

Dear Hazel,

I am immersed in the job of preparing the remaining chapters of the poverty report. There is one serious ~~one~~ gap which I'd be terribly grateful if you could help me to fill. In part ~~the gap~~ the problem refers to one of the tables you prepared for Alan Walker a few months ago which didn't work

namely:  $\text{Eg Household Type I (25)} \times \text{Worth/as PC SB (26)}^{\text{of income units}}$   
 $\times \text{Age (40)} \times \text{Complete (21)}$

The problem is that I have been inconsistent in sometimes requesting tables for individuals of ~~the~~ net disp. <sup>household</sup> income last year as a per cent of SB ~~for households~~ and sometimes <sup>of net disp.</sup> ~~income~~ <sup>income</sup> units. As you will appreciate the results are sometimes different and I need to iron out the inconsistency.

Therefore, would it be possible for you to run the following? :-

1. Individuals. Net disp inc last year ~~as % SB~~ of income units as % SB (under 100, 100-119, ~~120-139~~, 140-199, 200-299, 300+)  
 $\times$  sex (males, females and both sexes)  
 $\times$  age (0-4, 5-9, 10-14, 15-19, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60-64, 65-69, 70-79, 80+)

2. Individuals Net income worth last year of income units as % SB (same groups as above)  
 $\times$  sex (as above)  
 $\times$  age (as above)

3. and 4. As 1 & 2 substituting weeks employed last year (0, 1-25, 26-39, 40+) for sex.

4 and 5. As 1 and 2

<sup>social class</sup>  
age (0-14, 15-39, 40-64, 65+ and all ages)  
 $\times$  <sup>social class</sup>

As 1 & 2

age (0-14, 15-39, 40-64, 65+ and all ages)  
 $\times$  disability score (0, 1-2, 3-6, 7+)

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various committees of the Board of Directors of the City of New York, for the year 1902.

(1902) Board of Directors

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been appointed to the various committees of the Board of Directors of the City of New York, for the year 1902.

(1902) Board of Directors  
 (1902) Board of Directors  
 (1902) Board of Directors

(1902) Board of Directors  
 (1902) Board of Directors

(1902) Board of Directors

(1902) Board of Directors

(1902) Board of Directors

## Hazel

There seems to be some discrepancy between Tables 4 and 26

According to 4, there are 298 <sup>65+</sup> males in elderly income units 563 <sup>Female, 65+</sup>


According to 26, 258 males 65+ 572

According to 4 53 males, under <sup>100</sup> ~~92~~ % SB, + 117 females  
~~117~~ females

26

47

+ 115



~~Occa~~ Contributions to pensions as reported by Gov Actuary

	1967	(1956)	1971
	Private	Public	Total
185	160	345 (130)	290 230 520
515	405	920 (365)	725 625 1350
700	565	1265 (495)	1015 855 1870

written Answer Hansard  
25 Jan 73 <sup>232</sup>

Bur.

Nat Westminster Bank Review Aug 72

TE Chester "Private Pensions or State Benefits"

Reserve scheme made as modest as possible & provides miniscule pensions for many years to come.

A man retiring in 1995 (20 yrs after start of scheme) can expect a pension from this source of only 8% of his last complete ear's.

Benefits

~~in 1956~~ ~~then~~

<del>Occ Pensions</del>	1956	1967
Occ P.'s	185	570
Ret benefits	455	1401
S.B.	61	200
	<u>701</u>	<u>2,171</u>

O'fs 26.4% 26.3%

\_\_\_\_\_

[illegible]

\_\_\_\_\_

STUDY ON THE REACTION OF POLYMERIZATION

1. What is the purpose of the study?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

1. What is the main purpose of the study?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_

---

\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

\_\_\_\_\_

## Add to Chapter on Old People

Tab 8.7 SB list  
for Ch 16.

Received

~~Return~~  
Add inc units receiving ret pensions  
134

Ok

17

No

23

Above

241

Below

102


517

Table 121 of Poverty Among the Aged Series ~~27~~

off. age.

206 receive

146 eligible —



Check ~~300~~ TAB 129

(46)

Used  
TAB 24/15

Extra costs

Increasing Disability and Access to Resources



Help. <sup>by relative</sup> most helped in 100-140% group living alone

Also true though less marked married couples

Tab 103 Help by neighbour ditto

	under 100	100-139	140+	Total
Helped by relative per cent	25	43	22	35
<u>TAB 100</u> base no.	40	122	51	213
friend neighbour	35	26	12	24
<u>103</u> Same				
106 no help neigh/friend/rel	42	37	69	45

<u>TAB 114</u>	Stayed away from home			guest to stay		
	living alone	MC	others			
No	51	66	75	72	60	63
rel	38	29	<del>17</del>	20	33	27
friend	8	3	2	5	2	5
both	<del>3</del>	1	<del>4</del>	3	5	4
	<del>188</del>	<del>344</del>	<del>218</del>			
	223	401	266	225	401	265

	<u>TAB 121</u>		Total
	Receives	eligible	
60-64	19.1	11.5	157
65-69	27.2	18.7	235
70-74	18.4	26.6	158
75-79	32.9	15.7	140
80+	34.6	18.7	107
	206	146	797


How long since i work x age groups. Table ~~123~~ ~~128~~

352

18.3 x

Subj. deprivation

	Alone	MC	others
helped by rel.	34	13	8
neigh	23	4	3
neigh help.	52	16	11
helped last 12 mths.	43	25	21




TABLE

Percent of elderly living alone, in married pairs and with others according to frequency of seeing relatives outside the household

most frequent contact <del>Frequency</del> with relatives outside household	Living alone	Living in married pairs	Living with others
Seen most or all days of week	31	24	21
Seen at least <del>one</del> weekly	38	38	36
Not seen in last week	31	38	43
	100	100	100
	229	408	270

Source: Poverty Among the Aged Series No. 96.



$$\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 9 \overline{) 5568} \\ \underline{619} \\ 1237 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{r} 5568 \\ 4005 \\ \underline{1563} \\ 79 \end{array}$$

1871

$$\begin{array}{r} 187 \\ \underline{94} \\ 281 \end{array}$$

$\frac{2}{9}$


$$\begin{array}{r} 4005 \\ \underline{4005} \\ 0 \end{array} = \begin{array}{r} 890 \\ \underline{234} \\ 1171 \end{array}$$

1171

$$\begin{array}{r} 205 \\ 205 \\ \underline{180} \\ 15 \end{array}$$


How ~~is~~ was figure 1153 computed?

$$\begin{array}{r} 22 \quad 21 \quad 24 \quad 26 \\ 17 \quad 30 \quad 51 \quad 77 \\ \hline 39 \quad 51 \quad 75 \quad 103 \\ 14 \quad 19 \quad 28 \quad 39 \end{array}$$



### Items required on resource take for income units

1. Gross weekly earnings last year less travel costs
2. Estimate tax paid in year
3. Amount received in year retirement pension  
Ditto each of other benefits



Jobs Monday

Raelung's arrangement

Hazel : ① Inc of inc unit as % SB what do about housing costs?

Walt Ischwig : Proofs


Alan Walker ① Disability g'aive  
② Point on Old P. chapter

~~Phil~~

Tony Atkinson check housing costs

John Bond check 7% rate of interest as rental income


Phil Holden : ① Long-standing tables  
② Housing subsidy  
③ Net worth alternative



NOT USED

	seen others	relatives men 65+	women 60+
most days	21.8	22.2	26.2
weekly	40.1	38.5	36.6
none	38.1	39.2	37.2
	100	100	100
TAB 54	5046	288	621

~~Tab~~ Tab 58 seen rels eligible / receives SB



Living alone	Household Income as % to SB			NIW as % to SB		
	N	M	SK Man Partly or unskilled			
under 100	15	21	21	4	13	10
100-139	44	64	64	20	49	55
140+	41	15	15	15	10	12
	43	16	14	19	16	14
	61	73	53	43	12	8
	54	69	49	54	69	49
married pairs	18	15	17	0	5	14
	17	40	44	4	21	24
	64	45	39	15	26	25
	22	29	26	22	29	26
	60	20	11	60	20	11
	87	91	137	82	82	122

(13)	(3)	4
15	26	37
72	72	60
39	39	52

(0)	(0)	(0)
3	9	28
22	24	30
22	44	30
53	24	12
36	34	43

- This shows
- ① Fewer living in poverty <sup>as on margin</sup> when living with others
  - ② Fewer <sup>than living alone</sup> m.c.
  - \* ③ Fewer non-manual than manual in poverty <sup>as on margin</sup> in all three living arrangements
  - ~~④~~ and Partly and unskilled either same (living alone) or worse (living in pairs or with others).
  - ⑤ When account taken of assets more striking decline in non-manual groups living in poverty or on margin

~~A/73~~ A/73

