

borne out by the claims. About 42 percent of the dependents whose cases have been handled so far have not been residing with their sponsors because of the exigencies of service in the Armed Forces. It appears probable that this situation will continue.

Currently, a committee has been authorized by the Secretary of Defense that will consider the question of dental care for dependents. Recommendations will be incorporated in a report and submitted to the Secretary of Defense for his action.

Dependents of Army personnel—and Air Force dependents to a lesser extent—previously received dental care when dentists were available to give such care. The other services were not dispensing dental treatment to any great extent, and its being “taken away” did not affect their dependents as much as it did in the Army.

The purpose of the Dependents’ Medical Care Act was “to create and

maintain high morale throughout the uniformed services by providing an improved and uniform program of medical care for . . . dependents.” Its intent was to aid in attracting and keeping the serviceman in the service. How well it is doing this job, it is too early to ascertain. A recent survey, however, of dependents who had availed themselves of civilian medical care showed that the vast majority of them were well pleased with the service they had received. Whether recruiting and reenlistments will, in turn, be stimulated is at best a difficult question to answer. In recruitment drives and reenlistment posters, the program is being featured as a benefit for service personnel.

As experience is obtained, it is possible that the protection of the program can be extended to include care for mental and nervous disorders and dental care—types of care that are limited under the present plan. A continuing study looking toward im-

provement and extension of medical care for service dependents is under way. A report from the Committee on Armed Services that accompanied the medical care bill when it reached the floor of the House of Representatives stated:

It should be noted that the minimum requirements do not preclude additional benefits being provided if in the course of developing such program, the addition of benefits is both administratively and economically feasible.

Those of us charged with the responsibility of administering this program have found it a challenging experience. It could not have become an effective program had it not been for the cooperation and good will we have met in every phase of its implementation. The principle, inherent in this program, of using private insurance organizations as the agents for providing service benefits has proved workable.

Notes and Brief Reports

State and Local Government Employment Under OASDI, January 1957*

Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage of State and local government employees has continued to rise. In January 1957, almost 2 million of these workers were covered through voluntary agreements made by the States with the Federal Government—a slight increase from the number in October 1956.

The coverage added during the 3-month period amounted to somewhat

more than 50,000, only about half the increase in the preceding quarter. In most States the number of employees covered in January 1957 was higher than in October 1956. For only a few States, however, was the increase marked. Sixty percent of the coverage added during the quarter was concentrated in four States—Michigan, Oregon, Texas, and West Virginia.

Of all State and local employees (other than those under compulsory coverage), slightly less than two-fifths have been covered through the voluntary agreement provisions. With the availability of new data from the Bureau of the Census, it has been possible to shift from October 1955 to October 1956 the base used in relating coverage to total employment. Consequently, the approximate coverage percentages for January 1957 cannot be compared with those for the preceding quarter for purposes of measuring the change between October 1956 and January 1957. The total for all employment in State and

local governments was nearly 220,000 higher in October 1956 than in October 1955. Shifting to the more up-to-date base therefore tends to reduce the coverage index slightly. The 38 percent that represents the current approximate percentage for the continental United States would have been 40 percent if the old base had been used. The percentages shown in table 1 for each State are likewise affected, but the influence for some may be in the other direction.

In general, the States with the largest total employment in State and local governments have relatively small proportions of their employees covered. Seven States, each with more than 200,000 employees, account for almost half the total employment but for less than one-fifth of the covered employment. Approximately 16 percent of the aggregate employment of these seven States is covered, in contrast to 57 percent in the remaining 41 States.

The following tabulation shows the number of States distributed by the proportion of employment covered in January, separately for total employment and each type of government.

* Prepared by Dorothy McCamman, Division of Program Research, Office of the Commissioner, from estimates developed in the Division of Program Analysis, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance. More detailed data by State and type of government appear in a quarterly statistical report, *State and Local Government Employment Covered by Old-Age and Survivors Insurance under Section 218 of the Social Security Act* (Division of Program Analysis, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance).

Table 1.—Rough estimates of State and local government employment covered under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance through voluntary agreements and of dual coverage, by State, as of January 1957

[Continental United States]

State	Covered by old-age, survivors, and disability insurance		Number with dual coverage ³			
	Number ¹	Approximate percent of all State and local government employment ²	Total	Previous system dissolved and reinstated	No previous system (added after OASDI coverage)	Members covered under referendum provisions
Total.....	4 1,988,000	38	982,450	347,160	30,070	604,740
Alabama.....	76,700	90	39,810	150	10	5 39,650
Arizona.....	29,500	90	15,920	5 8,920	0	6 7,000
Arkansas.....	26,500	56	3,520	0	100	3,420
California.....	26,900	6	4,460	420	100	3,940
Colorado.....	16,900	28	960	0	0	960
Connecticut.....	9,400	14	1,420	0	730	690
Delaware.....	11,300	85	7,500	5 6,500	0	1,000
District of Columbia ⁷						
Florida.....	14,300	11	220	0	100	120
Georgia.....	24,700	25	3,330	610	550	2,170
Idaho.....	15,800	69	60	0	0	60
Illinois.....	10,100	4	110	90	20	0
Indiana.....	104,000	80	60,000	0	0	5 60,000
Iowa.....	90,900	94	79,090	5 78,930	70	90
Kansas.....	66,700	85	24,760	6,590	250	5 17,920
Kentucky.....	42,400	56	1,000	0	0	1,000
Louisiana.....	25,000	24	14,460	1,400	5,700	5 7,360
Maine.....	6,400	20	280	0	0	280
Maryland.....	8,000	10	410	0	410	0
Massachusetts.....	300	(8)	0	0	0	0
Michigan.....	197,500	80	138,390	0	190	5 138,200
Minnesota.....	2,200	2	960	0	0	960
Mississippi.....	52,300	84	40,010	5 20,000	5 20,000	10
Missouri.....	76,800	66	6,100	0	600	5 5,500
Montana.....	15,200	83	13,330	0	0	5 13,330
Nebraska.....	52,600	97	29,150	920	0	5 28,230
Nevada.....	700	7	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire.....	10,000	47	300	0	0	300
New Jersey.....	135,500	83	120,700	72,500	0	5 48,200
New Mexico.....	2,800	10	1,820	0	0	1,820
New York.....	102,100	18	0	0	0	0
North Carolina.....	87,300	75	74,280	0	0	5 74,280
North Dakota.....	2,400	9	1,160	0	0	5 1,160
Ohio ¹⁰						
Oklahoma.....	51,000	63	9,370	10	0	5 9,360
Oregon.....	64,800	102	48,150	5 44,000	0	5 4,150
Pennsylvania.....	32,400	11	2,520	1,290	1,230	0
Rhode Island.....	10,300	43	2,630	0	0	2,630
South Carolina.....	59,900	93	53,110	0	0	5 53,110
South Dakota.....	23,000	83	390	0	0	390
Tennessee.....	27,500	29	930	0	0	930
Texas.....	113,000	45	49,740	0	0	5 49,740
Utah.....	31,800	104	11,900	5 11,770	0	130
Vermont.....	7,300	55	1,410	0	10	5 1,400
Virginia.....	96,200	92	51,290	5 50,540	0	750
Washington.....	33,900	34	24,410	0	0	5 24,410
West Virginia.....	37,400	74	120	0	0	20
Wisconsin.....	42,000	32	35,000	5 35,000	0	0
Wyoming.....	13,400	95	8,000	5 8,000	0	0

¹ Current estimate of employment for which coverage has been approved, regardless of effective dates. Includes, in addition to employment shown in wage reports, data on employees recently covered but not yet represented in tabulated wage reports.
² Approximate percent of all State and local government employment (other than that under compulsory old-age, survivors, and disability insurance coverage) that is actually covered. Based on data from the Bureau of the Census for total State and local government employment as of October 1956 (latest available).
³ Based on estimates furnished by the State or made by the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance at the time the groups were brought under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance rather than on wage reports. (Employees with dual coverage are not identified in wage reports.) Some retirement systems, particularly the smaller ones,

may not be included because States are not required to report information of this type.
⁴ Includes 600 employees of interstate instrumentalities not distributed by State.
⁵ Includes State employees.
⁶ Includes public school teachers covered under a statewide retirement system.
⁷ Not included in statutory definition of State for purposes of agreement.
⁸ Less than 0.5 percent.
⁹ Includes public school teachers in one or more school districts, counties, or cities; or school teachers covered under city or township retirement systems.
¹⁰ No agreement.
¹¹ Special Federal legislation made dissolution of previous system unnecessary.
 Source: Estimates by Division of Program Analysis, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance.

Use of the current Census Bureau data as the base has also affected this distribution, especially with respect to employment at the State level, and invalidates any comparison with the earlier tabulation.

Approximate percent of employment covered ¹	Number of States			
	Total	Type of government		
		State	County	Local
Total.....	48	48	2 47	48
None or unknown.....	1	2	5	1
Less than 20.....	12	16	7	13
20-39.....	7	2	2	10
40-59.....	6	1	4	9
60-79.....	6	8	5	4
80 or more.....	16	19	24	11
80-89.....	7	6	1	6
90 or more.....	9	13	23	5

¹ Current estimates.
² Rhode Island has no county governments.

Dual coverage.—Only some 13,000 of the newly covered State and local employees were added through the referendum provisions of the 1954 amendments. The number with dual coverage (coverage under old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and membership in a State or local government retirement system) is approaching 1 million and accounts for almost half the total number with coverage under the Federal program. In eight States—Iowa, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and Wisconsin—three-fourths or more of the employees covered by the Social Security Act also have protection under special systems. With the exception of Wisconsin, these are States where the approximate percentage of all public employment covered by old-age, survivors, and disability insurance considerably exceeds the national average; in five of them, more than 4 out of every 5 State and local government employees were covered as of January 1957.

Employment, Workers, and Wages Under OASDI

Greater economic activity brought a rise from April-June 1955 to April-June 1956 in the number of workers covered by old-age, survivors, and