son why Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948 should not be approved at this time. The whole question of the organization of the executive branch of the Government is now being studied by a commission specifically created for that purpose by Public Law 162, of the first session of the Eightieth Congress. . . .

"Any loss of economy or efficiency resulting from continued separation of the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security for the next few months would be more than offset by the expense and confusion of a later reshuffling of these functions, which would be required should the Commission make any recommendations further affecting the location and operation of these agencies."

On March 16 the Senate debated House Concurrent Resolution 131, approving it by a vote of 58 to 25 and thus defeating the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. Under existing statute the U. S. Employment Service is scheduled to revert to the Federal Security Agency 6 months after the official termination of the war, when the unemployment insurance and employment service functions will once more be lodged in the Federal Security Agency.

Proposed Changes in Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Report of the Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Finance Committee*

The Advisory Council on Social Security, appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance to make a full and complete investigation of the present social security program, made its first report to the Committee on April 8. The report, the first part of which is reproduced here, deals exclusively with the Council's recommendations for necessary and desirable changes in the present program of old-age and survivors insurance. These proposals, which parallel many of the recommendations made by the Social Security Administration and by its predecessor, the Social Security Board, are designed, the report declares, "to provide a program that will meet the present needs of the people without imposing too heavy a burden on the taxpayers of the future. The Council anticipates that still further revisions in the program will be needed as future events affect family life, the labor force, and the general conditions under which people live."

The Advisory Council on Social Security was created by the Senate Committee on Finance under the authority of Senate Resolution 141, adopted July 23, 1947. The resolution directed the Committee "to make a full and complete investigation of old-age and survivors insurance and all other aspects of the existing social security program, particularly in respect to coverage, benefits, and taxes related thereto. . ." and authorized an appropriation of $25,000 to be spent for that purpose. An additional $25,000 to finance the work through the current fiscal year was made available by Senate Resolution 202, adopted March 11.

The 17 members of the Advisory Council were appointed on September 17, 1947. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., rector of the University of Virginia, was named chairman, and Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard University, associate chairman. The other members, drawn from various fields and representing different parts of the country, are: Frank Bane, executive director of the Council of State Governments; J. Douglas Brown, dean of the faculty, Princeton University; Malcolm Bryan of the Trust Company of Georgia; Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of social insurance activities, American Federation of Labor; Mary H. Donlon, chairman of the New York State Workmen's Compensation Board; Adrien J. Falk, president of the S & W Fine Foods, Inc.; Marion B. Folsom, treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co.; M. Albert Linton, president of the Provident Mutual Life Insurance Co.; John Miller, assistant director of the National Planning Association; William I. Myers, dean of the New York State College of Agriculture; Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers' Union and vice president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; Florence R. Sabin, scientist; S. Abbot Smith, president of the Thomas Strahan Co.; Delos Walker, vice president of R. H. Macy & Co.; and Ernest C. Young, dean of the graduate school of Purdue University.

In the present report the Council presents its recommendations for closing the gaps in the protection now offered by old-age and survivors insurance. Necessary and desirable changes in other parts of the social security program are to be discussed in later reports.

In offering its proposals for strengthening old-age and survivors insurance, the Council "has endeavored to take full account of the interests—both present and future—of all segments of the Nation." Changes that have occurred in the economy since 1939, when the general structure of the present program was adopted, are related to the recommendations, and the report directs particular attention to the problem of financing the program. In shaping the recommendations, the Council was assisted by the studies of its interim committee and its technical staff, as well as by statements and other information received from Federal agencies and from interested groups and individuals. The following material is taken verbatim from the introductory section, which summarizes the recommendations developed at greater length in the body of the report.

Opportunity for the individual to secure protection for himself and his family against the economic hazards of old age and death is essential to the sustained welfare, freedom, and dignity of the American citizen. For some, such protection can be gained

*Committee Print, 80th Cong., 2d sess.

through individual savings and other private arrangements. For others, such arrangements are inadequate or too uncertain. Since the interest of the whole Nation is involved, the people, using the Government as the agency for their cooperation, should make sure that all members of the community have at least a basic measure of protection against the major hazards of old age and death.

In the last analysis the security of the individual depends on the success of industry and agriculture in producing an increasing flow of goods and services. However, the very success of the economy in making progress, while creating opportunities, also increases risks. Hence, the more progressive the economy, the greater is the need for protection against economic hazards. This protection should be made available on terms which reinforce the interest of the individual in helping himself. A properly designed social security system will reinforce the drive of the individual toward greater production and greater efficiency, and will make for an environment conducive to the maximum of economic progress.

The Method of Social Insurance

The Council favors as the foundation of the social security system the method of contributory social insurance with benefits related to prior earnings and awarded without a needs test. Differential benefits based on a work record are a reward for productive effort and are consistent with general economic incentives, while the knowledge that benefits will be paid—irrespective of whether the individual is in need—supports and stimulates his drive to add his personal savings to the basic security he has acquired through the insurance system. Under such a social insurance system, the individual earns a right to a benefit that is related to his contribution to production. This earned right is his best guaranty that he will receive the benefits promised and that they will not be conditioned on his accepting either scrutiny of his personal affairs or restrictions from which others are free.

Public assistance payments from general tax funds to persons who are found to be in need have serious limitations as a way of maintaining family income. Our goal is, so far as possible, to prevent dependency through social insurance and thus greatly reduce the need for assistance. We recognize that, for a decade or two, public assistance will be necessary for many persons whose need could have been met by the insurance program if it had been in effect for a longer time and had covered all persons gainfully employed. The Council looks forward, however, to the time when virtually all persons in the United States will have retirement or survivorship protection under the old-age and survivors insurance program. If insurance benefits are of reasonable amount, public assistance will then be necessary only for those aged persons and survivors with unusual needs and for the few who, for one reason or another, have been unable to earn insurance rights through work. Under such conditions the Federal expenditure for public assistance can be reduced to a small fraction of its present amount.

The Council has studied the existing system of old-age and survivors insurance and unanimously approves its basic principles. The Council, however, finds three major deficiencies in the program:

1. Inadequate coverage — only about 3 out of every 5 jobs are covered by the program.
2. Unduly restrictive eligibility requirements for older workers—largely because of these restrictions, only about 20 percent of those aged 65 or over are either insured or receiving benefits under the program.
3. Inadequate benefits — retirement benefits at the end of 1947 averaged $25 a month for a single person.

The Council's recommendations are designed to remedy these major defects.

The Council has agreed unanimously on 20 of its 22 specific recommendations.[1] . . .

Summary of Recommendations

Recommendations on Coverage

1. *Self - employment.* — Self - employed persons such as business and professional people, farmers, and others who work on their own account should be brought under coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system. Their contributions should be payable on their net income from self-employment, and their contribution rate should be 1½ times the rate payable by employees. Persons who earn very low incomes from self-employment should for the present remain excluded.

2. *Farm workers.*—Coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system should be extended to farm employees.

3. *Household workers.* — Coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system should be extended to household workers.

4. *Employees of nonprofit institutions.*—Employment for nonprofit institutions now excluded from coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program should be brought under the program, except that clergymen and members of religious orders should continue to be excluded.[2]

5. *Federal civilian employees.*—Old-age and survivors insurance coverage should be extended immediately to the employees of the Federal Government and its instrumentalities who are now excluded from the civil-service retirement system. As a temporary measure designed to give protection to the short-term Government worker, the wage credits of all those who die or leave Federal employment with less than 5 years' service should be transferred to old-age and survivors insurance. The Congress should direct the Social Security Administration and the agencies administering the various Federal retirement programs to develop a permanent plan for extending old-age and survivors insurance to all Federal civilian employees, whereby the benefits and contributions of the Federal retirement systems would supplement the protection of old-age and survivors insurance and provide combined benefits at least equal to those now payable under the special retirement systems.

6. *Railroad employees.*—The Congress should direct the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Re-

[1] See footnotes 2 and 3.

[2] Two members of the Council favor extension of coverage to the nonprofit group on an elective basis.

tirement Board to undertake a study to determine the most practicable and equitable method of making the railroad retirement system supplementary to the basic old-age and survivors insurance program. Benefits and contributions of the railroad retirement system should be adjusted to supplement the basic protection afforded by old-age and survivors insurance, so that the combined protection of the two programs would at least equal that under the Railroad Retirement Act.

7. *Members of the armed forces.*—Old-age and survivors insurance coverage should be extended to members of the armed forces, including those stationed outside the United States.

8. *Employees of State and local governments.*—The Federal Government should enter into voluntary agreements with the States for the extension of old-age and survivors insurance to the employees of State and local governments, except that employees engaged in proprietary activities should be covered compulsorily.

9. *Social security in island possessions.*—A commission should be established to determine the kind of social security protection appropriate to the possessions of the United States.

10. *Inclusion of tips as wages.*—The definition of wages as contained in section 209 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, and section 1426 (a) of subchapter A of chapter 9 of the Internal Revenue Code should be amended to specify that such wages shall include all tips or gratuities customarily received by an employee from a customer of an employer.

Recommendations on Eligibility

11. *Insured status.*—To permit a larger proportion of older workers, particularly those newly covered, to qualify for benefits, the requirements for fully insured status should be 1 quarter of coverage for each 2 calendar quarters elapsing after 1948 or after the quarter in which the individual attains the age of 21, whichever is later, and before the quarter in which he attains the age of 65 (60 for women) or dies. Quarters of coverage earned at any time after 1936 should count toward meeting this requirement. A minimum of 6 quarters of coverage should be required and a worker should be fully and permanently insured if he has 40 quarters of coverage. In cases of death before January 1, 1949, the requirement should continue to be 1 quarter of coverage for each 2 calendar quarters elapsing after 1936 or after the quarter in which the age of 21 was attained, whichever is later, and before the quarter in which the individual attained the age of 65 or died.

Recommendations on Benefits

12. *Maximum base for contributions and benefits.*—To take into account increased wage levels and costs of living, the upper limit on earnings subject to contributions and credited for benefits should be raised from $3,000 to $4,200. The maximum average monthly wage used in the calculation of benefits should be increased from $250 to $350.[3]

13. *Average monthly wage.*—The average monthly wage should be computed as under the present law, except that any worker who has had wage credits of $50 or more in each of 6 or more quarters after 1948 should have his average wage based either on the wages and elapsed time counted as under the present law or on wages and elapsed time after 1948, whichever gives the higher result.

14. *Benefit formula.*—To provide adequate benefits immediately and to remove the present penalty imposed on workers who lack a lifetime of coverage under old-age and survivors insurance, the primary insurance benefit should be 50 percent of the first $75 of the average monthly wage plus 15 percent of the remainder up to $275. Present beneficiaries, as well as those who become entitled in the future, should receive benefits computed according to this new formula for all months after the effective date of the amendments.

15. *Increased survivor protection.*—To increase the protection for a worker's dependents, survivor benefits for a family should be at the rate of three-fourths of the primary insurance benefit for one child and one-half for each additional child, rather than one-half for all children as at present. The parent's benefit should also be increased from one-half to three-fourths. Widows' benefits should remain at three-fourths of the primary insurance benefit.

16. *Dependents of insured women.*—To equalize the protection given to the dependents of women and men, benefits should be payable to the young children of any currently insured woman upon her death or eligibility for primary insurance benefits. Benefits should be payable also (a) to the aged, dependent husband of a primary beneficiary who, in addition to being fully insured, was currently insured at the time she became eligible for primary benefits, and (b) to the aged, dependent widower of a woman who was fully and currently insured at the time of her death.

17. *Maximum benefits.*—To increase the family benefits, the maximum benefit amount payable on the wage record of an insured individual should be three times the primary insurance benefit amount or 80 percent of the individual's average monthly wage, whichever is less, except that this limitation should not operate to reduce the total family benefits below $40 a month.

18. *Minimum benefit.*—The minimum primary insurance benefit payable should be raised to $20.

19. *Retirement test.*—No retirement test (work clause) should be imposed on persons aged 70 or over. At lower ages, however, the benefits to which a beneficiary and his dependents are entitled for any month should be reduced by the amount in excess of $35 which he earns from covered employment in that month. Benefits should be suspended for any month in which such earnings exceed $35 but, each quarter, beneficiaries should receive the amount by which the suspended benefits exceeded earnings above the exemption.

20. *Qualifying age for women.*—The minimum age at which women may qualify for old-age benefits (primary, wife's, widow's, parent's) should be reduced to 60 years.

21. *Lump-sum benefits.*—To help meet the special expenses of illness and death, a lump-sum benefit should be payable at the death of every insured worker even though monthly

[3] While the majority of the Council favor increasing the upper limit to $4,200, some favor keeping the limit at $3,000 and some favor increasing it to $4,800.

survivor benefits are payable. The maximum payment should be four times the primary insurance benefit rather than six times as at present.

Recommendations on Financing

22. *Contribution schedule and Government participation.*—The contribution rate should be increased to 1½ percent for employers and 1½ percent for employees at the same time that benefits are liberalized and coverage is extended. The next step-up in the contribution rate, to 2 percent on employer and 2 percent on employee, should be postponed until the 1½-percent rate plus interest on the investments of the trust fund is insufficient to meet current benefit outlays and administrative costs. There are compelling reasons for an eventual Government contribution to the system, but the Council feels that it is unrealistic to decide now on the exact timing or proportion of that contribution. When the rate of 2 percent on employers and 2 percent on employees plus interest on the investments of the trust fund is insufficient to meet current outlays, the advisability of an immediate Government contribution should be considered.

Technical and Minor Amendments

In addition to these major recommendations, several minor and technical amendments are needed to correct certain inequities and administrative problems resulting from the present provisions. The Council has preferred in the main to leave recommendations on such questions to the Social Security Administration. The Council would like to call attention, however, to the need for additional adjustments to protect the rights of men who served in World War II. Our general recommendations, if put into effect, would remove most of the inequities which these veterans would otherwise suffer; but, in addition, section 210[4] of the present act should be temporarily extended to protect veterans during the transitional period until our general recommendations become fully operative. The Council also wishes to call attention to the lack of coverage for American citizens employed outside the United States by American firms.

[4] Section 210 provides special survivor benefits to dependents of veterans who died within 3 years of discharge if such dependents are not entitled to survivor benefits under veterans' laws.

Interdependence of Recommendations

The Council stresses the fact that its recommendations are a consistent whole and that many of the 22 specific proposals are interdependent. If coverage is not broadly extended, for example, the Council would propose very different modifications in the present provisions for insured status, benefit structure, method of determining the average monthly wage, and financing. Accordingly, the Council strongly urges that its recommendations be considered as a whole.

Plan of the Report

The Council's proposed remedies for the three major deficiencies of the present program—inadequate coverage, unduly restrictive eligibility requirements, and inadequate benefits—are outlined in this section. The test of retirement, financing, and the importance of a broad informational program are also discussed. . . . Appendixes A and B are concerned with special aspects of costs and financing.

Goal of Universal Coverage

The basic protection afforded by the contributory social insurance system under the Social Security Act should be available to all who are dependent on income from work. The character of one's occupation should not force one to rely for basic protection on public assistance rather than insurance.

Earlier decisions to exclude the self-employed, workers in agriculture, and workers in domestic service from coverage of the insurance system were based on expectation there would be administrative difficulties in collecting contributions and obtaining wage reports for these groups. Other groups such as railroad workers, Government employees, and employees of religious, charitable, and educational institutions were excluded for various reasons—because some of the workers were protected under existing retirement plans, because of the constitutional barrier to the levy of a Federal tax on State and local governments, or because of objections to taxing traditionally tax-exempt nonprofit organizations.

The Council believes that none of the reasons for the original exclusions justifies continued denial of basic social insurance protection to these groups. The administrative difficulties which may arise from including the self-employed and workers in agriculture and domestic service seem far less formidable today than they did 10 years ago when the social insurance system was new and in the early stages of developing its administrative organization.

Ten years' experience with incomplete coverage has revealed the many inequities and anomalies which arise when workers move between covered and noncovered employments. In many cases these workers pay contributions but never receive benefits, and in others they may become entitled to benefits which, though small, are worth far more in relation to their contributions than are the benefits of workers covered regularly.

The present incomplete system of social insurance affords uneven protection in different parts of the United States. Coverage restrictions cause relatively fewer people to receive old-age and survivors insurance benefits in agricultural States than in States where industry predominates. Conversely, the number of persons receiving old-age assistance per 1,000 aged population is considerably larger in the agricultural States. . . As a consequence, the taxpayers of the agricultural States must meet, from general revenues, a disproportionate share of the costs of old-age security and aid to families of workers who die prematurely. Since the per capita income of most predominantly agricultural States is far below that of the largely industrial and commercial States, the former have relatively more people in need of assistance and smaller revenues from which to meet this need.

Employers as well as employees suffer from the lack of protection for the noncovered occupations, because employers offering noncovered jobs cannot furnish as attractive labor conditions as those of their competitors in the labor market who are in covered industries. Some workers who have been protected by social insurance during the war have been unwilling to return to such noncovered jobs as agriculture or domestic work or work in nonprofit organizations, where they will lose that protection.

An incidental but important result of extension of coverage will be a reduction in the percentage of pay rolls required to meet the costs of old-age and survivors insurance. Extension of coverage would increase the revenue of the program more than it increases benefit payments. The net saving would be roughly one-half percent to 1 percent of pay roll under the present provisions. Under a program of liberalized benefits such as we recommend, costs would, of course, be increased, but under such a program the net saving as a result of the extension of coverage would also be increased—possibly to as much as 2 percent of pay roll. The saving occurs in the main because under the present limited coverage system, those who move in and out of covered employment have low average monthly wages in covered employment and receive the advantage of a formula weighted in favor of those with low average wages. Under extended coverage such persons will have to pay contributions on all the wages which they earn, and although their benefits will be increased, they will be increased at the lower rate of the formula (the present formula pays 40 percent of the first $50 of average monthly wage, but only 10 percent above) and the income to the fund will increase more than the claims against it.

There are no immediate obstacles to extension of coverage to the self-employed, farm employees, workers in domestic service, employees of nonprofit institutions, the armed forces, and employees of State and local governments. Accordingly, the Council recommends that coverage be extended to these groups without delay. A similar recommendation applies to the Federal civilian employees who are not under the civil-service retirement system. Extension of coverage to Federal civilian employees who are subject to the Federal retirement plan and to the employees of the railroads, however, requires solution of various technical problems before legislation is enacted. The civil-service retirement system and the railroad retirement system will have to be modified to take into account the protection which would be afforded by coverage under old-age and survivors insurance. The Council believes that the best way to work out these problems is through joint studies by the Social Security Administration and the Civil Service Commission in the case of Federal civilian employees, and the Social Security Administration and the Railroad Retirement Board in the case of the railroad employees. The Council has recommended that the necessary studies be required by Congress. Extension of coverage to types of employment with existing staff retirement systems or compulsory insurance protection can and should be accomplished without any loss of benefits to the workers regularly covered by these systems. This result can be achieved by making their present special pension plans supplementary to old-age and survivors insurance.

Since the present civil-service retirement plan and railroad retirement system now give more protection to those regularly covered than would old-age and survivors insurance, the question may be asked: "Why extend old-age and survivors insurance to Federal civil-service employees or to railroad workers?" . . . In essence, the answer is that some workers, particularly short-service workers and those who move in and out of Federal or railroad employment, are inadequately protected under present arrangements. An extension of coverage would help these workers without reducing the combined protection available for long-service workers. In addition, if the Council's recommendation for an eventual Government contribution were followed, an extension of coverage would mean that these employers and employees would pay less for that protection.

Limitations of Voluntary Methods

Voluntary coverage under old-age and survivors insurance has been suggested. In the opinion of the Council, voluntary coverage is defensible only where the Federal Government cannot under the Constitution apply compulsion. Since it is apparently unconstitutional for the Federal Government to tax the States and localities, we believe it necessary to allow these units to enter into voluntary compacts for the coverage of their employees. We are convinced that to offer voluntary coverage in any area where it can possibly be avoided would be a grave mistake.

Since the chief objective of the old-age and survivors insurance program is basic family protection adequate for the needs that can be presumed to exist in various family situations, the program contains eligibility and benefit provisions which, especially in the early years of operation and in the case of workers with large families, allow for the payment of benefits considerably in excess of the value of contributions. These provisions make the program vulnerable if voluntary participation by individuals is allowed. The "adverse selection" which would occur would have serious effects on the program's solvency.

Voluntary participation by employing organizations would have less serious but still highly undesirable effects. The organizations most likely to participate in an elective program would be those whose employees as a group would stand to gain disproportionately large benefits in return for their contributions, such as organizations largely made up of persons nearing retirement age or men with large families. Furthermore, many employers in the groups now excluded employ only a few persons. The smaller the staff, the greater the probabilities that the distribution of employees by age, sex, and family dependents will differ from the distribution which obtains among the employee population as a whole and therefore the greater are the possibilities of adverse selection. Under a voluntary system, the employers who pay the lowest wages and whose employees consequently may be in greatest need of protection would be least likely to elect coverage.

The history of voluntary social insurance indicates that those who most need the protection seldom participate. Usually the persons who choose to participate are those who can expect a large return for their contributions and who can easily spare the money. We see no justification whatever in offering insurance protection at extreme bargain rates to a select group, consisting primarily of those who recognize the opportunity for a bargain and are well able to take advantage of it, and in requiring the covered group as a whole to bear the cost of the difference between what the select group pays and what it receives.

More Liberal Eligibility Requirements for Older Workers

Old-age and survivors insurance now offers basic retirement protection to the majority of younger workers, but many of those in the middle and higher age groups will not be eligible for benefits when they retire. The worker who is now young and has a whole working lifetime of some 40 years ahead has ample opportunity to build up credits toward meeting the present eligibility requirements. Older workers, however, have only relatively limited opportunity to build up such credits, and many fail to qualify who would have done so had the program come into existence when they were young. The Council believes that, in establishing eligibility requirements, special allowance should be made for those who were already at the higher ages when the system began. Liberalization of the present eligibility requirements is made even more necessary if coverage is extended. As a group, newly covered workers will have had no opportunity to build up credits in the past and, unless some change is made in the requirements, very few of the older workers in the newly covered groups would ever be eligible for retirement benefits.

If the effectiveness of the social insurance method of meeting income loss in old age is not to be unduly postponed, the period of covered employment required for insured status will have to be substantially reduced. It should not, of course, be reduced so far as to endanger the character of the benefit as an earned right based on contributions and work records. We propose as a method of reducing the requirements for insured status a "new start" which will require the same qualifying period for an older worker now as was required for a person who was the same age when the system began operation. As pointed out in the report which follows, this recommendation is contingent on a broad extension of coverage.

More Adequate Benefits Now

The benefit amounts now being paid under the old-age and survivors insurance program are inadequate for the security of most of the beneficiaries. At the end of 1946 the average benefit for a retired male worker alone was $24.90 a month, the average benefit for a retired man and wife was $39, and the average family benefit for a widow and two children was $48.20. If the old-age and survivors insurance program is to do an effective job of insuring gainfully occupied individuals and their families against dependency in the old age or on the death of a family breadwinner, the level of benefits must be raised.

Under the present program, benefits are computed as a basic amount which is increased by 1 percent for each year in which the wage earner received $200 or more in wages. Full-rate benefits, under this system of computation, will not be paid until after 1980, when those now young will be able to retire on benefits some 40 percent larger than the basic amounts payable at the beginning of the system's operation.

The Council believes that the primary benefit should be 50 percent of the first $75 of the average monthly wage and 15 percent of the remainder up to the maximum average monthly wage ($350 a month) that can be counted toward benefits. Under this formula, the full rate of benefits contemplated for the future would be paid at once and the 1-percent increment would be eliminated. Without the increment, which commits the system to an automatically increasing level of benefits, a higher level of benefits can be paid immediately than would be warranted under a formula such as that in the present law.

Our proposed benefit formula was chosen because it combines the advantages of relatively high benefits in the low wage brackets with a considerable spread of benefit amounts for the middle and higher wage levels.

In addition to the revision in the benefit formula, several other changes we recommend would have the effect of making benefits more adequate. Extension of coverage will achieve this result for those who move in and out of the employments now covered, since their future benefits will be based on all their earnings up to the maximum base rather than only on those earned in certain types of employment. By reducing the age of eligibility for women from 65 to 60, benefits payable to a family consisting of a primary beneficiary and his wife aged 60 to 64 would be increased immediately by 50 percent. By raising the base for computation of benefits from the present $3,000 to $4,200, the benefits for workers at the higher wage levels will be increased somewhat in the near future and to a greater extent as additional years elapse—an increase for which in a mature program these workers will have paid by additional contributions. An increase in benefits would also result from our recommendation for basing benefits solely on wages earned after 1948 if such wages result in a higher average monthly wage than that derived from all wages earned under the program. After this "new start" provision becomes effective, the over-all effect of our recommendations would be to increase the benefit currently awarded a retired male worker alone from the present average of about $25 a month to an average of about $55. An average benefit for man and wife would be about $85 a month, and the average family benefit for a widow and two children would be about $110. These amounts are higher than those which would be paid under the proposed formula before the new start becomes effective.

Test of Retirement

The rapidly increasing number of aged in the population has made the Council conscious of the need for modification of the present retirement test, which prevents the payment of benefits to all who earn $15 a month or more in covered employment. Since the time of the passage of the original act, the number of persons aged 65 and over has risen from somewhat more than 7.8 million to nearly 11 million. In another 25 years there may be nearly 20 million aged persons in the United States. In these circumstances it is particularly important that the aged make the contribution to production of which they are capable.

Most aged persons, it is true, do not retire voluntarily. Generally speaking, those who retire do so at the will of the employer or because they are unable to work. The existence of a work clause in old-age and survivors insurance probably has little effect on this basic fact, since few people are likely to give up full-time jobs because of the availability of old-age and survivors insurance benefits. The present very restrictive work clause, however, probably discourages some of those who have retired from their regular jobs from making such contribution to production as they are capable of making. We have therefore suggested liberalizations in the retirement test which will remove some of the barriers to gainful activity on the part of beneficiaries.

The Council believes that further study of the broad problem of the aged in our society is desirable. We recommend that the Federal Government establish a commission to undertake such a study. We have in mind particularly consideration of employment opportunities for the aged, their adjustment to retirement, the availability of recreational facilities, housing for the aged, care for the chronically ill, and other services. The maintenance of income for those who have retired is only part of the provision of security for the aged.

Financing

A primary consideration in evaluating proposals for social security benefits must be the impact of their present and future costs on the Nation's economy. The recommendations of the Council for changes in benefits and in coverage have been made only after careful consideration of the probable costs and the method for financing them. The Council, however, would be less than frank if it failed to stress the difficulties of estimating the ultimate cost of the system. Appendix B of [the full] report deals with the problem of estimating costs and discusses in some detail the nature and purpose of long-range cost estimates.

Exactly what future costs will be will depend on a number of factors that are more or less uncertain—the proportion of men and women in covered employment who will reach the age of retirement, the proportion of persons reaching the age of retirement who will have fully insured status, the proportion of persons eligible for benefits who will elect to work rather than retire, and the length of time retired persons will draw benefits. Similar questions arise in connection with survivorship benefits.

In setting the contribution rates for the system, the essential question is probably not "What percentage of pay roll would be required at some distant time to pay benefits equal to the money amount provided in the Council's recommendations?" Rather it is "What percentage of pay roll will be required to pay benefits representing about the same proportion of future monthly earnings that the benefits recommended by the Council represent of present monthly earnings?" If past trends continue, monthly wage earnings several decades hence will be considerably larger than those of today, and benefits will probably be revised to take these increased wages into account. The long-range estimates presented by the Council, however, disregard the possibility of increases in wage levels and state the costs of the proposed benefits as a percentage of the pay rolls based on continuation of the wage levels of the last few years. If increasing wage levels had been assumed, the costs of these benefits as a percentage of pay rolls would be lower than those presented. Use of the level-wage assumption, therefore, has the effect of allowing for liberalizations of benefits to keep pace with any increases in wages and pay rolls which may occur. If wages continue to rise and such liberalizations are not made, these estimates overstate the cost as a percentage of pay roll and a contribution rate based on them would be too high.

The percentage-of-pay-roll figures are the most important measure of the financial effort required to support the system and are the basis for determining ultimate contribution rates. Dollar figures taken alone are misleading. For example, extending coverage to groups now excluded would greatly increase the dollar costs because more people would become eligible for benefits, but as indicated earlier it will actually decrease the cost as a percentage of pay roll. As a result of coverage extension the income of the insurance system will be increased more than the outgo. In appendix B, however, we have included both the dollar figures and the percentage-of-pay-roll figures.

As indicated in appendix B, the percentage of pay roll required to maintain the relationship between benefits and monthly earnings recommended by the Council would average somewhere between 4.9 percent and 7.3 percent of covered pay roll under a system of nearly universal coverage. The cost in the early years of the system is much lower than it will be when those attaining age 65 have had a working lifetime under the program in which to gain insured status. By that time, the number of persons over age 65 will be much larger than at present and a much larger proportion of the aged population will be eligible for benefits. Our estimates show that the cost of the expanded plan in 1955 will probably be between 2.4 percent and 3.1 percent of pay rolls. In the year 2000 a program which maintains the same relationship between benefits and monthly earnings as the program now being recommended by the Council might cost from 5.9 percent to 9.7 percent of pay rolls. These costs are well within the range of costs expected for the program adopted in 1935 and for the amended program of 1939. Our recommendations therefore do not make necessary any increase in contribution rates over those contemplated from the beginning.

Appendix B also contains an estimate of what the Council's proposals would cost now as a percentage of covered pay rolls under a nearly universal system, had the Council's recommendations been in effect over the last 100 years. These estimates are included to give a sense of what these recommendations would mean if they were now fully operative. Using the estimate of the actual wages paid over the last 100 years, such a system would cost this year from 2.4 percent to 3.0 percent of pay rolls. If it were assumed that the benefits being paid now under such a system were based on current wage levels rather than past wages, such a system would cost this year from 4.1 percent to 4.9 percent. These figures are lower than the estimates for the future, largely because the number of old people will be much greater in the future than now.

Contribution Rate

The Council believes that, at the time benefits are liberalized, the contribution rate should be raised to 1½ percent for both employees and employers. The present 1-percent rate has remained unchanged for more than 10 years. The longer it remains unchanged, the greater the danger that the public will fail to appreciate that in the long run there must be a close relationship between contributions and benefits. It is also desirable to achieve the increase in contribution rates to the level which will eventually be necessary by gradual and more or less evenly spaced changes. Even at the present level of benefits, contributors pay but a fraction of the actuarial value of the benefits to which they are entitled. If benefits and eligibility requirements are changed as the Council recommends, current contributions will bear an even smaller ratio to the actuarial value of benefits. For these reasons, the Council believes that the contribution rate should be increased when benefits are liberalized.

An incidental effect of the recommendation just outlined is that the trust fund will continue to increase for a number of years. Changes in the size of the trust fund, whether increases or decreases, may present certain problems of fiscal policy, the character of which will depend on prevailing economic conditions. The Council does not believe that the short-range increases in the trust fund which will result from its recommendations will confront the Government with fiscal problems that cannot be readily handled. We favor, however, keeping this excess of income over outgo as low as is consistent with public understanding that in the long run there must be a close relationship between benefits and contributions. We believe that the second step-up in the tax rate, to 2 percent on employer and 2 percent on employee, should not take place until actually needed to cover current disbursements.

Government Participation

The Council believes that old-age and survivors insurance should be planned on the assumption that general taxation will eventually share more or less equally with employer and employee contributions in financing future benefit outlays and administrative costs. Under our recommendations, the full rate of benefits will be paid to those who retire during the first two or three decades of operation even though they pay only a fraction of the cost of their benefits. In a social insurance system, it would be inequitable to ask either employers or employees to finance the entire cost of liabilities arising primarily because the act had not been passed earlier than it was. Hence, it is desirable for the Federal Government, as sponsor of the program, to assume at least part of these accrued liabilities based on the prior service of early retirants. A Government contribution would be a recognition of the interest of the Nation as a whole in the welfare of the aged and of widows and children. Such a contribution is particularly appropriate in view of the relief to the general taxpayer which should result from the substitution of social insurance for part of public assistance.

The Council has suggested that the introduction of the Government contribution be considered when the 2-percent rate for employer and employee plus interest on the trust fund is insufficient to meet current costs. If the Government contribution is delayed beyond the point at which costs begin to exceed 4 percent, the result might well be that the contribution would never be as much as one-third of eventual benefit outlays, because under our low-cost estimates, the annual cost of the benefits never exceeds 6 percent of pay roll even though under the high estimates the cost reaches 9.7 percent.

Purchasing Power of Benefits

For millions of persons the social security system represents a guaranty of future security. If that guaranty is to be valid and meaningful, the purchasing power of benefits must not be destroyed by large increases in price levels. A special obligation rests on the Government and all groups in the community with an interest in the social insurance system and in the security it offers to make sure that monetary policies, price policies, and wage policies contribute to the objective of preventing such a large rise in the price level. If the people of the United States are unable to prevent steep increases in price levels, benefits will have to be readjusted to preserve their purchasing power, for unless the purchasing power of the benefits is preserved, the security guaranteed by the social insurance plan will be illusory.

Importance of a Broad Informational Program

The Council recommends a broad informational program to give publicity to any new amendments passed by the Congress. Under old-age and survivors insurance, contributors have established an equity in the trust fund. The Government as trustee has an obligation to inform the beneficiaries of their rights. The reporting and tax provisions as well as the benefit provisions will affect millions heretofore outside the scope of the law; unless they are fully informed of the duties they must now assume, records will be incomplete and the resulting confusion may tend to defeat the purpose of the extended protection. No social security program can be effective unless those who are entitled to participate know their rights and obligations.