One will also note from this table that there has been a general tendency for payroll taxes to rise. This was not, however, true during the 1930's and 1940's. In fact, the anticipated rise of rates was postponed, and particularly in the 1930's there was a considerable fear that an increase in rates would have a depressing effect upon the economy. It is a little more difficult to explain the failure to increase rates during the war, at least the failure during the war when inflationary forces were at work. By that time a general view had developed that the program should be on a pay-as-you-go basis and, therefore, it would not be wise to accumulate large reserves. Beginning in 1950, however, the tendency to increase rates tended to become stronger and particularly since 1954, as the table suggests. By 1969 it is expected that the total rate for combined employer-employee would be 9 percent.

INCREASED BENEFITS THROUGH INCREASED COVERAGE OF FAMILY MEMBERS

So far we have discussed largely the benefits available to an individual or the family. It should be noted, however, that there has been liberalization of the program through making available additional benefits to other members of the family. The original 1935 act provided 100 percent of primary insurance amount for the old-age retired worker. There were no provisions for disability until the 1956 act and even that applies only to those aged 50 and over. The 1939 act provided for wives' or husbands' benefit of 50 percent of the primary insurance amount; a child of retired worker, 50 percent of the primary insurance amount; a child of deceased worker, 50 percent of primary insurance amount; widows or widowers and widow mothers, 75 percent of primary insurance amount; parents, 50 percent of primary insurance amount. The last was later increased under the 1950 act to 75 percent of primary insurance amount. The minimum family and maximum family benefits in relation to price and income rises are still relevant. The introduction of these additional benefits to other members of the family made it possible to provide a larger amount of benefits within these minimums and maximums.

Under the pressure of increased benefits the costs of the program tend to increase. For example, the level premium equivalent benefits in 1950 were 6.05 percent of taxable payrolls and by the 1958 act they were estimated at 8.76. Contributions in these 2 years were estimated at 5.95 and 8.52. In recent years the Government has urged the Congress and the Congress in turn has been anxious to balance the accounts so that the program would be actuarially sound. This has meant, of course, a marked rise in payroll taxes to match the increase in benefits.

> It may, therefore, be said that the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program is actuarially sound if the estimates show that future income from contributions and from interest earnings on the accumlated trust funds will, in the long run, support the disbursements for benefits and administrative expenses * * *.[29]

[29] Myers, R. J., "Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Financing Basis and Policy Under the 1958 Amendments," Social Security Bulletin, October 1958, p. 15.