare services (table 6). There was a wide range in State fiscal effort, from \$1.16 for every \$1,000 of State personal income in Vermont and \$1.15 in New York to 1 cent in Idaho and 5 cents in Texas.<sup>5</sup>

Fiscal effort was greatest in the most urban States, in the highest-income States, and in the Northeast-

<sup>5</sup> Although two States may make the same fiscal effort, their total expenditures can differ widely. New York and Vermont, for example, made almost equal fiscal efforts in 1955-56, yet New York spends many times what Vermont spends and its per capita expenditures also are larger. For the same reason, less fiscal effort in a wealthy State may yield a larger amount for expenditure than greater effort in a poor State.

ern and Western States. Fiscal effort was lowest in the States with a high proportion of children to adults; in the rural States, where voluntary child welfare services are least available and where public services must

**Table 6.—Public child welfare expenditures per \$1,000 of State personal income, by specified State group, fiscal year 1955-56**

State group	Number of States	Expenditures per \$1,000 of State personal income
Total <sup>1</sup> .....	42	\$0.47
Region:		
Northeast.....	8	.87
North Central.....	10	.29
South.....	14	.23
West.....	10	.44
Urban-rural character:		
Most urban.....	13	.54
Semirural.....	18	.36
Most rural.....	11	.24
Income level:		
Highest-income.....	14	.56
Middle-income.....	14	.30
Lowest-income.....	14	.26

<sup>1</sup> Personal income data not available for Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (the 3 other jurisdictions reporting child welfare expenditures for 1955-56).

fill the gap; and in the poorest States, where the amounts available for expenditures are less, as a result, than they are in other States.

### Public Payments to Voluntary Organizations

All but seven of the 45 reporting States furnished information on the amounts spent in 1955-56 to purchase foster-family or institutional care from voluntary child-caring organizations and care for children living in foster-family homes supervised directly by the public agencies. About half the total outlay for foster care in these 38 States was expended by the public agencies directly, and half was paid to private organizations. Atypical patterns, however, in Pennsylvania and New York conceal the predominant pattern of direct payment by the public agencies. When these two States are excluded, it is found that the agencies spent 86 percent directly and paid 14 percent to voluntary organizations. In 28 of the 38 States, four-fifths or more of the foster-care expenditures—and in 12 of the 28, practically the entire expenditure—was made directly by

the public agency. In only three States was more than 50 percent paid to voluntary organizations—Pennsylvania (84 percent), New York (79 percent), and North Dakota (56 percent). Within the northeastern region alone there were wide differences; the payments to voluntary agencies in Maine, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island (the only Northeastern States besides New York and Pennsylvania for which information was available) together amounted to only 7 percent. The variations may result from the fact that voluntary facilities are less generally available in some States than in others, from differences in State policy concerning purchase of care, or from both these reasons.

Sizable payments to voluntary organizations occurred in a number of States where the percentage was substantially lower than in Pennsylvania, New York, and North Dakota. Illinois paid voluntary agencies more than \$1 million in 1955-56 (36 percent of its total foster-care expenditure), Oregon and Washington paid more than \$600,000 (42 percent and 30 percent, respectively), and Indiana and Ohio paid more than \$500,000 (24 percent and 11 percent, respectively).

### Trends, 1952-56

National expenditure data on child welfare services first became available in 1952. Expenditures during the period from 1951-52 to 1955-56 went up 29 percent.<sup>6</sup> Increases occurred in all major functional components except educational-leave payments.<sup>7</sup> Expenditures for professional and facilitating services went up 37 percent and foster-care expenditures 26 percent. Among the three types of expenditures for professional and facilitating services, personnel costs rose 42 percent, educational-leave payments fell 2 percent, and other administrative costs increased 21 per-

<sup>6</sup> This section is based on data for the 38 States that reported completely and comparably from 1951-52 to 1955-56. The 15 States not included were estimated to have spent about one-fourth the national aggregate expenditure in 1955-56; they include States from all State groups—by region, by income level, or by urban-rural character.

<sup>7</sup> Fifty-three States reported their expenditures of Federal funds for educational leave.

cent. Per capita expenditures went up 17 percent.

Expenditures of State funds increased 89 percent, and expenditures of local and Federal funds declined 11 percent and 6 percent, respectively. The marked divergence between the trends for State funds and that for local funds was mainly the result of shifts in State-local fiscal patterns in Connecticut, referred to earlier, and in New York. In 1954, New York extended State participation in local costs—previously limited to sharing expenditures for salaries of local personnel—to all child welfare expenditures. With the exclusion of these two States, expenditures from State funds rose 34 percent and from local funds, 25 percent.

There is a clear trend toward enlarging the share of public child welfare expenditures coming from State funds and thus reducing the share coming from local funds. The State share went up in 32 of the 38 States included in this trend series. With respect to the local share the situation was different. No local funds were expended in either 1951-52 or 1955-56 in 13 of the 38 States, and in 16 States the local share was less in the later year than in 1951-52. Michigan passed a law, effective April 1, 1956, designed to extend, strengthen, and equalize the foster-care programs of the counties through the use of State aid; it is expected to effect a gradual reallocation of State-local fiscal responsibilities. Recent legislation in Pennsylvania authorizing State reimbursement to counties for local foster-care programs should have a similar result.

The rise from 1951-52 to 1955-56 in aggregate national expenditures reflected real gains in public child welfare services, since the period was one of fairly stable prices. Although the child population grew rapidly during these years, the increase in expenditures was relatively greater. Specific evidences of program development and strengthening were a 12-percent rise in the number of children served and a 10-percent rise in the number of public child welfare employees. The resulting rise in personnel expenditures was also attributable to higher salary levels; the median salary of public welfare caseworkers, the largest group

of professional employees, went up 20 percent.

The upward trend in expenditures was nationwide. Thirty-four of the 38 States increased their expenditures from 1951-52 to 1955-56; only Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island registered declines. In some jurisdictions the rise was substantial, exceeding 50 percent in eight States.<sup>8</sup> The trend was also generally upward each year. Increases occurred in all 4 years in 18 States, and in 3 of the years in 13 States. Decreases in all 4 years occurred only in Hawaii and Rhode Island, and in Idaho and Massachusetts they occurred in 3 of the years. The pervasiveness of the rising trend throughout the country and during the 4-year period is attributable, to no small degree, to common dynamic forces having a nationwide impact—most important perhaps, the growth in population and the generally high levels of production, employment, and income.

Program improvements in child welfare services may sometimes bring about a fall rather than a rise in expenditures. In some States with large foster-care expenditures, for example, advances in such fields as work with parents and adoptions may effect a net reduction in expenditures by reducing the need for costly foster-care facilities.

### Trends in Foster-Care Payments, 1947-56

A study of the Nation's foster-care resources, undertaken in 1947 by the American Public Welfare Association, included inquiry into "the extent to which public funds were being utilized by State and local public welfare agencies for children in need of foster care."<sup>9</sup> Information on foster-care payments in the fiscal year 1946-47 was collected through a questionnaire sent to state public welfare agencies. Since the concept and coverage of the 1947 inquiry and of the reports to the Children's Bureau for 1955-56 are substantially similar, trends in payments for board and care could be studied for the 30

<sup>8</sup> Colorado, Delaware, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, and Wyoming.

<sup>9</sup> Bess Craig, *Foster Care*, American Public Welfare Association, 1948.

States that reported completely at both times.<sup>10</sup>

Foster-care payments increased considerably (85 percent) in the 9-year interval. With the exclusion of New York, which in 1955-56 spent two-thirds of the total payments made in the 30 States, the increase was 126 percent. Payments from State funds went up more than payments from local funds (304 percent compared with 11 percent)—a difference that is narrowed markedly when New York is excluded (142 percent from State funds and 108 percent from local funds). This trend undoubtedly began before the period under consideration and is simply one aspect of the historical evolution of government functions and financing during which the State governments have assumed a more important role.

The rather limited public responsibility for foster-care services in some States as recently as 1946-47 is indicated by the fact that in that year total payments for board and care were less than \$50,000 in eight of the 30 States.<sup>11</sup> The large percentage increases in seven of these States must be related to the low level of expenditure from which they started.

The rise in foster-care payments, although in part a response to the increase in the general price level, was mainly a reflection of the expansion of service and the advance in the level of payment per child receiving care. The number of children served by public agencies who were living in foster-family homes in the 30 States rose 27 percent (44 percent, excluding New York)—the result of the growth of public child welfare services and the shift from institutional to foster-family care. In

<sup>10</sup> Expenditures of public institutions, reported in the American Public Welfare Association study, have been omitted to conform with the definition of expenditures used in this article. The reporting for 1955-56, based on an annual expenditures reporting plan, may have been more nearly complete and accurate than that in the earlier inquiry, and accordingly the magnitude of the increases shown may be somewhat overstated. An additional limitation of the data is the fact that four of the five States with the largest total child welfare expenditures in 1955-56 are not included.

<sup>11</sup> Florida, Idaho, Mississippi, Montana, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wyoming.

10 of the 30 States, however, the number of children served by public agencies who were living in foster-family homes either remained about the same or declined.

### Trends in Federal Expenditures, 1936-56

Federal participation in the financing of public child welfare programs began in 1936. Under the terms of the Social Security Act of 1935, \$1.5 million was authorized to be appropriated annually for grants-in-aid to States for child welfare services. A uniform allotment of \$10,000 was to be made to each cooperating State, the remainder of the authorization to be distributed according to the size of the State's rural population in relation to the total rural population of the United States. Under the 1950 amendments, distribution is based on the size of the State's rural population under age 18 in relation to the total rural population of the United States under that age.

Since 1935 the amount of the authorization has been increased four times—in 1939, 1946, 1950, and 1956—and the amount of the uniform allotment has been raised twice—in 1946 and 1950. Under the law as it stands today, the annual appropriation authorized is \$12 million, and the uni-

Table 7.—Federal grants to States for child welfare services: Amounts authorized, appropriated, and expended by States, fiscal years 1935-36 through 1955-56

Fiscal year	Federal grants for child welfare services		
	Authorized	Appropriated	Expended by States
1935-36.....	\$1,500,000	\$625,000	<sup>1</sup> \$84,956
1936-37.....	1,500,000	1,376,457	851,089
1937-38.....	1,500,000	1,499,543	1,312,077
1938-39.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,526,678
1939-40.....	1,510,000	1,505,000	1,492,315
1940-41.....	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,523,985
1941-42.....	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,554,183
1942-43.....	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,495,994
1943-44.....	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,473,349
1944-45.....	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,365,007
1945-46.....	1,510,000	1,510,000	1,276,426
1946-47.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	1,852,470
1947-48.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,077,148
1948-49.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,749,322
1949-50.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	4,046,120
1950-51.....	10,000,000	7,075,000	4,858,064
1951-52.....	10,000,000	7,590,400	7,116,856
1952-53.....	10,000,000	4,370,923	7,409,061
1953-54.....	10,000,000	7,228,900	6,988,709
1954-55.....	10,000,000	7,228,900	6,883,876
1955-56.....	10,000,000	7,228,900	6,933,148

<sup>1</sup> February-June only.

form allotment is \$40,000. Amounts appropriated in recent years, however, have been somewhat less than the amounts authorized (table 7).

The basic purpose of the 1935 act stands unaltered: to enable the Federal Government "to cooperate with State public welfare agencies in establishing, extending, and strengthening, especially in predominantly rural areas, public welfare services . . . for the protection and care of homeless, dependent, and neglected children, and children in danger of becoming delinquent." The act provides that grants are to be expended "for payment of part of the cost of district, county, or other local child welfare services in areas predominantly rural, for developing State services for the encouragement and assistance of adequate methods of community child welfare organization," and (by a 1950 amendment) "for paying the cost of returning any runaway child who has not attained the age of sixteen to his own community in another State in cases in which such return is in the interest of the child and the cost thereof cannot otherwise be met." State or local sharing is required only in the financing of local services in predominantly rural areas. Except in the earliest years, all States have joined with the Federal Government in developing annual plans for using child welfare grants.<sup>12</sup>

The States spent less than the amounts appropriated by Congress in some years—especially the years immediately following legislation authorizing new or enlarged appropriations, when they needed time to put to full use the amounts made available. In other years the States used funds carried over from preceding years, and expenditures exceeded the annual appropriation. Under a provision enacted in 1953, however, no allotment can be made available after the close of the year for which it was made, except to liquidate obligations incurred during the year.

The history of State expenditures of Federal funds since 1935 can be divided into three periods. There was

<sup>12</sup> Puerto Rico was not eligible to participate in the program until 1940, and the Virgin Islands was not eligible until 1947. Utah did not participate in 1945.

an initial period of growth, from 1935-36 to 1938-39. Declines occurred in 1939-40 and in each of the war years from 1942-43 to 1945-46. After the war, as the amounts appropriated were increased, expenditures advanced markedly until 1953-54, when they began to level off. The upturn in 1955-56 is expected to continue for the 2 succeeding years, in view of the increased appropriations.

In the concepts underlying the original Social Security Act, grants for the program of aid to dependent children were seen, along with grants for maternal and child health services, services to crippled children, and child welfare services, as part of a program of social security measures for children. Expenditures for aid to dependent children have shown an almost continuous growth. Successive amendments to the Social Security Act that increased the Federal share of assistance payments, as well as other factors, contributed to the growth in Federal expenditures for the program. There is a relationship between aid to dependent children and the child welfare programs that has had an important bearing on child welfare expenditures. Aid to dependent children has helped to reduce, for example, the number of children removed from their own homes because of the poverty of their families. As a result, foster-care payments—from voluntary sources as well as from State funds—have been less than would otherwise have been necessary.

### Conclusion

In reviewing tendencies in child welfare at the turn of the century, one authority wrote "The question now being decided is this—shall our state administrations be intrusted with the management of a system for the care and training of destitute children, or is it wiser to turn that branch of public service over to private charitable corporations, leaving to the public officials the functions of paying bills, and of exercising such supervision over the workings of the plan as may be possible?"<sup>13</sup>

Public welfare administration has

matured since this statement was written in 1902. The questions now being decided are no longer whether public administration is to be entrusted with responsibility, but what this responsibility is to include, by what methods of administration and financing it is to be implemented, and how it is to be shared between the several levels of government and between the voluntary and the public services. The earlier questions were raised at a midpoint between two historic events in the evolution of public welfare in the United States. About 35 years earlier, in 1863, Massachusetts had set up a State Board of Charities that is considered the Nation's first State welfare agency. Thirty-five years after he wrote, the Social Security Act brought about definite effective steps toward the goal that had long been sought in the field of child welfare—the assumption by all the States of a degree of responsibility for child welfare on a Statewide basis. This action was accompanied in most instances by the organization of child welfare divisions within the State public welfare agencies.

Typically, the financing of public child welfare services today is shared by all levels of government. All States expend State funds, all participate in the Federal grant-in-aid program and most of them expend local funds. Although the largest part of the national expenditure is from State funds, the local share is substantial. In relation to the total expenditure, Federal funds have been limited, but they have been effective in their objective of extending and strengthening services in rural and other areas of "special need." In recent years, expenditures of all levels of government have been rising, as services generally have been extended and strengthened. A trend toward relatively greater increases in State than in local funds seems likely to be continued in the years ahead.

The financing and administration of child welfare programs do not necessarily go together. Under the Federal grant-in-aid system, responsibility for directing and administering child welfare programs lies with the States. States frequently transfer State funds to localities to aid locally

administered services, and local governments sometimes transfer funds to the State for State-administered services. Further research is needed on prevailing State-local administrative and fiscal patterns, especially since it is at the local level—where direct service is given to individuals—that service too often is not available. One-half of all United States counties, with a fourth of the Nation's child population, did not have access to the services of a full-time public child welfare worker in 1956.

The remarkable variability of State expenditures for child welfare is evident in per capita expenditures, in the proportions of total expenditures used for foster care, in the shares of foster-care payments going to voluntary organizations, in fiscal effort, and in other ways. When the States are grouped according to region, urban-rural character, and income level (characteristics that are interrelated), a few patterns are clear. Fiscal effort and per capita expenditures, and the share of total expenditures devoted to foster care, are greatest in the Northeast, the most urban States, and the highest-income States; they are lowest in the South, the most rural States, and the lowest-income States. The States with the highest proportions of children have the lowest per capita expenditures. These financial inequalities between States have been moderated somewhat by the method of distributing Federal funds. As a result of the allocation of these funds on the basis of rural child population, the Federal share of State expenditures for professional and facilitating services is largest in the South, the lowest-income States, and the States with the highest child dependency ratios—State characteristics all correlated with rurality.

Wide variations in expenditures occur not only between groups of States but also within any one group. Perhaps more decisive for the child welfare services than conditions peculiar to an individual State or conditions common to a group of States are certain forces in American society that affect the Nation as a whole. Such forces have always powerfully affected child welfare programs, and their importance may

*(Continued on page 29)*

<sup>13</sup> Homer Folks, *The Care of Destitute, Neglected, and Delinquent Children*, Macmillan Company, 1902, page 240.

**Table 12.—Average payments including vendor payments for medical care, average amount of money payments, and average amount of vendor payments for assistance cases, by program and State, April 1958<sup>1</sup>**

State	Old-age assistance			Aid to dependent children (per recipient)			Aid to the blind			Aid to the permanently and totally disabled		
	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>	All assistance <sup>2</sup>	Money payments to recipients <sup>3</sup>	Vendor payments for medical care <sup>2</sup>
Total, 53 States <sup>4</sup> .....	\$61.24	\$55.78	\$5.62	\$27.33	\$25.84	\$1.50	\$66.65	\$62.48	\$4.26	\$60.61	\$52.70	\$8.19
Alabama.....	38.70	38.68	.02	8.42	8.40	.01	35.93	35.93	( <sup>5</sup> )	33.23	33.16	.07
Arkansas.....	44.15	41.22	2.93	14.98	14.81	.16	49.54	46.98	2.56	33.71	30.88	2.84
California.....	84.02	78.12	6.00	45.43	41.78	3.78	105.03	99.16	6.00			
Colorado.....	92.30	81.05	11.26	31.88	30.31	1.58	75.38	66.71	8.66	60.38	58.11	2.27
Connecticut.....	<sup>6</sup> 107.32	<sup>6</sup> 88.32	19.00	45.27	40.66	4.61	98.68	81.68	17.00	<sup>6</sup> 118.55	<sup>6</sup> 86.55	32.00
Delaware.....							71.97	66.34	6.13			
District of Columbia.....	56.71	56.10	.61	28.64	28.56	.08	64.15	64.00	.14	67.28	66.36	.91
Hawaii.....	51.45	45.87	5.58	29.60	26.85	2.75	63.76	57.10	6.66	64.14	58.60	5.54
Illinois.....	66.12	45.20	23.02	37.26	34.02	3.24	77.15	58.61	19.52	79.94	56.13	25.13
Indiana.....	56.90	42.44	14.65	28.13	25.13	3.03	68.56	57.30	11.42	( <sup>7</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )
Kansas.....	72.77	63.41	9.73	33.79	30.51	3.42	78.52	69.19	9.99	76.19	64.93	11.93
Louisiana.....	63.32	61.69	1.64	20.98	20.88	.10	74.09	72.40	1.72	50.42	47.52	2.93
Maine.....	55.71	49.71	6.00	26.66	25.80	.86	60.26	54.26	6.00	62.02	53.02	9.00
Massachusetts.....	97.85	78.09	20.30	46.38	43.07	3.39	118.18	108.44	10.12	118.89	85.14	35.80
Michigan.....	69.06	60.85	8.26	37.07	36.81	.26	72.20	69.23	2.97	83.37	77.44	5.98
Minnesota.....	79.54	67.76	11.79	40.18	35.96	4.25	92.77	77.06	15.71	60.21	56.29	4.40
Montana.....							73.63	68.85	4.79			
Nebraska.....	65.66	53.06	10.79	27.11	26.63	.48	79.60	63.40	16.33	67.74	54.43	13.54
Nevada.....	68.23	62.26	5.97				96.40	90.45	5.96	( <sup>7</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )	( <sup>7</sup> )
New Hampshire.....	67.87	52.67	15.25	37.92	34.08	3.84	73.38	61.99	11.40	84.66	54.75	30.08
New Jersey.....	81.77	70.36	11.41	42.61	41.53	1.08	78.88	76.29	2.60	91.36	82.13	9.23
New Mexico.....	53.59	47.16	6.43	28.10	23.61	2.59	56.66	51.41	5.25	56.59	50.01	6.58
New York.....	93.89	76.83	18.51	39.78	36.21	3.69	96.23	84.59	12.88	93.64	74.54	20.79
North Carolina.....	36.90	35.62	1.28	18.22	17.82	.40	46.07	45.11	.95	42.41	40.09	2.32
North Dakota.....	80.41	68.05	12.48	36.64	33.08	3.72	66.87	60.30	6.58	87.28	74.98	12.38
Ohio.....	64.81	58.73	6.09	24.60	24.44	.16	65.88	57.19	8.85	66.82	52.29	14.65
Oklahoma.....	69.23	63.26	5.98	29.34	25.57	3.77	84.99	78.96	6.03	76.48	70.40	6.08
Oregon.....	80.36	59.20	21.19	39.41	36.67	2.77	84.32	73.39	10.92	89.99	69.09	20.99
Pennsylvania.....	51.27	46.10	5.17	29.89	28.33	1.56	63.13	59.51	3.63	60.00	52.62	7.38
Rhode Island.....	70.44	61.50	9.00	34.19	30.43	3.76	73.50	67.50	6.00	76.37	64.43	12.00
Tennessee.....	38.63	37.63	1.00	18.72	18.17	.55	43.35	41.92	1.43	41.73	40.84	.89
Utah.....	63.54	57.57	5.97	35.83	32.12	3.71	67.97	62.29	5.68	67.21	61.35	5.86
Virgin Islands.....	18.59	18.11	.51	9.28	9.11	.16	( <sup>8</sup> )	( <sup>8</sup> )	( <sup>8</sup> )	20.27	19.77	.50
Washington.....	85.28	76.04	9.40	43.48	39.18	4.30	94.28	86.97	7.54	97.56	84.21	13.67
West Virginia.....	34.23	32.66	1.57	23.60	22.79	.81	38.66	37.07	1.59	38.79	35.60	3.11
Wisconsin.....	75.05	60.91	14.52	43.64	38.55	5.15	76.36	65.95	10.54	116.57	83.88	33.09
Wyoming.....	71.07	61.27	9.80	36.38	33.88	2.51	74.52	64.29	10.23	68.68	61.31	7.36

<sup>1</sup> Averages for general assistance not computed because of difference among States in policy or practice regarding use of general assistance funds to pay medical bills for recipients of the special types of public assistance. Figures in italics represent payments made without Federal participation. For State programs not shown, no vendor payments were made during the month or such payments were not reported.

<sup>2</sup> Averages based on cases receiving money payments, vendor payments for medical care, or both.

<sup>3</sup> May also include small amounts for assistance in kind and vendor payments

for other than medical care. Averages based on number of cases receiving payments. See tables 13-16 for average payments for State programs under which no vendor payments for medical care were made.

<sup>4</sup> For aid to the permanently and totally disabled represents data for the 48 States with programs in operation.

<sup>5</sup> Less than 1 cent.

<sup>6</sup> Includes retroactive payments covering increase in rate for convalescent care.

<sup>7</sup> No program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled.

<sup>8</sup> Average payment not computed on base of less than 50 recipients.

**CHILD WELFARE FUNDS**

(Continued from page 15)

well be greater today than in earlier periods of our history. In recent decades, for example, national advances in such areas as the standard of living, public health, and social security have materially reduced the proportion of children placed in foster care. Another factor has been

the increased emphasis on preventing the need for foster care and providing alternative services, such as adoption, whenever possible. Population growth and mobility, metropolitan expansion, and many other changes that today affect families wherever they live are increasing the requirements for financing child welfare services in practically all

States. A large majority of the State welfare agencies have recently reported inadequate financing as one of the major limitations of their present-day programs of foster care. This limitation may also affect child welfare services generally, as the slow and uneven development of social services for children in their own homes indicates.