Notes and Brief Reports

Disability Insurance Benefits in Current-Payments Status, by State, February 28, 1959*

At the end of February 1959, the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program was paying disability insurance benefits to 255,000 disabled workers aged 50-64-a 70-percent increase from the number in December 1957. The accompanying table shows the average monthly benefit amount as of February 28, 1959, and gives a percentage distribution of the number of beneficiaries according to the size of their benefit. The data are classified by the beneficiaries' State of residence at the end of February 1959.

In February 1959 the average disability insurance benefit amounted to \$88.11-\$15.35 more than the average in December 1957. The higher average resulted chiefly from provisions in the 1958 amendments that (1) repealed, effective August 1958. the "offset" provision, under which disability insurance benefits were reduced by payments based on disability payable under certain other programs, and (2) increased benefits by about 7 percent, effective January 1959. Another factor increasing the average benefit was the rise in the proportion of benefits computed on the basis of earnings after 1950; the proportion increased from 62 percent in December 1957 to almost 69 percent in November 1958, the latest date for which this information is available. The average disability insurance benefit went up in each of the 14 months-from \$72,76 in December 1957 to \$88.11 in February 1959.

Almost half of all disabled-worker beneficiaries were receiving monthly benefits of \$90-\$116. The proportion receiving the maximum amount -\$116 in February 1959 and \$108.50 in December 1957—increased from 1.4 percent in December 1957 to 7.2 percent in February 1959. Forty-four percent were receiving benefits in the \$60-\$89 range, and only 1 in 15 was receiving less than \$60.00. Minimum benefits were being paid to only 0.2 percent of all disabled-worker beneficiaries.

Among the 50 States and the District of Columbia, disability insurance beneficiaries living in Alaska

and Michigan were receiving the highest monthly benefits—an average of \$96.39 in Alaska and \$95.93 in Michigan-and those in Mississippi were receiving the lowest benefitsan average of \$77.81. Benefits ranging from \$90 to \$116 were being paid to 67 percent of the disabled-worker beneficiaries in Michigan and to 27 percent in Mississippi. Only 14 percent of the disability insurance beneficiaries in Michigan but 48 percent

Number and average monthly amount of disability insurance benefits 1 in current-payment status and percentage distribution by amount of benefit, by State, February 28, 1959

State 2	Average	Number of dis-	Percent of disability beneficiaries receiving—								
(ranked by size of average benefit)	dis- ability benefit	ability bene- ficiaries	Total	\$33	\$34- 44	\$45- 59	\$60- 74	\$75- 89	\$90- 104	\$105- 115	\$116
Total	\$88.11	254,701	100.0	0.2	0.9	5.6	19.1	25.4	20.4	21.2	7.2
Alaska	96.39	69	100.0	0	0	2.9	10.3	16.2	19.1	41.2	10.3
Michigan	95.93	10,010	100.0	(3)	.3	2.5	10.8	19.2	20.5	33.5	13.2
Connecticut	91.99 9 1.98	3,933	100.0 100.0	. 1	.2	2.7	14.8	24.8 23.6	23.6	24.8	9.0 9.5
OhioArizona	91.98	13,638 2,089	100.0	.1 .1	.4	3.5 3.4	13.9	25.2	21.0	25.0	10.8
New Jersey	91.83	9,029	100.0	.î	.4	3.3	15.5	23.4	22.4	25.1	9.8
California	91.74	18,798	100.0	(8)	.3	3.4	15.0	24.7	21.2	26.4	9.0
Washington	91.57	3,890	100.0	. 1	.2	3.0	15.2	24.7	23.5	26.6	6.7
Indiana	91.50	6,519	100.0	.1	,.6	4.2	15.0	22.9	22.2	26.0	9.0
Nevada Wisconsin	91.43 91.18	271 4.843	100.0 100.0	.3	0.7	3.4 4.2	16.5 16.2	24.4 22.1	22.6 21.7	24.8	8.3 10.0
Utah	91.10	576	100.0	.2	.5	4.6	15.4	24.5	21.4	21.9	11.5
Pennsylvania	90.88	21,136	100.0	.1	.6	3.7	14.3	25.3	26.1	23.1	6.8
Oregon West Virginia	90.86 90.83	2,194 4,809	100.0 100.0	(3)2	.3 .6	3.0 3.7	16.1 13.7	24.2 27.1	24.4 23.4	25.2 24.7	6.6 6.8
Illinois	90.58	13,993	100.0	.2	.6	4.4	16.7	23.4	21.2	24.6	8.9
Montana	90.12	754	100.0	.ĩ	.9	5.8	17.2	24.6	16.6	23.0	11.8
Florida	89.95	8,893	100.0	.1	.9	5.4	17.4	22.3	18.6	25.7	9.6
Wyoming Colorado	89.72	269	100.0	.8	.4	4.9	15.5	24.2	23.5	23.5	7.2
Colorado	89.28	1,515	100.0	.1	.5	5.6	16.8	26.1 25.9	22.1 20.5	21.3 21.7	7.5 8.2
New York Delaware	89.16 88.83	27,280 575	100.0 100.0	.1 .4	.5 .7	4.7 5.0	18.4 21.6	22.9	18.9	18.8	11.7
Idaho	88.63	559	100.0	0.4	.4	5.5	19.5	24.4	22.0	22.4	5.8
Minnesota	88.32	2,912	100.0	.2	1.0	6.1	19.1	23.2	21.4	22.1	6.9
Maryland	87.37	3,545	100.0	.1	.7	6.7	20.0	25.3	19.1	21.5	6.6
Hawaii	87.10	588	100.0	.2	.5	5.5	16.8	31.0	24.6	18.5	2.9
Kansas	86.84	2,275	100.0	.5	1.4	6.0	20.1	25.5	20.5	19.4	6.6
New Mexico Massachusetts	86.77 86.59	649	100.0	.2	.8	5.8 5.0	20.6 21.6	27.6 29.5	20.1	18.8 17.2	6.1 5.3
Iowa	86.44	9,000 2,761	100.0 100.0	.1 .2	1.2	5.9	20.8	26.7	20.8	19.0	5.4
Oklahoma	86.41	2,950	100.0	.2	1.1	7.3	21.6	23.4	20.0	19.9	6.5
Virgin Islands	86.40	5	100.0	0	0	0	40.0	0	40.0	20.0	0
Rhode Island	86.20	1,814	100.0	.1	.3	5.3	21.7	30.0	21.0	16.9	4.7
Missouri	85.82	6,432	100.0	.2	1.2	7.3	22.1	25.5	19.1	19.0 14.9	5.6 4.3
New Hampshire Nebraska	85.70 84.96	944 1,338	100.0	0 .5	1.0	4.5 7.5	22.2 19.9	31.5 28.8	21.6 20.2	16.8	4.6
Kentucky	84.60	4.950	100.0	.3	1.6	7.5	21.9	27.8	19.8	16.5	4.6
Vermont	84.52	697	100.0	.4	1.0	7.0	21.8	29.5	21.8	14.8	3.7
South Dakota	84.44	421	100.0	.2	.7	8.0	22.0	27.4	22.5	16.5	2.7
Texas	84.16	10,210	100.0	.3	1.6	8.6	23.6	25.2	18.0	17.1	5.6
Dist. of Col	83.57	1,007	100.0	0	.6	7.2	26.2	29.5	19.7	13.3	3.5
Virginia	83.14	5,983	100.0	.4	1.8	8.0	24.9 23.3	27.5 30.4	18.4 19.2	14.5 13.7	4.5 3.4
Maine North Dakota	83.04 82.72	1,702	100.0	.2 .4	1.9	7.9 10.9	25.4	25.4	18.4	12.4	6.4
Tennessee	82.35	5.063	100.0	.3	2.0	8.4	25.7	28.6	16.6	14.0	4.4
Alabama	81.96	5,314	100.0	.7	2.1	8.4	25.7	28.1	17.4	14.0	3.6
Louisiana	81.19	4,209	100.0	.7	2.3	10.4	27.6	24.5	15.6	14.4	4.5
Arkansas	80.47	2,873	100.0	.4	2.7	11.0 10.4	26.8 30.8	26.7 28.7	15.5 14.0	12.8 10.0	4.1 3.0
Georgia South Carolina	78.61 78.54	6,178 3,677	100.0 100.0	.7 .4	2.4 1.9	10.4	30.8	31.3	15.0	8.4	2.0
North Carolina	78.38	7,541	100.0	.3	1.6	10.5	31.7	31.1	14.0	8.4	2.4
Mississippi	77.81	2,681	100.0	.6	3.0	11.7	32.4	25.2	13.9	10.1	3.1
Puerto Rico	65.51	303	100.0	5.1	16.8	19.9	22.1	19.9	10.1	5.4	.7
Foreign	92.98	765	100.0	0	.3	1.6	10.7	26.9	25.3	29.2	6.0

Payable to disabled workers aged 50-64. Beneficiary's State of residence.
Less than 0.05 percent.

^{*} Prepared in the Division of Program Analysis, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

of those in Mississippi were receiving benefits of \$33-\$74.

Coverage of State and Local Government Employees Under OASDI*

Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage of State and local government employees has increased in each of the 8 years that the protection of the Federal program has been available to this group. As of January 1959 about 3½ million, or 55

Table 1.—State and local government employment, total number and covered under OASDI number through voluntary agreements, October 1950-58 and January 1959

[Numbers in thousands]

Month	State and local government employment ¹							
	Contine							
	Total	Cov under (Total number covered under					
	number 2	Number	Percent of total	OASDI3				
October: 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1956 1957 1958 January 1959	4,230 4,230 4,470 4,610 4,805 5,005 5,225 45,700 5,840 45,990	540 695 810 960 1,220 1,935 2,275 3,180 3,230	13 16 18 20 24 37 40 54 55	540 735 850 1,000 1,270 1,985 2,360 3,295 3,345				

¹ Excludes the District of Columbia, which is not

percent of the almost 6 million persons employed by State and local governments, were covered through voluntary agreements made by the States with the Federal Government.

In October of 1951—the first year coverage for these workers was possible-more than half a million employees were covered; they represented approximately 13 percent of all persons employed by State or local governments at that time. The 55 percent covered in January 1959 was more than four times the proportion with coverage in October 1951, and the number of covered employees had increased to six times the number covered in 1951.

One reason for the rise in number was the growth in State and local government employment, which increased by more than 11/2 million during the period October 1951-January 1959. The increase in the number of persons employed by State and local governments and in their coverage by old-age, survivors, and disability insurance under successive amendments to the Social Security Act is shown in table 1.

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1950 permitted coverage, effective in 1951, of State and local government employees who were not protected by retirement systems. By October 1954 coverage under this provision had been extended to approximately 1 out of every 5 of these government employees. The 1954 amendments granted eligibility for coverage, effective in 1955, to most employees who were under a State or local retirement system. By October 1957, 2 out of every 5 State or local government employees were covered, including almost a million who were members of retirement systems. Under the 1956 amendments, specified States were permitted to divide positions under their retirement systems into two groups in order to provide

Table 2.—State and local government employment covered under old-age. survivors, and disability insurance through voluntary agreements, by State, January 1959

		Approximate percent of all State and local gov- ernment employment ²						Approximate percent of all State and local gov- ernment employment ²			
	Num- ber ¹	Total	Type of government			State	Num- ber ¹	(To Ao)	Type of government		
			State	Coun- ty	Lo-			Total	State	Coun- ty	Lo- cal ³
Total	3,346,100	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	Mississippi	58,800	80	91	82	70
Continental	<u> </u>					Missouri Montana	$91,200 \\ 23,300$	74 84	99 91	82 142	63 64
U.S	3,227,900	55	65	70	48	Nebraska	56,100	95	94	110	92
Alabama	83,200	87	86	98	85	Nevada New Hampshire	700 19,900	6 85	90	(5) 133	8 80
Alaska	4,100	(4)	(4)		(4)	New Jersey	151,300	83	101	80	79
Arizona	36,100		87	106		New Mexico	17,500		83	23	43
Arkansas				71		New York	450,000	71	85	80	61
California		9		17		North Carolina	111,400			93	81
Colorado Connecticut	18,100 24,200		6		24	North Dakota	15,800	51	88	85	32
Delaware			92			Oklahoma	62,800	75	79	99	68
Dist. of Col.	13,000	94	82	101	90	Oregon	64,200			111	87
Florida	72,600	48	74	86	32	Pennsylvania	241,200		80	94	77
Georgia	62,800				46		211,200		"	0.2	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Hawaii			(4)	(4)	(4)	Puerto Rico	98,900	(4)	(4)	ا۔۔۔۔ا	(4)
Idaho	23,700	88	97	112	79	Rhode Island	15,700	62	86		`´50
****			_			South Carolina	62,500		92	106	87
Illinois	47,400			4	22		24,600		84		70
Indiana					81		63,500		69	69	45
Iowa Kansas	98,800 77,300		102 82		94 74		141,000		96		24
Kentucky	48,000			82		Utah Vermont	32,300				88
Louisiana	31.200		10	50	34	Virginia	9,200 109,900		74 94		47 88
Maine	7,300				23	Virgin Islands	1.900		(4)	(4)	(4) 88
Maryland	73,100	81	88	96		Washington	94,900				86
Massachusetts	700		2		(5)	West Virginia	49,900	91	93		89
Michigan	217,700	76	77	100	73	Wisconsin	83,500	59	69	79	52
Minnesota	27,200	20	73		1	W yoming	14,300	90	92		80

¹ Estimated employment for which coverage has

7 No agreement.

included in the statutory definition of State for purposes of agreement.

2 Excludes employment for transit systems compulsorily covered; based on data from the Bureau of the Census.

of the Census.

Includes Alaska and Hawaii, and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Estimated.

^{*} Prepared in the Division of Program Analysis, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. Detailed data, by State and type of government unit, appear in a quarterly statistical report, State and Local Government Employment Covered by Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Under Section 218 of the Social Security Act.

Estimated employment for which coverage has been approved, regardless of effective dates.

Excludes employment for transit systems, compulsorily covered under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance. Based on data from the Bureau of the Census for October 1958 (latest available). Where the percentage exceeds 100, the excess is due primarily to the difference in reference

periods, and the percentage should be taken as 100

Other than county governments.

Not available.

Not included in the statutory definition of State for purposes of agreement.