

Retirement Protection for State and Local Employees: Ten Years of Growth

by DOROTHY McCAMMAN*

The 1950 Social Security Act Amendments made old-age and survivors insurance coverage available to certain groups of State and local employees through voluntary agreements negotiated between the States and the Federal Security Administrator. Members of existing retirement systems and other persons working in positions covered by these systems were specifically excluded from the coverage extension. To assess the potential effect of the amendment and for administrative planning, up-to-date coverage information was needed for each State. A survey undertaken to obtain this information provides, as a byproduct, a measure of the growth in retirement protection over the past decade.

RETIREMENT systems for State and local government employees have doubled their membership in the last 10 years. In October 1952 these systems had 3.0 million members, according to a national survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. Two-thirds of the 4.5 million employees belonged to a system—an important gain proportionally as well as numerically from January 1942, when 1.5 million members represented somewhat less than half of all State and local employment.

The new survey provides the only comprehensive information on retirement coverage for employees of State and local government units that has been available since the Bureau of the Census and the Social Security Board made a joint survey of retirement systems in operation in the fiscal year 1940-41 and their membership in January 1942.¹ The 1952 survey is limited to coverage data, while the earlier one had included information

on beneficiaries and benefit payments, contributions, and other operations of the more than 1,700 systems.

The present survey expands the knowledge of retirement protection by providing data on an important and hitherto unexplored aspect—a measure of the number of State and local employees who work in positions covered by a retirement system without having membership in the system. Some of these employees are ineligible because of such factors as age or recency of employment; others have elected not to join the system. Both groups are nevertheless excluded from old-age and survivors insurance coverage, along with the employees who are members of the retirement system. In October 1952, there were 0.3 million such persons, representing 6.7 percent of total State and local government employment, or about 1 for every 10 members of retirement systems.

The State and local government officials supplying information for the 1952 survey were asked to indicate the number of employees, as of October, who were covered by old-age and survivors insurance through voluntary agreements between the State and the Federal Security Administrator. It had been recognized when the questionnaire was drafted that a sample designed for a survey of all State and local government employment would not necessarily yield accurate data on this relatively small

segment of employment, unevenly distributed from State to State and among different levels of government.² In addition, the official taking responsibility for supplying the information was more likely to have access to accurate data on retirement system coverage for the month of the survey than to old-age and survivors insurance coverage data, for which quarterly reports are prepared. Since the primary purpose of the survey was to obtain accurate data on coverage of State and local retirement systems, the instructions requested that any employee who was covered by both a State or local retirement system and old-age and survivors insurance be counted only once and reported under the State or local system. The question on old-age and survivors insurance coverage was nevertheless included because it made it possible for the official to account for any type of retirement protection applicable to the employees of his State or locality, and to arrive at the same total employment figure reported to the Census Bureau for its October 1952 employment survey.

A total of 438,000 employees, 9.7 percent of all persons in State and local employment in October 1952, were reported as covered by old-age and survivors insurance only. A reasonable allowance for employees who are reported as covered by State or local systems and who also are covered by old-age and survivors insurance under voluntary agreements might bring this total close to 490,000. The survey figure is considerably below the estimate of actual voluntary agreement coverage for September 1952 (590,000 for the continental United States), based on third-quarter wage reports

² The sample and the survey procedures and definitions are described in *Retirement Coverage of State and Local Government Employees*, Bureau of the Census (State and Local Government Special Studies, No. 30), March 1953.

* Division of Research and Statistics, Office of the Commissioner.

¹ The Social Security Board's analysis of the earlier survey data and of the legal provisions of the largest systems appeared in *The Scope of Protection Under State and Local Retirement Systems*, by Dorothy McCamman (Bureau of Research and Statistics, Report No. 12, December 1943); the report, with estimates for fiscal years ended in 1942 and 1943, was reissued in October 1944 (out of print).

Table 1.—Estimated number of State and local government employees, by type of retirement protection and employment, October 1952

[In thousands]

Type of employment	Total	Members of State or local retirement systems ¹	In covered positions but not members ²	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance ¹	No coverage
State and local government employees					
Total.....	4,510	3,021	304	438	746
School.....	1,853	1,374	123	90	265
Police and fire.....	366	259	9	22	75
Other.....	2,291	1,387	173	325	406
State employees					
Total.....	1,102	746	82	136	137
School.....	316	166	27	26	96
Other.....	786	580	55	109	41
Local employees					
Total.....	3,409	2,276	222	302	609
School.....	1,537	1,208	96	64	169
Police and fire.....	366	259	9	22	75
Other.....	1,505	808	117	216	365

¹ Employees who are members of State or local retirement systems and also covered by Federal old-age and survivors insurance have been counted only in the former category.

² Employees in positions potentially covered by a State or local retirement system who are not themselves members of the system because of individual option, age, recency of employment, or other disqualifying factors.

received by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance through January 31, 1953, and increased by an estimate of the coverage effected after September but made retroactive to that date.

Another area of dual coverage—compulsory coverage under old-age and survivors insurance of employees of transit systems acquired from private ownership after 1936—results in an understatement of the survey figure for old-age and survivors insurance coverage. (Because of the compulsory nature of this coverage it is not included in the special wage reports relating to coverage under agreements and therefore does not account for the difference between the figures from the two sources.) More than 30,000 employees of such transit systems³ are believed to be covered under both old-age and survivors insurance and a State or local system, but for purposes of the survey they have been counted only once—

³ These transportation systems and the number of their employees are as follows—San Francisco Municipal Transit System, 3,700; Chicago Transit Authority, 17,500; Boston Metropolitan Transit Authority, 7,700; and Cleveland Municipal Transit System, 4,000.

as members of the special system. With these recognized limitations, the survey data on old-age and survivors insurance coverage are important because they make possible a measure of the total number of employees with protection under one system or the other.

One out of every 6 State and local employees, or 746,000, had no retirement protection in October 1952 and worked in a job not covered by any system.⁴ For these employees, there are no Federal legal barriers to coverage under old-age and survivors insurance. For some of them, negotiations had been started by the States to effect coverage under old-age and survivors insurance. For others, retirement protection may have been deemed unnecessary because of the nature of their employment—a stu-

⁴ Any comparison of the survey figures with estimates based on total State and local government employment—4,237,000 in September 1952—from the *Monthly Report on the Labor Force* of the Bureau of the Census must recognize that the present survey of retirement coverage includes in the total of 4,500,000 State and local government employees some persons who were classified in another category under the *Monthly Report* definitions.

dent employed by a school department, for example, or a part-time employee whose major job was in some other field.

Type of Employment Covered

Membership in retirement systems is proportionately higher for school employees than for police and fire department employees or for employees engaged in the other functions of State and local governments.

Of the 1.9 million school employees, including clerical and custodial workers as well as instructional staff, 3 out of every 4 belonged to a State or local retirement system (table 1). Most educational employees are working at the local level. Here, membership in retirement systems was at its highest—79 percent of all such employment. Coverage under old-age and survivors insurance, relatively rare for this group, brought the total with retirement protection to 83 percent.

In contrast, of the educational employees at the State level (instructors and other persons working for State colleges and universities), only slightly more than half (53 percent) belonged to State retirement systems or systems like that of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association to which the State was contributing. Addition of old-age and survivors insurance coverage raised the proportion with protection to just over three-fifths. That State educational employment, in comparison with other areas of employment identified by the survey, had such a high proportion without protection may be explained in part by the inclusion of student help in the employment total.

Police and fire department employees working for localities also had a relatively high degree of retirement coverage. (State protective employees were classified with "other" types of State employment.) Of these local employees, again including those in clerical and administrative jobs as well as uniformed personnel, 71 percent were members of retirement systems and another 6 percent had retirement protection under old-age and survivors insurance. The proportion classified as "in covered position but not members" of retirement sys-

tems was considerably lower for this group (2.5 percent) than for educational employees (6.6 percent) or for other nonschool employees (7.5 percent).

Some 2.3 million employees have been grouped as "other," not because of the homogeneity of their functions or working conditions but simply because separable information was needed only for educational and for police and fire department employees. The group "other" encompasses employees performing general administrative and financial functions, legislative and judicial employees, highway and sanitation workers, per-

sons engaged in public service enterprises and in health and welfare activities; it includes the charwoman who sweeps the floor of the county courthouse as well as the presiding judge. Obviously, retirement provisions for these public employees are diverse, and over-all figures on the extent of protection conceal wide variations, ranging from comprehensive coverage to virtually no coverage. Of the total number, three-fifths were members of retirement systems.

The survey reveals interesting differences between the State and local levels. Three-fourths of the State employees but only a little more than

half the local employees belonged to retirement systems. Addition of old-age and survivors insurance coverage (14 percent of the total at each level) raises the proportion protected to 88 percent at the State level—the highest for any of the survey groupings—and to 68 percent at the local level.

Growth Since 1942

Despite some differences in the type of coverage data collected in the 1942 and 1952 survey, certain conclusions on the growth of the systems can be drawn from a comparison. Membership in State and local retirement

Table 2.—All employees of State and local governments, by type of retirement protection and by State, October 1952

States	Total	Number (in thousands)				Percent of total State and local employment			
		Members of State or local retirement systems ¹	In covered positions but not members ²	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance ¹	No coverage	Members of State or local retirement systems ¹	In covered positions but not members ²	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance ¹	No coverage
Total	4,510.0	3,021.3	304.4	438.1	746.3	67.0	6.7	9.7	16.5
Alabama	72.1	39.0	2.7	17.6	12.8	54.1	3.7	24.3	17.8
Arizona	24.6	13.4	1.5	5.4	4.3	54.5	6.2	21.8	17.4
Arkansas	42.7	15.8	1.1	17.3	8.5	37.1	2.5	40.5	19.9
California	388.5	299.9	37.7	12.8	38.1	77.2	9.7	3.3	9.8
Colorado	46.5	28.4	4.2	6.9	7.0	61.1	8.9	14.9	15.1
Connecticut	61.8	48.4	2.2	3.9	7.4	78.2	3.5	6.2	12.0
Delaware	10.3	7.5	.9	.4	1.6	72.5	8.4	3.4	15.8
District of Columbia	19.9	19.9	0	0	0	100.0	0	0	0
Florida	101.0	69.7	10.3	7.1	13.9	69.0	10.2	7.1	13.7
Georgia	85.8	49.5	6.4	0	30.0	57.6	7.5	0	34.9
Idaho	20.9	5.7	.2	12.3	2.7	27.5	1.0	58.7	12.8
Illinois	239.3	182.7	15.0	(¹)	41.5	76.4	6.3	(¹)	17.4
Indiana	112.5	(²)	(³)	16.9	(³)	(²)	(¹)	15.0	(³)
Iowa	91.3	74.0	1.4	0	15.8	81.2	1.5	0	17.3
Kansas	65.5	21.3	2.9	28.8	12.5	32.5	4.4	44.0	19.0
Kentucky	61.5	24.2	.5	29.4	7.4	39.3	.9	47.8	12.0
Louisiana	78.8	55.9	4.9	0	17.6	70.9	6.3	.5	22.4
Maine	30.3	17.1	1.5	2.1	9.5	56.5	5.0	6.9	31.5
Maryland	64.0	(²)	(³)	2.2	(³)	(²)	(³)	3.4	(³)
Massachusetts	166.3	129.4	13.8	(¹)	23.0	77.8	8.3	(¹)	13.8
Michigan	202.3	157.4	3.8	9.1	31.9	77.8	1.9	4.5	15.8
Minnesota	107.4	(²)	(³)	0	(³)	(²)	(³)	0	(³)
Mississippi	55.9	1.8	.9	36.8	16.4	3.1	1.6	65.9	29.3
Missouri	104.9	35.8	1.3	54.4	13.4	34.2	1.2	51.9	12.8
Montana	20.8	14.5	2.4	0	4.0	69.6	11.3	0	19.1
Nebraska	48.6	18.6	3.4	17.4	9.2	38.3	6.9	35.9	18.9
Nevada	6.9	5.9	.3	0	.7	85.7	4.2	0	10.2
New Hampshire	19.4	9.8	1.3	1.2	7.1	50.3	6.9	6.1	36.7
New Jersey	138.8	90.7	15.2	0	30.9	66.3	11.1	0	22.6
New Mexico	22.0	15.4	1.4	0	5.1	70.1	6.6	0	23.3
New York	508.1	426.6	(²)	0	(³)	84.0	(²)	0	(³)
North Carolina	103.2	66.9	8.4	4.5	23.4	64.9	8.1	4.4	22.6
North Dakota	24.1	16.9	.3	0	6.9	69.8	1.4	0	28.8
Ohio	234.0	185.2	12.6	(¹)	36.1	79.2	5.4	(¹)	15.4
Oklahoma	70.4	24.4	5.0	30.3	10.7	34.7	7.1	43.1	15.2
Oregon	53.5	34.9	7.4	3.8	7.4	65.3	13.9	7.1	13.8
Pennsylvania	235.8	168.3	22.1	5.1	40.3	71.4	9.4	2.2	17.1
Rhode Island	21.0	15.3	.5	3.3	2.0	72.7	2.2	15.5	9.6
South Carolina	54.3	37.6	8.8	0	7.9	69.2	16.1	0	14.6
South Dakota	24.2	.4	0	19.2	4.6	1.7	0	79.3	19.1
Tennessee	79.3	(²)	(³)	8.1	(³)	(²)	(³)	10.2	(³)
Texas	206.9	137.1	17.8	12.7	39.3	66.3	8.6	6.1	19.0
Utah	25.6	10.9	.7	4.3	9.8	42.5	2.6	16.8	38.1
Vermont	12.8	5.2	1.7	2.3	3.6	40.5	13.6	17.9	28.0
Virginia	85.9	50.9	3.1	28.5	3.4	59.3	3.6	33.2	4.0
Washington	85.9	61.2	3.8	4.1	16.8	71.2	4.5	4.8	19.5
West Virginia	49.8	24.2	1.2	17.8	6.5	48.7	2.4	35.8	13.1
Wisconsin	115.7	69.3	7.5	8.9	30.0	59.9	6.4	7.7	25.9
Wyoming	11.1	5.4	.7	2.8	2.2	48.8	5.9	25.4	19.8

¹ Employees who are members of State or local retirement systems and also covered by Federal old-age and survivors insurance have been counted only in the former category. Such dual coverage did not occur on a significant scale in October 1952 except in Virginia and for certain transit systems located in California, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Ohio.

² Employees working in positions potentially covered by a State or local retirement system who are not themselves members of the system because of individual option, age, reency of employment, or other disqualifying factors.

³ Not available.

systems in January 1942 was surveyed in terms of the type of system to which the employee belonged, rather than the type of job, as in the recent survey. Thus, a policeman whose membership was in a system that included general employees as well as not identifiable as a policeman; a local teacher who belonged to a State-administered school system could not be distinguished from a member employed by the State college.

Another difference in the two surveys is in the definition of a State or local retirement system. The 1942 survey was limited to retirement plans administered by the State or locality and excluded plans providing for the purchase of retirement annuity contracts through life insurance companies or through such organizations as the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. The definition used in the 1952 survey—any plan, other than Federal old-age and survivors insurance, for employee retirement benefits to which a government gives any financial support—included such arrangements. It is probable that this difference in definition accounts for only a small proportion of the increase in membership of retirement systems. No up-to-date measure of the number of employees covered by these insurance arrangements is available. Evidence from the 1942 survey indicated they were numerically unimportant then. For an intermediate period, there are some data relating to teachers at higher educational institutions that had contracts with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. In 1946, 9,100 teachers were employed by public higher educational institutions with such contracts; the number actually covered by the contracts was probably less.⁵

The proportion of school employees who were members of State and local retirement systems had grown from 59 percent in January 1942 to 74 percent in October 1952. During this time the corresponding increase for nonschool employment

had been from 37 percent to 62 percent.

Of all nonschool employees in January 1942, 39 percent at the State level and 36 percent at the local level were members of systems. From this fairly even starting point, State employees made much the greater gains in the 10-year period. In October 1952, 74 percent of them—in comparison with 57 percent of all local nonschool employees—belonged to public employee retirement systems. Addition of old-age and survivors insurance coverage does not narrow the gap; 88 percent of the State nonschool employees and 70 percent of the local nonschool employees had protection under one system or the other.

For the 1942 survey, an analysis of the effect of the municipality's size on coverage had to be limited to States in which there was no State-administered system covering employees of localities of different sizes. The States excluded from the analysis were, by the very nature of the limiting factor, the ones that had attained the most complete coverage for local employees; localities too small to maintain their own systems could affiliate with the State-administered system. Thus, the proportion of local nonschool employment covered in 1942 (36 percent for all States) was only 23 percent in the 36 States that had no State-wide system for local nonschool employees. For those 36 States, the proportion of municipal nonschool employment that was covered bore a direct relationship to the size of city; it was 74 percent in cities of 500,000 or more population, 51 percent in cities of 100,000–499,999, and only 13 percent in cities of less than 100,000.

From the 1952 survey it is possible to see a clear-cut relationship between the size of the employing municipality and coverage under a retirement system administered by either the State or locality. Of all nonschool city employees, 88 percent of those employed by cities of 100,000 or more population, but only 40 percent of those employed by smaller cities, were members of State or local retirement systems. The very incomplete coverage for employees of small

cities is even more significant when viewed against the widespread growth in State-administered retirement systems for general employees of local governments. By the beginning of 1950, 32 States had State-wide systems covering nonschool city employees, 21 more than the number with such systems at the time of the 1942 survey.

The sparseness of retirement system coverage for employees of small cities has been somewhat offset by their coverage under old-age and survivors insurance. In October 1952, about 16 percent of all nonschool employees of cities of less than 100,000 population—in contrast to only 4 percent of those employed by larger municipalities—had coverage under the Federal program.

The 1942 survey had shown little coverage of county employees; only 6.2 percent were members of systems in the 36 States without State-wide systems. In October 1952, 48 percent of all nonschool county employees were members of retirement systems and 22 percent were covered by old-age and survivors insurance. The over-all proportion of county employees having protection (70 percent) thus compares favorably with that for employees of cities of all sizes (75 percent). For this latter group, almost 66 percent had their protection through State or local retirement systems, and something less than 10 percent were protected under old-age and survivors insurance.

Townships and special districts were included with cities in the earlier survey, but the present data provide separable information for these local units of government. Of the nonschool employees of townships in October 1952, only 25 percent were members of retirement systems and 5 percent were covered by old-age and survivors insurance. Protection was considerably more complete for nonschool employees of special districts; 48 percent belonged to a State or local retirement plan, and an additional 15 percent had coverage under the Federal program.

State Variations

In 1942, when somewhat less than half of all State and local employees

⁵Dorothy McCamman, "Higher Educational Institutions and Social Security," *Social Security Bulletin*, January 1948, p. 7.

were members of retirement systems, unevenness of protection from State to State was extremely marked. One State—Idaho—had no retirement system coverage; in a dozen other States, less than one-tenth of the employees were covered. In about half the States, the employees who had no protection outnumbered by more than 2 to 1 the members of retirement systems. The reverse—2 members for every unprotected person—was found in only six States.

A decade's growth in State and local retirement systems, aided by the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage, has greatly reduced the State differences. In October 1952, at least two-thirds of all the employment was covered by one system or the other in all but five States.⁶ In no State were fewer than half the employees protected.

The part that old-age and survivors insurance has played in achieving this widespread protection may not be large in the aggregate; addition of old-age and survivors insurance coverage to retirement system membership raises the over-all proportion with protection by a scant 10 percentage points (from 67.0 percent to 76.7 percent). The extension of coverage under the Federal program has been effective, however, in bringing many States close to the coverage proportion achieved by the retirement systems of only a few States. If their old-age and survivors insurance coverage is not counted, the number of States with coverage of less than two-thirds of all employees rises from 5 to 25; instead of no State with coverage of less than half, there would be 13. The significance of old-age and survivors insurance coverage is especially apparent in some of the States that provided virtually no protection in 1942. Of the 13 States where fewer than

one-tenth of the employees were covered in 1942, one State now covers under old-age and survivors insurance four-fifths of all its employees, another covers two-thirds, two cover more than half, and four others cover at least one-fourth—proportions much higher than that for all States combined.

The States having the highest proportions of coverage in 1942 were the largest ones. As a result, there was a marked concentration of membership in a handful of States. New York alone accounted for one-fifth of all the members of systems in 1942; covered employees in that State and in California, Ohio, and Pennsylvania represented almost half the total membership. The combined employment in these four States with the largest number of public employees accounted for somewhat less than a third of all State and local employment in January 1942. In contrast, the 14 States with the fewest government employees had 6.6 percent of all State and local employment at that time but only 4.1 percent of the membership of systems.

The 1952 survey shows a different situation. The same four large States still had almost a third of all State and local employment (30 percent), but their proportion of the membership of State and local retirement systems had dropped to not much more than a third (36 percent); they accounted for an even smaller proportion of all employees with protection, including old-age and survivors insurance coverage (32 percent). The 14 States that in 1942 had had the smallest number of government employees had, in October 1952, only 6.1 percent of all employment, but their proportion of the membership of State and local retirement systems had risen slightly to 4.7 percent. When their coverage under old-age and survivors insurance is included, they accounted for almost the same proportion of persons with protection (5.7 percent) as of total employment.

Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Coverage in Perspective

The emphasis placed on the role of old-age and survivors insurance

in making protection available to public employees in States where retirement system coverage had been sparse does not imply that the two forms of protection are equivalent. Actually, the two types of systems provide very different protection, reflecting very different purposes.

State and local retirement systems are designed primarily for employees who retire after many years of service. They make public employment attractive by rewarding the career employee with an annuity heavily weighted by length of service and frequently related to his full salary during his highest-paid years. A primary function of pension plans for public employees is to provide an orderly and humane method of retiring workers who, having served the public for many years, have grown too old to perform their work efficiently. The varied functions of State and local governments call for differing degrees of physical and mental vigor from employees, and so the plans commonly allow for these differences by making the retirement age flexible.

Because the special systems are designed for employees making a career of government service, they do not attempt to provide adequate protection for employees who come within their scope for relatively brief periods. Moreover, because of concentration on the provision of adequate retirement protection in old age, systems other than those covering the hazardous jobs of policemen and firemen offer little protection to survivors. If the government worker dies in service, the usual plan provides only a refund of his own contributions and interest; if he reaches retirement age, he may have the option of taking a reduced benefit during his lifetime in order to assure his wife of a continuing income after his death.

The protection of old-age and survivors insurance, on the other hand, is geared to the essential needs of the average worker. The social insurance benefit is heavily weighted in behalf of lower-paid workers and not weighted by years of coverage. The broad and Nation-wide coverage is a distinct advantage for the worker who moves from job to job; it gives

⁶Because data for State employees in four States were incomplete, these States are excluded from the analysis although estimates for them are included in the national totals. The proportion of local employees in the four States who were members of retirement systems or covered by old-age and survivors insurance was 67 percent in Indiana, 74 percent in Maryland, 62 percent in Minnesota, and 71 percent in Tennessee.

no special advantage to the more unusual individual who spends his entire working lifetime with the same employer. Old-age and survivors insurance provides family protection at no higher cost to the worker with dependents than to a single worker with the same earnings. During his earning period, the worker with family responsibilities has valuable survivor

protection, payable in the form of monthly benefits to orphaned children and their mothers or to dependent parents. On retirement, additional benefits are paid if the worker has eligible dependents, and after his death, his aged widow continues to receive a benefit.

If the two types of protection are evaluated from the point of view of

retirement income for the career employee, it is clear that the old-age benefits of the social insurance system are not—and are not intended to be—sufficiently high or flexible enough to serve as an inducement to public employment. Nevertheless, the old-age and survivors insurance system can greatly strengthen retirement provisions for public employees.

Table 3.—School employees of State and local governments, by type of retirement protection and by State, October 1952

[Numbers in thousands]

State	Number of State and local employees					State employees			Local employees		
	Total	Members of State or local retirement systems ¹	In covered positions but not members ²	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance ¹	No coverage	Number	Percent who are—		Number	Percent who are—	
							Members of retirement systems	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance		Members of retirement systems	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance
Total.....	1,853.0	1,374.4	122.7	90.4	265.5	315.9	52.6	8.4	1,537.1	78.6	4.2
Alabama.....	36.6	24.7	1.3	3.1	7.5	5.5	28.0	20.8	31.2	74.3	6.4
Arizona.....	11.1	6.5	.7	1.9	2.0	2.0	28.6	0	9.2	65.2	20.5
Arkansas.....	23.2	13.9	1.0	4.3	3.9	3.9	20.1	27.6	19.3	68.1	16.9
California.....	156.9	126.7	15.9	(*)	14.3	23.4	55.7	.1	133.5	85.2	0
Colorado.....	21.2	14.3	2.9	0	3.9	4.6	49.2	0	16.6	72.6	0
Connecticut.....	24.2	20.1	.6	1.0	2.5	5.1	91.4	0	19.1	80.8	5.1
Delaware.....	3.7	3.1	.4	0	.2	1.5	97.4	0	2.2	74.5	0
District of Columbia.....	5.7	5.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.7	100.0	0
Florida.....	37.3	30.2	4.7	0	2.4	5.8	59.8	0	31.5	84.8	0
Georgia.....	39.8	31.3	1.0	0	7.5	5.0	52.0	0	34.8	82.6	0
Idaho.....	9.0	5.2	.2	2.5	1.1	2.2	22.6	57.1	6.8	69.9	17.9
Illinois.....	88.5	74.4	4.6	0	9.5	10.2	50.6	0	78.3	88.5	0
Indiana.....	52.3	36.0	3.8	1.7	10.8	11.3	45.7	0	41.0	75.3	4.1
Iowa.....	44.1	38.8	.7	0	4.5	8.2	60.3	0	35.9	94.5	0
Kansas.....	31.4	17.9	2.8	4.8	5.9	6.8	1.1	65.4	24.6	72.4	1.3
Kentucky.....	30.7	21.2	.4	5.8	3.3	3.8	11.6	54.2	26.9	77.2	13.9
Louisiana.....	32.8	24.7	2.8	.4	4.9	5.8	62.9	7.0	27.0	78.1	0
Maine.....	10.9	8.1	.2	.9	1.8	1.3	28.0	33.6	9.6	80.2	4.0
Maryland.....	27.0	(*)	(*)	.9	(*)	4.0	(*)	0	23.0	68.9	4.5
Massachusetts.....	41.7	33.7	1.9	0	6.1	2.2	65.5	0	39.5	81.6	0
Michigan.....	92.2	76.5	2.0	0	13.8	17.4	49.6	0	74.8	90.7	0
Minnesota.....	43.4	29.3	6.4	0	7.7	9.4	60.1	0	34.1	69.4	0
Mississippi.....	25.0	0	0	21.6	3.5	3.8	0	71.0	21.2	0	88.9
Missouri.....	46.1	30.4	1.2	8.9	5.7	5.2	5.8	83.2	40.9	73.5	11.2
Montana.....	9.5	7.2	.5	0	1.9	1.9	32.2	0	7.7	81.1	0
Nebraska.....	19.8	13.9	3.0	.1	2.8	3.3	64.6	0	16.5	71.3	.6
Nevada.....	2.4	2.0	.1	0	.3	.3	96.4	0	2.0	83.8	0
New Hampshire.....	6.2	4.2	.2	.5	1.3	1.5	27.6	27.9	4.7	81.1	1.1
New Jersey.....	51.7	37.9	4.2	0	9.5	3.7	42.9	0	47.9	75.8	0
New Mexico.....	11.8	9.4	.1	0	2.3	3.2	49.9	0	8.6	90.5	0
New York.....	147.8	113.2	11.2	0	23.3	6.4	87.1	0	141.4	76.1	0
North Carolina.....	51.3	37.7	3.2	.5	9.9	51.3	73.6	.9	0	0	0
North Dakota.....	9.8	8.8	.2	0	.8	1.6	89.4	0	8.2	90.3	0
Ohio.....	95.2	81.9	3.1	0	10.2	12.1	56.0	0	83.0	90.4	0
Oklahoma.....	35.9	21.3	4.9	2.6	7.1	7.3	22.6	34.9	28.5	69.0	0
Oregon.....	22.9	15.7	3.1	0	4.2	4.2	46.2	0	18.7	73.2	0
Pennsylvania.....	97.6	81.1	5.3	1.9	9.4	8.1	70.1	0	89.5	84.3	2.1
Rhode Island.....	6.5	4.9	.5	.6	.5	1.1	55.5	0	5.4	80.1	10.4
South Carolina.....	29.6	21.2	5.2	0	3.2	3.3	75.1	0	26.3	71.3	0
South Dakota.....	10.6	.4	0	9.5	.7	1.7	23.7	53.3	8.9	0	96.8
Tennessee.....	34.8	(*)	(*)	2.0	(*)	4.7	(*)	0	30.1	75.9	6.6
Texas.....	105.0	79.5	10.5	0	15.0	16.2	47.6	0	88.8	80.8	0
Utah.....	12.3	9.0	.3	0	3.0	3.4	41.3	0	8.9	85.5	0
Vermont.....	4.9	3.0	.3	.8	.8	1.0	26.4	52.0	3.9	69.2	7.8
Virginia.....	40.6	28.2	1.4	10.6	.4	6.8	46.6	53.4	33.8	74.0	20.5
Washington.....	35.3	24.1	2.0	1.8	7.3	7.7	43.2	0	27.7	75.2	6.7
West Virginia.....	26.9	22.3	1.1	.1	3.4	5.4	46.0	.4	21.5	92.1	.3
Wisconsin.....	44.6	28.0	4.2	1.9	10.5	10.3	47.4	.3	34.3	67.3	5.5
Wyoming.....	5.3	3.8	.4	0	1.1	1.1	59.5	0	4.3	74.5	0

¹ Employees who are members of State or local retirement systems and also covered by Federal old-age and survivors insurance have been counted only once, in the former category. Such dual coverage of school employees probably did not occur in any State but Virginia in October 1952.

² Employees working in positions potentially covered by a State or local retire-

ment system who are not themselves members of the system because of individual option, age, reency of employment, or other disqualifying factors.

³ Less than 50.

⁴ Not available.

It can provide basic protection for those employees who fall outside the scope of the special systems. Even in States or areas where protection had been most widespread, some segments of employment had purposely been excluded from retirement systems designed for employees making a career of special types of government service. For example, a system for uniformed members of the police or fire department may have specifically excluded clerical employees of the department, a system for teachers may have excluded janitors or all noncertificated personnel, and systems for these and other types of employees may have excluded all part-time workers and those not on a permanent basis. In general, such excluded employees are probably less tied to government service than are those covered by retirement systems; hence, as a group, they have the most to gain from the crediting under old-age and survivors insurance of both governmental and nongovernmental employment.

In States where less widespread coverage under retirement systems has been achieved, old-age and survivors insurance has a different role to play in increasing the protection of public employees. So far as employment characteristics and retirement needs are concerned, the employees in these States who are covered or eligible for coverage under old-age and survivors insurance are essentially no different from their fellow workers in the same or other States who are covered by tailor-made systems. In some of these areas, consequently, more than the basic protection of old-age and survivors insurance has been considered desirable, and attention has been given to the possibility of supplementing the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance through plans established by the State or locality.

One State—Virginia—abolished its existing retirement system in order to become eligible for old-age and survivors insurance coverage; after negotiating an agreement for coverage under the Federal system, supplementary retirement protection was set up under a new State system. By October 1952, Virginia had already

completed the various steps of this procedure. In other governmental areas, similar procedures were under consideration or—as in Mississippi—partially completed at that time. The findings of the October 1952 survey, especially as they relate to coverage under old-age and survivors insurance, thus portray transitional and constantly changing conditions.

School Employees

For the country as a whole, 83 percent of the local school employees but only 61 percent of those at the State level were members of retirement systems or covered by old-age and survivors insurance in October 1952. This difference in favor of local employees, which is apparent in the vast majority of the States, must be recognized as due in part to the practice of employing relatively fewer student helpers in local schools than in State colleges and universities. In only nine of the States for which the comparison can be made (table 3) was the proportion of State employees with protection as high as or higher than the proportion of local employees. In three of the nine States, coverage under old-age and survivors insurance was important in bringing the proportion for State employees up to the height reached by local employees.

In only seven States (not including North Carolina, where employees of local schools are considered State employees) did as many as two-thirds of the State educational employees belong to a public employee retirement system. In 13 States, fewer than 1 out of 3 State school employees was a member of a retirement system. Addition of employees covered by old-age and survivors insurance raises this proportion to more than one-third in all but one of the 13 States and, in most of them, to well above half the total State school employment.

Of the local school employees, on the other hand, roughly two-thirds or more were members of State or local retirement systems in all States except Mississippi and South Dakota, where virtually all local school employees were reported as covered under old-age and survivors insurance.

In half a dozen States and in the District of Columbia, at least nine-tenths of all the local school employees belonged to a retirement system. In four additional States, nine-tenths or more were either members of retirement systems or covered by old-age and survivors insurance.

Only half the States reported any old-age and survivors insurance coverage of local school employees. In most of them the coverage applied to relatively few employees. Nevertheless, in these States as a group, employees had achieved somewhat more widespread retirement protection than in the States in which their only protection was under a State or local retirement system. Of the States with old-age and survivors insurance coverage, the over-all proportion with protection was 85 percent or above in 13 States, and in no State was it less than 70 percent. Of the half without old-age and survivors insurance coverage, the proportion with retirement system membership was as high as 85 percent in only nine States and the District of Columbia; in two States it was less than 70 percent.

Nonschool Employees

In virtually every State, relatively more of the nonschool employees at the State level than at the local level have retirement protection. This is the almost inevitable result of the difficulties encountered in organizing protection for employees of a variety of units of government, many of them too small to support a system of their own and with no common bond beyond their geographical location. Opportunities for localities to cover their nonschool employment by affiliating with State-wide systems were less frequent and came considerably later than in the case of school employment, where local teachers had pioneered in achieving retirement protection.

In a total of 27 States—including practically all the largest States—roughly nine-tenths or more of the State employees had retirement protection. In 17 States, this high proportion had been reached through membership in State-administered retirement systems; in nine, through

Table 4.—Nonschool employees of State and local governments, by type of retirement protection and by State, October 1952

[Numbers in thousands]

State	Number of State and local employees					State employees			Local employees		
	Total	Members of State or local retirement systems ¹	In covered positions but not members ²	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance ¹	No coverage	Number	Percent who are—		Number	Percent who are—	
							Members of retirement systems	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance		Members of retirement systems	Covered by old-age and survivors insurance
Total.....	2,657.0	1,646.8	181.7	347.6	480.8	785.6	73.8	13.9	1,871.4	57.0	12.7
Alabama.....	35.5	14.3	1.4	14.4	5.3	13.5	71.2	10.1	22.0	21.5	50.4
Arizona.....	13.4	6.9	.8	3.5	2.2	4.3	89.4	0	9.1	33.1	38.1
Arkansas.....	19.5	1.9	(³)	12.9	4.6	8.5	9.6	89.4	11.0	10.0	48.7
California.....	231.6	173.2	21.8	12.8	23.8	52.7	98.4	0	178.9	67.8	7.2
Colorado.....	25.4	14.1	1.2	6.9	3.1	7.6	99.4	0	17.8	37.2	38.9
Connecticut.....	37.7	28.3	1.6	2.9	4.9	14.5	98.7	0	23.2	60.5	12.5
Delaware.....	6.6	4.3	.5	.4	1.4	4.0	63.0	0	2.5	70.8	13.8
District of Columbia.....	14.2	14.2	0	0	0				14.2	100.0	0
Florida.....	63.7	39.5	5.6	7.1	11.5	20.4	93.4	0	43.2	47.2	16.5
Georgia.....	46.1	18.2	5.4	0	22.5	15.0	50.2	0	31.1	34.2	0
I Idaho.....	11.9	.5	0	9.8	1.6	4.3	.9	99.1	7.6	6.1	72.8
Illinois.....	150.8	108.3	10.5	(⁴)	32.0	33.6	88.2	0	117.2	67.1	(¹)
Indiana.....	60.2	(⁴)	(⁴)	15.2	(⁴)	14.8	(⁴)	0	45.4	22.0	33.5
Iowa.....	47.2	35.2	.7	0	11.3	14.8	86.8	0	32.4	69.0	0
Kansas.....	34.2	3.4	.1	24.1	6.5	9.9	2.4	94.6	24.3	13.1	60.7
Kentucky.....	30.8	3.0	.1	23.6	4.1	14.2	.8	99.2	16.7	17.2	57.2
Louisiana.....	46.0	31.1	2.1	0	12.8	22.0	92.0	0	24.1	45.4	0
Maine.....	19.4	9.0	1.3	1.2	7.8	8.3	70.9	0	11.1	28.5	11.1
Maryland.....	37.0	(⁴)	(⁴)	1.3	(⁴)	13.4	(⁴)	0	23.6	70.6	5.4
Massachusetts.....	124.6	95.8	11.9	(¹)	16.9	30.0	90.2	0	94.6	72.7	(¹)
Michigan.....	110.0	80.9	1.8	9.1	18.2	23.4	96.1	0	86.7	67.5	10.5
Minnesota.....	63.9	(⁴)	(⁴)	0	(⁴)	16.7	(⁴)	0	47.3	57.4	0
Mississippi.....	30.8	1.8	.9	15.2	12.9	12.5	0	79.6	18.3	9.6	29.0
Missouri.....	58.7	5.5	.1	45.5	7.7	17.5	0	100.0	41.2	13.3	67.8
Montana.....	11.3	7.3	1.9	0	2.1	4.9	80.9	0	6.4	52.3	0
Nebraska.....	28.7	4.7	.3	17.3	6.4	7.7	1.8	98.2	21.0	21.7	46.4
Nevada.....	4.5	3.9	.2	0	.4	1.5	97.8	0	3.0	79.5	0
New Hampshire.....	13.2	5.6	1.1	.7	5.8	4.7	65.7	.1	8.6	29.1	8.3
New Jersey.....	85.2	52.8	11.0	0	21.4	21.6	59.5	0	63.5	62.8	0
New Mexico.....	10.2	6.0	1.3	0	2.9	5.4	75.8	0	4.8	40.8	0
New York.....	360.3	313.4	(⁴)	0	(⁴)	83.3	89.4	0	277.0	86.2	0
North Carolina.....	51.9	29.2	5.2	4.0	13.5	24.6	73.3	0	27.4	40.9	14.7
North Dakota.....	14.3	8.0	.2	0	6.1	3.7	95.4	0	10.7	42.4	0
Ohio.....	138.8	103.3	9.5	(¹)	25.9	29.5	100.0	0	109.3	67.6	(¹)
Oklahoma.....	34.5	3.1	.1	27.8	3.6	12.9	3.3	93.9	21.6	12.2	72.5
Oregon.....	30.6	19.3	4.3	3.8	3.2	13.5	78.1	0	17.1	51.3	22.2
Pennsylvania.....	138.2	87.1	16.8	3.3	31.0	57.8	74.4	0	80.3	54.9	4.1
Rhode Island.....	14.5	10.3	0	2.7	1.5	6.6	100.0	0	8.0	47.5	33.8
South Carolina.....	24.7	16.4	3.6	0	4.7	11.3	88.6	0	13.4	47.6	0
South Dakota.....	13.7	0	0	9.7	3.9	3.6	0	100.0	10.0	0	60.7
Tennessee.....	44.5	(⁴)	(⁴)	6.1	(⁴)	14.0	(⁴)	0	30.5	40.0	20.2
Texas.....	101.9	57.6	7.3	12.7	24.3	28.3	88.5	0	73.6	44.2	17.3
Utah.....	13.3	1.9	.3	4.3	6.8	4.9	5.9	0	8.4	19.2	51.2
Vermont.....	7.8	2.2	1.4	1.4	2.7	3.6	56.3	0	4.2	4.3	34.0
Virginia.....	45.3	22.7	1.7	17.9	3.0	24.1	65.4	34.6	21.1	32.8	45.3
Washington.....	50.6	37.1	1.8	2.2	9.5	14.4	81.6	0	36.1	70.0	6.2
West Virginia.....	22.9	1.9	.1	17.7	3.1	14.4	3.9	93.8	8.5	16.2	50.2
Wisconsin.....	71.2	41.4	3.2	7.0	19.6	11.7	94.8	2.3	59.5	50.9	11.3
Wyoming.....	5.7	1.6	.3	2.8	1.0	2.1	65.9	0	3.6	5.2	77.8

¹ Employees who are members of State or local retirement systems and also covered by Federal old-age and survivors insurance have been counted only once, in the former category. Such dual coverage occurred, in October 1952, in Virginia and for local transit systems in California, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Ohio.

² Employees working in positions potentially covered by a State or local retirement system who are not themselves members of the system because of individual option, age, recency of employment, or other disqualifying factors.

³ Less than 50.

⁴ Not available.

coverage under old-age and survivors insurance; and in one (Virginia), through a combination of the two types of protection.

In no State did as many as nine-tenths of the local nonschool employees have retirement protection. New York came closest, with 86 percent protected through membership in retirement systems; and Oklahoma was next, with 85 percent, mostly

through old-age and survivors insurance coverage.

Because retirement system protection was so much more nearly complete for State employees than for those employed by local governmental units, the extension of coverage under old-age and survivors insurance has had a different impact at the two levels. For State employees, the role of old-age and survivors insurance

has been to perform the functions that otherwise would have been performed by a State-administered system. Only 10 States had not established their own systems for general State employees by 1950. These States are Mississippi, where—by October 1952—eight-tenths of all State nonschool employees were covered by old-age and survivors insurance, and

(Continued on page 24)

Table 7.—Public assistance in the United States, by month, February 1952–February 1953¹

[Exclusive of vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments]

Year and month	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children		Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	General assistance	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children (families)	Aid to the blind	Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	General assistance	
			Families	Recipients										
				Total ²										Children
Number of recipients													Percentage change from previous month	
1952														
February		2,685,070	593,945	2,050,773	1,531,064	97,142	131,778	336,000	-0.3	+0.1	+0.1	+2.6	-0.9	
March		2,679,899	596,729	2,061,581	1,540,034	97,257	134,957	335,000	-2	+5	+1	+2.4	-4	
April		2,671,695	598,398	2,068,790	1,546,296	97,353	138,017	320,000	-3	+3	+1	+2.3	-4.5	
May		2,666,474	598,236	2,069,849	1,547,261	97,571	141,830	302,000	-2	(³)	+2	+2.8	-5.7	
June		2,659,667	589,968	2,041,551	1,527,354	97,690	145,344	294,000	-3	-1.4	+1	+2.5	-2.5	
July		2,650,156	578,155	2,006,321	1,501,148	97,670	148,132	307,000	-4	-2.0	(³)	+1.9	+4.6	
August		2,646,077	572,100	1,990,763	1,489,988	97,905	151,457	295,000	-2	-1.0	+2	+2.2	-3.9	
September		2,642,395	569,215	1,984,253	1,486,506	98,071	153,902	\$274,000	-1	-5	+2	+1.6	\$-6.9	
October		2,637,280	566,666	1,977,710	1,482,290	98,249	156,645	\$270,000	-2	-4	+2	+1.8	\$-1.3	
November		2,635,591	565,536	1,975,901	1,482,431	98,377	159,053	\$267,000	-1	-2	+1	+1.5	\$-1.3	
December		2,634,662	569,184	1,990,819	1,494,563	98,461	161,441	\$280,000	(³)	+6	+1	+1.5	\$+4.9	
1953														
January		2,628,147	571,369	1,999,487	1,502,987	98,442	163,789	\$ 290,000	-2	+4	(³)	+1.5	\$+3.7	
February		2,618,880	572,449	2,007,964	1,509,091	98,408	165,463	\$ 287,000	-4	+2	(³)	+1.0	\$-1.2	
Amount of assistance													Percentage change from previous month	
1952														
February	\$192,321,805	\$120,209,179	\$45,274,623	\$4,840,367	\$6,097,636	\$15,900,000	+0.1	+0.1	+0.3	+0.7	+2.7	-1.5		
March	192,619,399	120,240,341	45,468,914	4,836,239	6,222,905	15,851,000	+2	(³)	+4	-1	+2.1	-3		
April	192,159,661	120,106,042	45,713,294	4,861,436	6,363,889	15,125,000	-2	-1	+5	+3	+2.3	-4.6		
May	191,436,861	120,390,263	45,505,911	4,875,654	6,565,033	14,100,000	-4	+2	-5	+5	+3.2	-6.8		
June	190,033,682	120,200,238	44,768,604	4,883,935	6,694,905	13,486,000	-7	-2	-1.6	+2	+2.0	-4.3		
July	191,365,814	120,542,626	44,175,800	4,943,745	6,842,643	14,861,000	+7	+3	-1.3	+1.2	+2.2	+10.2		
August	189,514,464	120,424,755	43,620,484	4,969,394	6,973,831	13,536,000	-1.0	-1	-1.3	+3	+1.9	-8.9		
September	189,680,122	121,251,437	43,522,039	4,974,710	7,074,936	\$ 13,857,000	+1	-7	-2	+3	+1.4	\$-4.7		
October	199,688,422	127,753,941	46,116,285	5,206,477	7,523,719	\$ 13,088,000	+5.3	+5.4	+6.0	+4.7	+6.3	\$+1.8		
November	200,239,380	128,231,874	46,209,537	5,240,897	7,681,072	\$ 12,876,000	+3	+4	+2	+7	+2.1	\$-1.6		
December	202,383,234	128,632,515	46,720,062	5,267,441	7,814,216	\$ 13,949,000	+1.1	+3	+1.1	+5	+1.7	\$+8.3		
1953														
January	203,802,873	129,219,048	47,084,386	5,273,447	7,960,992	\$ 14,265,000	+7	+5	+8	+1	+1.9	\$+2.2		
February	202,070,666	127,775,412	47,107,903	5,270,904	8,024,447	\$ 13,892,000	-8	-1.1	(³)	(³)	+8	\$-2.6		

¹ For definition of terms see the *Bulletin*, January 1953, p. 16. All data subject to revision.

² Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

³ Decrease of less than 0.05 per cent.

⁴ Increase of less than 0.05 per cent.

⁵ Excludes Nebraska; data not available. Percentage change based on data for 52 States.

STATE AND LOCAL SYSTEMS

(Continued from page 10)

the nine States in which nine-tenths of such employees had the protection of the Federal system. In each of the other States except Virginia, old-age and survivors insurance coverage of State employees was negligible, even in the few with relatively incomplete coverage under the State-administered systems.

For local employees, in contrast, old-age and survivors insurance coverage appeared both to be filling in the gaps in those States that had State-wide systems with which localities could affiliate and to be bridging a major gap in States without such systems. For example, in seven of the

States that already had State-wide systems in 1950, at the time of the extension of old-age and survivors insurance coverage, more employees were covered under old-age and survivors insurance in October 1952 than by the State-administered systems.⁷ These are relatively small States, however, and they do not greatly influence the national totals or the totals for all States that had State-wide retirement systems. The impact of old-age and survivors insurance coverage is thus much more evident in the group of States that did not provide for affiliation of local gov-

⁷ Alabama, Arizona, Colorado, Indiana, Nebraska (where the State-wide system was for municipal rather than all local employees), Utah, and Virginia.

ernmental units in a State system. At the beginning of 1950, there were 16 States without State-wide systems for general municipal employees. As of October 1952, about a third of the local nonschool employees of these 16 States—as compared with only 8 percent in the other States—were covered by old-age and survivors insurance. Membership in retirement systems in the 16 States (local systems or perhaps State-administered systems for special types of local nonschool employees) accounted for only 37 percent of their local nonschool employees, a much lower proportion than the 61 percent achieved by the States in which there were State-wide systems for general employees.