based on a percentage of the budget deficit (requirements minus income) the reduction in assistance represented only this percentage of the increase in old-age and survivors insurance benefit, even though the entire increase was considered. Thus if a recipient's expenses were $\$ 50$ and his only income the minimum oldage and survivors insurance benefit of $\$ 10$, his former assistance payment should have been $\$ 40$. If the State was paying only 50 percent of the budget deficit, his payment was actually only $\$ 20$. Under the amendments his benefit was raised to $\$ 25$, leaving a budget deficit of $\$ 25$, half of which ( $\$ 12.50$ ) is paid by the assistance agency. Therefore, although the increase in the insurance benefit was $\$ 15$, the decrease in assistance was only $\$ 7.50$. This anomaly explains the aboveaverage disparity between the amounts of the benefit increases and the reductions in assistance payments in some of the States with low fiscal capacity.
More numerous and more drastic percentage reductions in payments for aid to dependent children than in old-age assistance were among the reasons for the greater disparity in aid to dependent children than in old-age assistance between the total increase in insurance benefits and the total decrease in assistance for all States.

## No Change in Payments

No decrease in assistance payments followed the increase in old-age and survivors insurance benefits in some cases because the recipients' unmet
need had been as large as the increase in benefit. These were usually cases in which State maximums had prevented larger payments. Although the proportion of recipients whose assistance payments were not reduced was small for all States combined- 6 percent for old-age assistance and about 11 percent for aid to dependent children-these percentages were much higher in States that had been making high proportions of all payments at the State maximums. Such States included a few wealthy States with unusually high standards and maximums as well as some where both are low. High proportions of payments that were not reduced was another reason for the greater disparity in some States than in others between the increase in insurance and the decrease in assistance.

## Total Savings in Assistance

The total reduction in assistance payments because of the increase in old-age and survivors insurance benefits was approximately $\$ 4$ million a month for old-age assistance and was about $\$ 800,000$ for aid to dependent children. These totals represent 92 percent of the amount of the benefit increases for aged recipients and 83 percent for aid to dependent children families.

## Gain to Recipients

The advantage to the beneficiaryrecipients that resulted from the increase in their old-age and survivors insurance benefits in the month that the assistance agency took initial action is shown by the difference be-
tween the increase in monthly benefits and the decrease in assistance payments.
In Pennsylvania, for example, the sum of the old-age and survivors insurance benefit plus the old-age assistance payment was $\$ 45.60$ after the change ( $\$ 34.58$ from insurance; $\$ 11.02$ from assistance) as compared with $\$ 45.01$ ( $\$ 18.55$ plus $\$ 26.46$ ) before the change (chart 1). In Kentucky, a State that based payments on only 69 percent of the budget deficit, the average for insurance plus assistance increased from $\$ 29.64$ ( $\$ 15.15$ plus $\$ 14.49$ ) to $\$ 35.00$ ( $\$ 28.82$ plus $\$ 6.18$ ). For families on the aid to dependent children rolls the combined average in Pennsylvania increased from $\$ 100.46$ to $\$ 102.22$ and in Kentucky, where payments were 48 percent of the budget deficit, from $\$ 65.84$ to $\$ 78.54 .{ }^{5}$
The Pennsylvania assistance agency in October 1950 increased the amounts it allowed for food and shelter, and the Kentucky agency in February 1951 increased its maximum payments.
To the extent that these changes, and similar changes in some other States, were made possible by the savings in assistance funds resulting from the increase in insurance benefits, all recipients have profited from the increases in old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

[^0]
## Notes and Brief Reports

## Employers, Workers, and Wages, First Quarter, 1951

The 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act extended coverage, effective January 1, 1951, to certain groups formerly without the protection of old-age and survivors insurance. This extension is reflected in the estimates of the number of employers and workers and the amount of wages in the first quarter of 1951 , shown in the accompanying table. The impact of
defense preparations also contributed significantly to the sharp increases noted in this quarter.

The number of workers in covered employment during January-March 1951, not including the newly covered self-employed, is estimated at $47 \mathrm{mil}-$ lion, and their taxable wages are estimated at $\$ 31$ billion. These totals are 24 percent and 31 percent higher, respectively, than in the corresponding quarter of 1950 . Of the 9 -million increase in the number of workers
during the quarter, probably about half can be attributed to the expansion in economic activity and the other half to extension of coverage. It is estimated that an additional 4.5 million urban self-employed, from whom no returns have as yet been received under the provisions of the new law, had taxable earnings under the program during the quarter.
Average taxable wages, estimated at $\$ 660$ in January-March 1951, were 6.3 percent higher than in JanuaryMarch 1950. This increase is smaller than it would have been if coverage had not been extended because the

Old-age and survivors insurance: Estimated number of employers ${ }^{1}$ and workers and estimated amount of wages in covered industries, by specified period, 1940-51

| year and quarter | Employers reporting wages ${ }^{2}$ (in thousands) | Workers with taxable wages during period: (in thousands) | Tuxable wages ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  | All <br> workers employed in covered industries during period ${ }^{3}$ (in thousands) | Total payrolls in covered industries |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ \text { (in } \\ \text { millions) } \end{gathered}$ | Average per worker |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total } \\ & \text { (in } \\ & \text { millions) } \end{aligned}$ | Average per worker |
| 1940. | 2,500 | 35,393 | \$32, 974 | \$832 | 35, 393 | \$35, 668 | \$1,008 |
| 1941 | 2,646 | 40,976 | 41,848 | 1,021 | 40,976 | 45,463 | 1, 110 |
| 1942 | 2,655 | 46,363 | 52, 939 | 1,142 | 46, 363 | 58, 219 | 1,256 |
| 1043 | 2,394 | 47,656 | 62, 423 | 1,310 | 47,656 | 69, 653 | 1,462 |
| 1944 | 2,469 | 46, 296 | 64,426 | 1,392 | 46,296 | 73,349 | 1,584 |
| 1945 | 2,614 | 46, 392 | 62, 945 | 1,357 | 46, 382 | 71, 560 | 1,543 |
| 1946 | 3,017 | 48,845 | 69, 088 | 1,414 | 48,845 | 79, 260 | 1,623 |
| $19 \pm 7$ | 3, 246 | 48,908 | 78,372 | 1,602 | 48,908 | 92, 449 | 1,890 |
| 1948 | 3,298 | 49,018 | 84, 122 | I, 716 | 49,018 | 102, 255 | 2,086 |
| 19494 | 3,316 | 47, 200 | 81, 808 | 1,733 | 47, 200 | 99,989 | 2, 118 |
| 1950 \% | 3,350 | 49,200 | 87,600 | 1,780 | 49,200 | 109,900 | 2, 234 |
| - 1943 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January-March. | 1,971 | 36,537 | 15, 462 | 423 | 36,537 | 15,760 | 431 |
| April-June. | 2,008 | 37, 483 | 16,561 | 442 | 37,557 | 17, 400 | 463 |
| July-September | 1,998 | 37,682 | 15,838 | 420 | 38, 057 | 17,498 | 460 |
| October-December | 2,001 | 36,016 | 14, 562 | 404 | 37,593 | 18,995 | 505 |
| $\therefore 1944$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January-March. | 2.010 | 36,326 | 17,362 | 478 | 36, 326 | 17,696 | 487 |
| April-June--.... | 2,048 | 36, 893 | 17, 284 | 468 | 36,992 | 18, 185 | 492 |
| July-September- | 2, 038 | 37,301 | 16, 243 | 435 | 37, 752 | 18, 359 | 486 |
| October-December | 2,039 | 35,629 | 13,537 | 380 | 37, 789 | 19,109 | 506 |
| 1945 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January-March. | 2,076 | 35,855 | 17, 874 | 499 | 35,855 | 18,202 | 509 |
| April-June.-...- | 2,149 | 35, 864 | 17,541 | 489 | 35, 949 | 18, 558 | 516 |
| July-September | 2,176 | 35, 684 | 14,982 | 420 | 36, 285 | 17, 261 | 476 |
| October-December | 2,199 | 33, 598 | 12,548 | 373 | 35,973 | 17,478 | 486 |
| 1946 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January-March. | 2, 287 | 36,038 | 16,840 | 467 | 36,038 | 17,397 | 483 |
| April-June.-.- | 2, 416 | 38,055 | 17, 845 | 469 | 38, 153 | 19,079 | 509 |
| July-Septernber | 2, 478 | 39, 670 | 17,709 | 446 | 40,228 | 20, 222 | 503 |
| October-December | 2,513 | 37,945 | 16,604 | 440 | 39,930 | 22, 562 | 565 |
| 1947 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January-March. | 2, 509 | 38,765 | 20,805 | 537 | 38,765 | 21,497 | 555 |
| April-June... | 2,587 | 39, 801 | 20,655 | 519 | 40, 175 | 22, 245 | 554 |
| July-September | 2, 617 | 40, 255 | 19,555 | 486 | 41, 155 | 23,035 | 560 |
| October-December | 2, 609 | 37, 448 | 17,357 | 463 | 40, 748 | 25,672 | 630 |
| 1948 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Janunry-March | 2,588 | 39,560 | 23,080 | 583 | 39,560 | 23,923 | 605 |
| April-June.-. | 2,690 | 40, 245 | 22,708 | 564 | 40, 524 | 24, 668 | 609 |
| July-September | 2, 699 | 40,585 | 21, 150 | 521 | 41,675 | 25,700 | 617 |
| October-December | 2,661 | 36,790 | 17, 184 | 467 | 41, 540 | 27, 964 | 673 |
| 1949 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jamary-March ${ }^{\text {4 }}$ | 2, 639 | 38,500 | 23,376 | 607 | 38,500 | 24, 254 | 630 |
| April-June ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2,693 | 39,370 | 22,571 | 573 | 39,660 | 24, 570 | 620 |
| July-September ${ }^{4}$ - | 2, 697 | 38, 805 | 20, 160 | 520 | 40, 005 | 24,971 | 624 |
| October-December ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 2,692 | 35,400 | 15,701 | 444 | 39,700 | 26, 194 | 660 |
| 1950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $J$ amuary-March ${ }^{4}$ | $\bigcirc \cdot 670$ | 38,000 | 23,600 | 621 | 38,000 | 24,400 | 642 |
| April-Juno ${ }^{4}$-...- | $\bigcirc .750$ | 39,700 | 24, 200 | 610 | 40, 000 | 26, 400 | 860 |
| July-Septeraber ${ }^{4}$ - | 2.750 | 41,000 | 22,500 | 549 | 42,300 | 28,300 | 669 |
| October-December ${ }^{+}$ | 2, 730 | 36,400 | 17,300 | 475 | 40, 600 | 30,800 | 759 |
| $1951{ }^{\text {® }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| January-March ${ }^{4}$ | 3,000 | 47,000 | 31,000 | 060 | 17, (00) | 32,000 | 681 |

[^1]relatively low wage rates of the newly covered domestic and agricultural workers tended to depress the overall average. The total and average amount of taxable and nontaxable wages received by workers in covered industries-estimated at $\$ 32$ billion and $\$ 681$, respectively-were 31 percent and 6.1 percent higher than in January-March 1950.
The estimated number of employers reporting payment of taxable wages was 3.5 million, a 31 -percent increase over the number in the corresponding quarter of the preceding year.

SOCIAL SECURITY IN REVIEW

## (Continued from page 2)

The State trends underlying the national picture for aid to dependent children were unusually divergent. While a large group of States was restoring cuts, making cost-of-living increases, and raising assistance standards, some other States were sharply reducing their payments and restricting eligibility provisions. A few States moved first in one direction and then in the other within the year. The June-to-June shift in monthly expenditures for the program ranged from a 43 -percent drop in Mississippi to a 52 -percent increase in Oklahoma.
In aid to the blind the number of recipients climbed slowly but steadily to an all-time peak of 97,500 persons in November 1950 and then turned downward. Changes in most months were small, so that the June 1951 total was only 0.5 percent less than the November peak and about 1.7 percent higher than in June 1950.
As the result of a specific provision in the 1950 amendments, Pennsylvania submitted its plan for aid to the blind for approval by the Social Security Administration. Missouri and Alaska have passed enabling legislation for that purpose. Pennsylvania's plan was approved and became effective retroactively to February 1951; the proytam added some 15,000 blind persons to the count of recipients in States with plans approved, though payments to about 5,100 of these recipients were made without Federal participation.

The new program for aid to the


[^0]:    ${ }^{5}$ Data for Pennsylvania from the Public Assistance Review (Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance), December 1950; data for Kentucky from the Statistical Journal (Kentucky Department of Economic Security), November 1950.

[^1]:    INumber corresponds to number of employer reurns. A return may relate to more than 1 establishment if employer operates several separate establishments but reports for concern as is whole. 2 Quarterly and aumual data for $1937-39$ were presented in the Bulletin for February 1947, p. 31 ; quarterly data for 1940 were presented in the Builletin for August 1947, p. 30; quarterly data for 1941 and 1942 were presentod in the Bulletin for February 1948, b. 31.

